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FOREWORD

This document is Volume I of the Space Station Human Productivity Study Final Report, performed under NASA-JSC Contract NAS9-17272. The complete set of volumes for this final report consists of:

- Volume I — Final Report (Study Description)
- Volume II — Executive Summary (and Oral Review)
- Volume III — Requirements
- Volume IV — Issues
- Volume V — Management Plans
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Section 1
INTRODUCTION

The Space Station Human Productivity Study was formulated to aid in NASA's overall program to maximize human productivity in Space Station operations. The importance of providing adequate support for human productivity in manned space systems was made explicit by the National Academy of Sciences in 1972*. The continuing manned space flight experience has brought even greater recognition to this subject. Further impetus derived from the President's stated goal for NASA to promote private sector investment. To achieve that goal, the Space Station system must ensure efficient performance capabilities to merit the confidence and increased investment by the private sector, as well as to serve the need for effective space research.

During Phase A of the Space Station Program, NASA Headquarters formed NASA-Contractor Concept Development Working Groups, and the sub-group on Habitability and Human Productivity led to the definition of the present study, which was sponsored by Johnson Space Center. In fact, two related studies were formulated (and implemented): the Advanced EVA (Extra-Vehicular Activity) System Design Requirements Study, on RFP 9BE2-727-4-37P, and the Human Productivity Study, to address Intra-Vehicular Activity (IVA) and IVA/EVA interface concerns (NASA contract NAS9-17272). The primary goal of this study was to develop design and operations requirements for direct support of IVA crew performance and productivity. It was recognized that much work had already been accomplished which provided sufficient data for the definition of the desired requirements. It was necessary, therefore, to assess the status of such data to extract definable requirements, and then to define the remaining study needs. The explicit objectives of the study were to:

- Review existing data to identify potential problems for Space Station crew productivity and to define requirements for support of productivity insofar as they could be justified by current information

- Identify those areas that lack adequate data

- Define approaches for developing the lacking data

- Prepare plans for managing studies to develop the lacking data, so that results can be input to the Space Station Program in a timely manner.
This study was conducted by a joint NASA and contractor team whose key members are shown in Fig. 1-1. A total of about 36 contractor analysts, selected for their respective expertise, participated in initiating the data generated by the study. Throughout the performance of the study, contributions were received from many NASA offices and other recognized experts in their respective fields.

The primary products resulting from this study are:

• The Space Station Human Productivity Requirements document (Volume III of this report) to be made available to all Space Station Program (SSP) participants.

• Definitions of needed study topics, called “Issues” (Volume IV)

• Management Plans for the performance of studies needed to resolve defined Issues (Volume V)

• Personal Computer (PC) data files, containing all data developed for the study.

The study has been extended in order to develop a Relational Data Base from the evolved data files for broad Space Station Program utility. This is discussed in paragraph 2.2 and in Section 5.

Fig. 1-1 The Space Station Human Productivity Study Team
Section 2

TECHNICAL APPROACH

2.1 OVERVIEW

An overview of the study approach is depicted in Fig. 2-1. An initial literature search provided a data resource for identifying the IVA and IVA/EVA Interface Space Station Elements which affect human productivity. The data search then continued throughout the study in support of all tasks. This search disclosed many areas in which data was sufficient to enable the definition of requirements. These were documented and, in many cases, candidate solutions were also documented based on the research. In order to proceed with the study, certain critical assumptions about Space Station design or operations were necessarily defined. References throughout the study were fully documented. Research also disclosed problem areas for which requirements could not be fully defined, because of the inadequacy of existing data. Such data gaps were noted as unresolved requirements. Unresolved requirements were then synthesized to form distinctly defined study topics, called Issues.

The joint NASA-contractor team then evaluated the identified Issues through several iterations to confirm the content of each Issue and to estimate the relative importance of each to the Space Station Program. A comparison was then made to existing or firmly planned NASA studies to determine which Issues would be resolved by those programs. Those Issues not already in that process were addressed by the contractor team for the development of needed study approaches and study management plans. In many cases, the management plans combined several Issues in order to formulate comprehensive topical areas for meaningful research, correlating study completion schedules to need dates based on the Space Station Program (SSP) milestones. Each management plan contains several sections, including background, specific tasks, and schedule. As the described studies are completed, NASA will update the published requirements.

2.2 DATA MANAGEMENT

The large amount of data, collected and processed by the widely located study team members, required the support of a networked PC data collection system. The system architecture and network is shown in Fig. 2-2. Because of the large data exchange requirements, most data "networking" was handled by exchange of diskettes or tapes. Message communi-
Fig. 2-1 Technical Approach Overview
Fig. 2-2 The Human Productivity Study Data Management System Architecture
cations and transmittals of smaller data could occur daily. Inclusion of the TURN-ON unit (hardware and software) permitted access to Send or Receive files when one PC was powered off. The off PC was temporarily powered at the request of the active terminal, then unpowed at the conclusion of the transmittal, making communication across time zones convenient and economical.

All inputs and output reports were preformatted and standardized for control and convenience among the many users. As the study progressed, minor modifications to report formats occurred.

The described data files will be retained for conversion to a Relational Data Base. The conversion effort, underway as an extension to the presently described study, will enhance the utility of the developed data, making it available to NASA-designated participants in the SSP. This topic, the Human Productivity Data Management System, is discussed in greater detail in Section 5.

2.3 TASK FLOW

The flow of tasks, detailed in this study, is shown in Fig. 2-3. Only top level interfaces among tasks are shown. The many iterations and the needs to correlate data as the study evolved are not shown. The following section describes each task in detail.
Fig. 2-3  Space Station Human Productivity Study, Technical Approach Task Flow
Section 3

TASK DISCUSSION

3.1 TASK 1, IDENTIFY DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

The objectives of Task 1 were to compile and review the literature in order to scope the study by identifying Space Station Elements (SSEs) affecting Human Productivity (HP), then to define requirements and identify problem areas where adequate data was lacking.

3.1.1 Task 1.1, Study/Integrate Data

The study began with an existing library of documents which synthesized a broad array of literature (e.g., from Space Station analog studies, Soviet experience, Skylab and other NASA program experiences, and studies which had evolved data in areas covered by identified HP elements). The data search was expanded through use of the Space Station Program RFP and its listed references, through contacts with various NASA offices, and through resources brought and expanded by the analysts on the study team, who were selected because of their experience and expertise within their assigned topical areas. No constraints were placed on team members in the collection of data, other than to confirm the reasonableness of a resource with their Team Leaders and to fully document all references. A valuable resource for this purpose was provided by CAMUS, formed by W. Pogue and G. Carr, Skylab astronauts.

While the most concentrated literature research occurred early, the collection of data continued throughout the study. The primary objective of the data collection was to formulate supportable requirements and to identify problem areas. All directly utilized references were documented.

3.1.2 Task 1.2, Identify Space Station Elements Affecting Human Productivity

A candidate listing of Space Station Elements (SSE), potentially affecting HP, was provided with the RFP. The objective of this subtask was to review that list to revise and expand as necessary to achieve a comprehensive coverage of SSEs affecting human productivity. For this purpose, it was necessary to develop an operational definition of human productivity which could act as guidance in selecting topics for coverage.
It is recognized that there is not a commonly accepted definition of human productivity, especially as it relates to a space vehicle environment. There is an even greater lack of common acceptance on the definition and quantification of factors which will support such productivity. While our study did not pretend to solve these thorny concerns, we recognized the fact that neither industry nor NASA could afford to await the results of studies which might derive the appropriate answers. The Space Station Program will proceed, and a rational attempt must be made to maximize the opportunity for efficient, productive operations.

The data research confirmed that we have, today, a large amount of good data for defining the requirements for the support of efficient task performance and productiveness in a 1-g environment. This literature is supplemented by a good deal of data collected through NASA sponsorship on past space programs, disclosing problems and providing direction for meaningful recommendations and requirements. Existing criteria for support of efficient task performance, combined with criteria for human productivity provided by the studies of disciplines concerned with organizational and job effectiveness, provide a meaningful basis for establishing a definition and “checklist” for evaluation of whether a candidate Space Station Element was a fruitful area for investigation.

Human Productivity was defined in terms of crew performance:

Sustained performance of all assigned crew functions in a timely, accurate manner, with sustained quality throughout the assigned flight duration, at the least feasible cost.

Then a study team representing the disciplines of Human Factors, Systems Engineering, and Industrial Psychology, was formed to assess what the top level needs are to provide adequate support for the defined (Space Station) crew performance. The assessment led to the formulation of nine broadly defined “crew performance support needs”. Stress was placed on the use of simplified language for common team understanding, and on the intent to incorporate diverse but directly relevant concerns. The nine crew performance support needs are:

- **Physical Health.** Aspects of life and fitness support which could contribute to the defined crew performance

- **Psychological Health.** Including such things as sense of security, personal freedom, and an adequate social environment
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• **Motivation.** Aspects of design and operations which could act to support motivation

• **Access.** Both visual and physical access within the 0-g environment

• **Information/Knowledge.** Broadly incorporating real time information requirements, e.g., displayed system feedback, and knowledge gained through training, documentation, etc.

• **Organizational Structure.** Aspects of organizational considerations which support the needed dynamics of a favorable team effort

• **Tools and Equipment.** Provision and design of items needed to perform tasks, relating to broad aspects typically considered by human engineering concerns

• **Performance Capabilities.** Stressing capabilities and compatibility related to selection for the program, missions and crew

• **Stability in 0-g.** Aspects of restraint and orientation (physical and visual) which contribute to stability needs.

Each support need was analyzed and divided into its component parts, as shown in Fig. 3-1. Each support need requires providing an appropriate system, a means of monitoring that system, and an approach for maintaining the system. (The term “system” is used in its broad sense.) Ground support was addressed only to the extent that a specific relationship or function contributed to station crew performance. There was less stress placed on the use of exact terms (relating to the represented disciplines) than there was on the use of terms which could be best understood by all team members.

In summary, the purpose of the nine crew performance support needs and their analyzed parts was to utilize them as guidance to avoid omissions and to assess whether a candidate topic (SSE) was within scope of the study. A working meeting among all key team members was held at the beginning of the study to reach a general understanding of this concept and to confirm the initial list of Space Station Elements for allocation among all team members.
Fig. 3-1 Sample Analysis for Definition of Crew Performance Support Needs
The selected and defined Space Station Elements were organized into five numerically-designated groups:

1. Interior Architecture
2. Crew Support
3. Crew Activities
4. IVA systems
5. IVA/EVA Interface

Elements were listed within these respective groups and assigned subcategorized numbers (e.g., 101, 102, 103, etc.). Each Element was further subdivided into Subelements with a corresponding numbering scheme (e.g., 10101, 10102, 10103, etc.). The listing was revised as the study evolved, in some cases adding subelements, but in most cases by consolidation of subelements for more meaningful requirements and Issue description entities. The hierarchical scheme facilitated traceability and use within the PC files. The final topical Subelement List is provided as Appendix A.

A decision was also made to clearly identify requirements and Issues unique to Space Station Growth. Each Element, therefore, contains a Subelement titled “Growth”, enabling easy access to this topic within the broader Element context.

The investigation and organization of IVA/EVA interface elements presented a special problem. It is clear that requirements concerning Airlock design, as well as other obvious IVA/EVA interfacing areas, belonged in the Group 5 category. There were other concerns, however, that were basically IVA topics but which also presented at least points of interest for review and consideration by EVA-focused study. For example, the development of requirements for volume and clearance criteria nominally addressed IVA, shirt sleeved crew members. Contingency operations, however, such as leak repair, might require the temporary use of Extra-Vehicular Maneuvering Unit (EMU) suits until a safe IVA environment could be regained. This contingency poses a fundamental restriction on clearances and access requirements. Thus, the material contained within Groups 1 through 4 also addresses these EVA-related contingency requirements and similar concerns. Certain other topical areas led to uniquely-IVA requirements/Issues which might also be of interest to the EVA study members (e.g., window design and location as it relates to concern for monitoring EVA activities and backup communication). All of these fundamentally-IVA topics with potential EVA study interest were retained within Groups 1 through 4, but were duplicated to form a separate file, identified by an E suffix on the subelement numbers.
Initial planning for this study was to gain the benefit of a thorough technical interface with the EVA Study (Advanced EVA System Design Requirements Study, RFP 9BE2-727-4-37P) contractors in order to refine requirements and issues related to IVA/EVA interface. The later start of the three awarded studies, however, and differences in manner of data development allowed only a preliminary technical exchange. The solution for this concern was to forward copies of the “E” and Group 5 (five) files to each of the EVA study contractors and to the NASA Technical Manager. Management Plans were not prepared for Group 5 elements, and requirements and Issues within that group are viewed as preliminary.


The objectives of this combined task were to identify and define presently justified requirements and to provide selected recommendations for candidate solutions to these requirements. Requirements and candidate solutions were defined within subelements and documented on standardized report formats.

The inclusion of any specific candidate solutions was not a requirement. Where included, they are alternative solutions only, and do not convey a NASA sanction. Also, they in no way preclude identified study needs.

3.1.4 Task 1.5, Identify/Assess Problem Areas

The search for the definition of requirements led to the disclosure of problem areas for which it was recognized that requirements should be defined to ensure adequacy of support for crew performance, but for which purpose sufficient data was not available. Depending on the nature of the problem, one of these three approaches was taken:

a. Make only a generic requirement statement, subject to later refinement
b. Specify a requirement but include a “TBD” for the unknown data
c. Omit any statement at all until meaningful data is available

It is understood that until resolution, SSP users should use currently available NASA standards and references insofar as they pertain to the shown concerns. As NASA completes the studies needed to resolve problems represented by unresolved requirements, revisions will be published to refine and clarify needed requirements.
3.1.5 Requirements Document

The Design/Operations Requirements for support of crew performance/productivity underwent extensive review and modification to generate the requirements document represented by Volume III of this final report. The review team, representing NASA levels A, B, and C and a broad base of expertise, is listed in Appendix B.

A sample page of requirements is provided in Appendix C, with a detailed format description. The format includes entry of Critical Assumptions, which are described below.

3.2 TASK 2, IDENTIFY CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

In many cases, it was necessary to make certain assumptions about the Space Station design and/or operations in order to define requirements. The objectives of this task were to identify these assumptions and to provide rationale, as appropriate. This task was also defined for the documentation of references and for the definition of criteria to be used in assessing the importance of Issues (see paragraph 3.3.2).

3.2.1 Task 2.1, Identify Critical Assumptions

Critical assumptions were defined in three ways:

1. System Level, concerning all subelements
2. Subelement-specific assumptions
3. Assumptions needed for support of Issue study management plans

System-level critical assumptions were needed as a baseline against which to define all requirements. This was handled by stipulating reliance on the Phase B RFP document, Space Station Reference Configuration Description JSC-19989. Additionally, SSP Milestones were defined and dated for common use by all team members.

Other system-level assumptions defined the man-tended mode in order to scope relevant requirements and issues. A decision was made to define man-tended as utilizing a single, unpressurized lab module, which would be reoutfitted for manned IOC. The resulting requirements and Issues for man-tended operations provide a perspective on the impact of these critical assumptions, insofar as they relate to effects on crew performance.
pressurized environment, IVA requirements and Issues remain applicable, as appropriate.)
The Subelement coding scheme enables easy identification of the man-tended requirements and Issues, under 55XXX. The described assumptions are listed as System Level Critical Assumptions and appear in Appendix D.

As each subelement was addressed for the definition of requirements, other specific assumptions were needed. For example, requirements for waste/trash stowage assume that long term storage for return to earth will be in the logistics module; requirements for physiological conditioning and countermeasures are based on several assumptions, such as, that some type of cardiovascular loading is required. A change in any stipulated assumptions is likely to require a change in one or more requirements listed for the subelement. Each such critical assumption appears at the bottom of the requirements report format.

A final set of critical assumptions was made where the assumptions represented contingencies upon which recommended study approaches and management plans were defined. Each such assumption is shown within the appropriate management plan. (See paragraph 3.6.)

3.2.2 Task 2.2, Define Issue Effect Criteria

In order to assess the importance of Issues, their potential effects on design, operations, and crew performance were estimated. The assessment scheme and the criteria utilized for that purpose were developed under this task and are described in detail in paragraph 3.3.2.

3.2.3 Task 2.3, Review/List All References

The search for data was not restricted except to require that all data sources were approved by the Team Leaders and to require that each resource be identified and documented against a standardized format. Because of the very wide search which occurred, only those references which provided direct support for the definition of requirements were documented. A consolidated listing of all references was generated and each entry was assigned a number. These numbers, with corresponding section, chapter, or page information, were shown for each requirement statement, enabling easy reference by the reader. A complete copy of the reference list is provided with the Requirements (Volume III of this report).
3.3 TASK 3, IDENTIFY AND RANK ORDER ISSUES

The objectives of this task were to evolve Issue definitions, to rank Issues according to their importance, and to separately generate a ranking according to temporal priority.

3.3.1 Task 3.1, Identify Issues

Issue definitions evolved through the review of the unresolved requirements in order to form integrated study topics. An initial list of about 450 Issues, generated by team analysts, was finally consolidated to 214. As consolidation occurred, corresponding consolidation changes to requirements and the subelement designations were made. This tedious (and hazard laden) process involved contractor and NASA coordination. (NASA review team members are listed in Appendix B.) As noted earlier, the expected technical coordination with EVA study contractors did not occur. Consequently, all Issues under Group 5 (IVA/EVA Interface) remain preliminary. Adding these preliminary Issues (not scored) to the final IVA Issues, the total count becomes 305. All Issue descriptions appear in Volume IV of this final report.

3.3.2 Task 3.2, Rank Order by Importance

Assessing the importance of Issues first required a definition of importance and then the development of criteria for a standardized assessment approach. The objective in assessing importance was to aid in the decision process for allocation of resources to the resulting defined studies. It was decided early that, given the program objectives of supporting human productivity/crew performance, those issues which had the highest potential for affecting crew performance would carry a correspondingly higher importance. Also, greater significance should be given to those that had the greatest potential for impacting design and/or operations. Thus, the definition of importance was based on the relative estimated effects on crew performance, design, and operations. The finally selected criteria for this assessment were standardized and applied as guidance for assigning effect scores to each Issue. The significance (or effect score) of the impact was defined as occurring either in a positive or negative direction. A summary of the Issue scoring criteria is shown in Fig. 3-2. An Issue, for example, whose resolution might add or decrease weight by the same estimated amount would be assessed equally significant on this parameter.
### Design Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN IMPACT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHT ±</td>
<td>0-1 lb</td>
<td>2-25 lbs</td>
<td>26-75 lbs</td>
<td>76-100 lbs</td>
<td>&gt; 100 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER ±</td>
<td>0-99 w</td>
<td>100-500 w</td>
<td>501-1000 w</td>
<td>1.01-2 Kw</td>
<td>&gt; 2 Kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME +</td>
<td>0-2 ft³</td>
<td>2.1-3 ft³</td>
<td>3.1-4 ft³</td>
<td>4.1-5 ft³</td>
<td>&gt; 5 ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIGURATION (affects design of:)</td>
<td>Installed equipment configuration</td>
<td>Compartment arrangement</td>
<td>Module interior arrangement</td>
<td>Module exterior envelope or interconnect</td>
<td>Any combination of configuration affects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operations Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS IMPACT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* SS CREW WORK TIME ±</td>
<td>0-15 MIN</td>
<td>15.1-30 MIN</td>
<td>30.1-45 MIN</td>
<td>45.1-60 MIN</td>
<td>1 HOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* GROUND CREW WORK TIME ±</td>
<td>0-2 HRS</td>
<td>2.1-4 HRS</td>
<td>4.1-6 HRS</td>
<td>6.1-8 HRS</td>
<td>8 HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTION COMPLEXITY ±</td>
<td>NIL TO LOW</td>
<td>LOW TO MOD</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>MOD TO MAJOR</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average per work day*

### C.P. Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.P. IMPACT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POTENTIAL, POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EFFECT</td>
<td>NIL or Low</td>
<td>Low to Medium</td>
<td>Medium or Moderate</td>
<td>Medium to Very High</td>
<td>Very High, Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 3-2 Summary of the Issue Scoring Guidance*
A NASA-contractor team was selected and convened (Appendix B) for the final assessment process, representing NASA levels A, B, and C, and a broad combination of backgrounds. The result of this assessment was three ranked listings, based on average scores assigned to each Issue by team members. The scoring process, occurring over a period of several days, included panel discussions to ensure common understandings among members as to the content and intent of each Issue study topic. Various manipulations were then applied to synthesize the results, such as determining which issues appeared in the top quartile of all three listings. These listings were an aide in the selection of Issues for study (see Task 4).

3.3.3 Task 3.3, Rank Issues by Temporal Priority

The defined objective of this task was two-fold:

- To set a basis of priority for scheduling the preparation of management plans during the study

- To act as a reference point for the recommended study performance schedules within the management plans.

A date was estimated for each Issue, based on the requirements to be resolved, as to when resolution was needed in order to provide reasonably timely guidance to the SSP. Related milestone decision points were selected and study completion dates were typically selected as 5 to 6 months prior to the corresponding milestone. This approach formed a compromise between maximizing the time allowance for an appropriate study and achieving timely impact on the SSP. These estimations were made for the original set of 450 (IVA) Issues. A list, ranked by date, was then generated. As described above, however, the Issues were finally consolidated to a revised set of 214. Also, the duration of the consolidation process condensed the amount of time remaining in the study for preparation of management plans. It became unrealistic, therefore, to schedule the preparation of study management plans per this priority criterion alone. As management plan formation began, it was realized that several Issues might be addressed by a single plan, so that a range of "temporal priority" need dates might be represented.

As a consequence, it was determined that management plan approaches and schedules were driven more by the SSP need dates of specific and originating unresolved requirements. These, in turn, became the focus for scheduling the study management plans,
described in paragraph 3.6. Issue need dates for temporal priority assignment, therefore, were not further updated for this task, but were updated (based on requirements) for management plans.

3.3.4 Task 3.4, NASA Review/Update Issues and Rankings

This task occurred concurrently with Tasks 3.1 and 3.2 through the joint participation of NASA and contractors, as described above. Final assessment resulted from a comparison of Issue descriptions to studies in process within NASA, described under Task 4.1 (paragraph 3.4.1).

3.4 TASK 4, IDENTIFY TRADE STUDIES

This task definition incorporated multiple objectives. Following a comparison to ongoing NASA studies, the next step was to select the appropriate study approach. Definition of a trade study value system was also a part of this task. Lastly, the task called for the conduct of any trade studies which might be needed to select among alternate critical assumptions.

3.4.1 Task 4.1, Compare Issues to NASA Plans

The study intent was for the contractor team to compare Issues to ongoing NASA studies in order to assess potential overlaps and to avoid redundancy. The Research Technology Operating Plans (RTOPS) and the Project Operations Plans (POP) were to be used for this purpose. It became evident, however, that the proposed approach was untenable, given the unclear status of studies and difficulty in confirming a comprehensive search by a contractor. Hence, the task was performed by NASA from the offices of the Technical Monitor Representatives at Ames Research Center and at Johnson Space Center. Reviewing Issue descriptions against ongoing and already formulated studies resulted in the elimination of several Issues from further consideration for the development of study approaches. Thus, in many cases, the derivation of data for the definition of requirements, yet unresolved within the requirements document, will come from studies not identified for the preparation of management plans within the present study scope. The result of this process was a final formulation of Issues, grouped by broad topical areas. Joint NASA-contractor discussions led to the selection of 108 Issues, which were grouped into 67 study management plans. The complete list of submitted management plans and their subsumed Issues appears in Appendix E. All plans are contained in Volume V of this report.
3.4.2 Task 4.2, Select Issue Resolution Approach

A critical factor in the selection of an approach for the issue resolution studies was the determined SSP need dates. For example, an extended research approach was inappropriate for answers needed by IRR (January 1986). Candidate approaches, therefore, were evaluated against the permissible time frames. An assumption was made that studies could be started in October 1985, and no sooner. (It is noted that management plans were submitted as they were completed during the program.) Recommended study approaches incorporate a combination of subtasks, as appropriate (e.g., literature search, expert analysis, specific trade studies, mockup evaluation, surveys, simulations, etc.). Each study specifies its unique approach in terms of the defined subtasks.

3.4.3 Task 4.3, Define Trade Value System

Where trade studies were incorporated in a Management Plan study approach, the development of options and nature of the trade was prescribed. Because of the diversity of the trades and because trades were typically subtasks among several tasks which were defined, a common trade value system was not recommended.

3.4.4 Task 4.4, Conduct Selected Trades

This task was defined to support the potential needs to select from among optional critical assumptions. In all cases which led to the selection of needed critical assumptions, however, the process was reasonably straightforward. Rationale for the selection of certain critical assumptions was provided with the System Level Critical Assumptions and within sub-element requirement formats, as appropriate. Therefore, no trade studies were conducted for this purpose.

3.5 TASK 5, PERFORM SELECTED CONCEPTUAL DESIGNS

The need to develop certain conceptual designs was recognized in order to ease the depiction of problem areas, identified within Issues. In-depth description of problem areas (with associated conceptual designs) was appropriate for the study management plans. In all cases, these took the form of line drawings, providing three-dimensional perspectives for illustration. In many cases, the depiction of a candidate solution served best to illustrate a described problem. The design concepts are called out as figures within the management plans which use them.
3.6 TASK 6, DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PLANS AND DEVELOPMENTAL SCHEDULES

The objective of this task was to generate the plans for the management of recommended studies. These plans were to describe approaches, special needs, resource requirements and schedules. Three standardized formats provide this information. The first format is an overview which describes objectives, background, and summary information. The second format details the study approach, and the third format provides an integrated task schedule and summary of resource requirements. Plans were written by team analysts, reviewed by Team Leaders, further reviewed by the prime contractor, and finally accepted by the NASA Technical Monitor. A total of 108 Issues were covered by 67 Management Plans, each describing independent approaches for the development of data needed to define previously unresolved requirements for the support of crew performance. The Management Plan formats and rationale are described below.

3.6.1 Management Plan Overview (Format 13)

This format is shown in Fig. 3-3. A management plan numbering scheme was utilized for continued traceability. It was based on the topic Element number, an “M”, and sequence number. For example, plan 101M03 is the third study management plan written for element 101, General Layout. Titles were selected to be as descriptive as possible of the unique subject matter. If only one Issue was addressed, the title of the Issue was normally used.

The Issue numbers and titles, subsumed by the study plan, were shown along with resolution need dates. The specific objectives of the study were itemized as succinct statements. The Background then provides a brief basis for the proposed study, indicating the study significance and providing a summary of previous work in this area which led to the present study description. Specific Input needs are next listed. If the generation of the needed inputs was scoped for Issues and/or management plans within the HP study, the appropriate numeric designators were also shown.

In many cases, Critical Assumptions were needed to justify specified approaches, task schedules, or other parts of the plan. Each such assumption was described. A Special Remarks section provided a place for the analyst to highlight special comments, and/or explanations about other parts of the plan. A final entry for this format was a listing of the
References, alluded to in the Background. Where illustrations were used (see Task 5) they were attached to Format 13 as figures called out within the Background or Special Remarks.

3.6.2 Study Plan (Format 14)

The Study Plan detailed the study approach. As shown in Fig. 3-4, following the Management Plan number, title, and preparation date, the study tasks are described. These were listed as concise task statements in numbered, chronological order. Special Study Needs might be access to specific facilities, access to the astronaut population, or other unique needs that could have a significant impact on cost or schedule. Each such special need is listed against corresponding study tasks. Special Skills are separately listed, also by study task. Special Skills might include physicians, identified experts, mockup fabricators, etc.

Entries under Performing Organization represent recommendations for study management and performance. These recommendations may be generic or specific, depending on the nature of the study. The Study Products are specified to correspond to the objectives set forth at the beginning of the plan. The last entry for the format provides a cross-reference to the unresolved requirements which led to this study. Subelement numbers and titles are shown with specific requirement numbers.

3.6.3 Schedule-Task Flow (Format 15)

This form, shown in Fig. 3-5, has two sections. The first section provides a separate page for each fiscal year, beginning with Fiscal Year 1985. Study tasks are listed by title and number, taken from Format 14, and a timeline is shown within the body of the schedule. Input Needs are listed by their alpha designations (from Format 13) at appropriate points on the timelines. Also shown for each timeline are the total manmonths per task.

The second section is a Summary Schedule/Cost Factors for the planning of study resources. Resource categories are listed per a standardized format, and each entry is followed by specified cost drivers (e.g., special skill manmonths, and, where appropriate, dollar cost estimates).
Fig. 3.5 Management Plan Format 15
Each plan was independently written and schedules were not integrated across study plans. As a tool for NASA in performing the final analysis of study integration and allocation of resources, an Input-Output Relationship matrix was produced to aid in tracking that relationship among Issues and Plans produced by the HP Study. Further discussion concerning the integration of study schedules is in Section 4, Recommendations.

For the interested reader, a sample management plan is provided in Appendix E.
Section 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 INTEGRATION OF STUDY SCHEDULES

Management Plan schedules were formulated to target the specified need dates for each study. The approach did not integrate schedules across all plans, therefore, the completion of a plan which has been designated as providing an input for a second plan may be scheduled for completion after the second plan. One tool for evaluation of this condition was described in paragraph 3.6.3, that is, an Input-Output Relationship matrix among defined Management Plans and Issues: A copy of the matrix is provided in Volume V of this report. Resolution of identified conflicts could take several forms, such as:

- Decide that the input is not sufficiently critical and so delete the input stipulation
- Substitute a Critical Assumption for the input need
- Substitute the convening of an expert panel to formulate the designated input information (and make a decision whether to continue or supersede the previously planned "input producing" study)
- Reschedule one or both related studies in order to achieve the desired schedule integration
- Alter the study approach for one or both plans in order to condense previously described schedules (in order to achieve schedule integration).

This complex analysis and decision process must include consideration not only of the described management plans, but also of those other studies already in process within NASA which could generate inputs for HP Study-defined studies, but for which management plans (and perhaps issues) were not prepared. Listed input needs must be reviewed to identify where described data inputs can be provided by these other studies. This review should examine both non-issues and issues for which Management Plans were not prepared. Further complexity comes from the fact that Inputs may be needed at any designated point after start of the study. In some cases, the input-output relationships may form multiple study links, so that rescheduling one study will have corresponding impacts on the
schedule of other similarly related studies. Care is needed throughout the process to ensure SSP (milestone) need dates are met.

It is recommended that a panel be designated to perform this analysis, having sufficient authority and access to information to permit early resolutions. A part of this analysis must evaluate the feasibility of utilizing recommended facilities (or other special needs) in light of schedule availability and resources. It is expected that in some cases advantage could be gained by combining some described studies for concurrent facility use or by achieving concurrency with other previously scheduled studies. It is noted that the planned relational data base will provide a tool for identifying conflicts and assessing alternate solutions.

4.2 RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT STATUSING

During the conduct of the study it was disclosed that the RTOPS and POP documents do not provide adequate information concerning the current status of research and technology development efforts within NASA. Such information will become even more valuable as the Space Station Program (and other NASA programs) continues and as the list of study participants grows. Coordination of efforts and dissemination of information will become critical. It is understood that satisfaction of this critical need is an important objective of the Technical Management Information System (TMIS).

In anticipation of that system and possibly as an adjunct to its implementation, it is recommended that a NASA-wide program be implemented similar to that currently in use by the Department of Defense for the statusing of research and technology efforts. A standard format is updated at least once per year by all researchers. Results are pooled and entered on one data base for common access. Figure 4-1 shows a completed DD Form 1498. Periodic updating of such a form for all ongoing NASA studies, and the use of key words and/or a coding scheme, such as shown in Item 12, could make needed information immediately available.
**RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY WORK UNIT SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army</td>
<td>62717A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>20162717A790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of the Army</td>
<td>DD-8252/24A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Firm</td>
<td>Decisions and Designs, Inc. 8400 Westpark Drive, Suite 600 McLean, VA 22101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual</td>
<td>Mitchell, N. B. (202) 774-4920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Investigators</td>
<td>Robert N. Kraft and Terry A. Bresnick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U.S. Army Technology Development Study**

**Event:**

15, Sept, 81 - 15, Sept, 84

**Leadership:**

DA 0593-81 - C 0568

**Objective:**

The goal of this effort is to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of small unit battle simulation training systems through the application of advanced technology for terrain representation. A prototype terrain representation system based on the recently developed "surrogate travel" techniques which integrate videodisk, microprocessor and computer generated imagery technologies, will be developed and evaluated against conventional approaches.

**Approach:**

Initial work involves an empirical analysis of the temporal and spatial resolution requirements of a "surrogate travel" system, including interaction of resolution requirements with type of terrain to be represented, mode of travel, and other variables relevant to battle simulation applications. The resulting specification of minimum structural and performance requirements for application to particular battle simulation training objectives and control functions will be used to select a specific configuration for prototype development. The prototype advanced terrain representation system will in turn, be subjected, in a battle simulation training context, to a cost and training effectiveness analysis (CTEA) in comparison with conventional terrain representation methods, including tactical maps, map boards, and three dimensional terrain boards.

---

**Fig. 4.1 Example Report of Technology Development Study (DD form 1498)**
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Section 5

SPACE STATION HUMAN PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAM INTEGRATION

The study described by this report achieves one milestone in the broader program undertaken by NASA to incorporate human productivity concerns in the Space Station Program. The Introduction noted that this has been a long-standing and continuing effort. Fig. 5-1 provides key Space Station Program Milestones, related to currently key events within the Human Productivity program. Not shown are the continuing NASA-industry meetings to further the exchange of technology in this area, and the several focused studies, sponsored by NASA, to develop concepts and requirements for specific Space Station concerns.

The Space Station Human Productivity Study began in November 1984. This led to the generation of currently definable requirements, which will be disseminated to all SSP participants. The Management Plans produced by this study, remain preliminary until final review and integration with related studies. (See Section 5.) Implementation of these studies has in fact begun. For the definition of study “need dates,” a six-month lead time concept was adopted. For example, if the study results were required for SRR, (scheduled for March 1986), the specified need date was RUR 2, (scheduled for October 1985). IRR is viewed as a preliminary milestone to SRR; selection of RUR 2 is intended to give sufficient time for responding to the newly defined requirements in time for impact on SRR. In similar fashion, requirement needs for SRR impact were assigned a need date at ISR. Remaining need dates were based on having requirements defined by start of Phase C/D, or by 6 months prior to PDR and CDR, respectively. The milestone dates indicated by the schedule in Fig. 5-1 were defined in May, 1985, and are listed as Critical Assumptions for this purpose.

The data from the present study will be converted to a relational data base, on which effort has begun. This data base will facilitate access and updates while serving as a prototype for similar data bases, as they are developed.

The Human Productivity Data Management System (relational data base) will enable easy access for Space Station Program participants, while providing several functions, such as identifying requirements which may be affected by the change of a critical assumption, or by identifying the effects of a change in a key Space Station Program Milestone. Importantly, the cross-file traceability of the data base will ensure adequate updating of correlated data.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event 1</th>
<th>Event 2</th>
<th>Event 3</th>
<th>Event 4</th>
<th>Event 5</th>
<th>Event 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>RUR1</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>SRR</td>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>PHASE B</td>
<td>PHASE C/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY MILESTONES**

- **SPACE STATION PROGRAM (SSP)**
- **SS HUMAN PRODUCTIVITY STUDY**
- **REQUIREMENTS**
- **STUDY MANAGEMENT PLANS**
- **STUDY OUTPUTS**
- **RELATIONAL DATA BASE**
- **ADVANCED EMU STUDIES**
- **IVA/EVA INTERFACE REQMTS**
- **MAN-SYSTEMS INTEGRATION STANDARD**

*APPROXIMATE

**Fig. 5-1 Human Productivity Program and Space Station Program Integration (Schedule)**
The advanced EMU studies are conducting studies and developing requirements to improve productivity for Space Station EVA tasks. Results from these studies will be generated at about the same time as IRR and should be finalized for Space Station Program implementation by ISR.

Another study in process will lead to the development of Man-Systems Integration Standards (MSIS). That study will incorporate and expand the results of the Human Productivity Study to integrate them with previously produced standards and guidelines for IVA and EVA crew performance support. The MSIS will provide standards for space systems, in general, but will provide obvious guidance for the Space Station Program. The result will be an updated and integrated standard for man-systems interface requirements in time for application in Phase C/D. Incorporation of these results in a relational data base, as described above, is also planned.
APPENDIX A

SUBELEMENTS LISTING

(See Paragraph 3.1.2, Task 1.2)
## Interior Architecture

### 1. General Layout
- **101** Activity Volume per Crewmember/Function
- **10102** Dedicated vs Multipurpose Space Utilization
- **10104** Equipment & Furnishing Requirements
- **10106** Physical/Functional Adjacencies
- **10108** Inter/Intra-Module Equipment Orientation
- **10109** Growth

### 2. Traffic Flow
- **102** Frequency of Transit
- **10201** Equipment Accommodations
- **10203** Congestion Minimization
- **10204** Passage Impingement
- **10205** Emergency Egress/Ingress
- **10206** Crew/Equipment Translation & Handling Aids

### 3. Decor
- **103** Color, Texture, Graphics & Lighting
- **10301** Interior Design Modifiability
- **10302** Coding

### 4. Materials
- **10400** General
- **10401** Health and Safety
- **10402** Maintenance and Repair
- **10403** Durability & Susceptibility to Damage
- **10404** Auditory, Olfactory & Tactile Effects
- **10405** Electromagnetic Properties

### 5. Anthropometry
- **10501** Population Characteristics
- **10502** Range of Accommodation
- **10503** Physical Dimensions & Limits in Micro-G

### 6. Modularity
- **10601** General
- **10603** Existing Standards and Conventions
- **10605** Maintainability Support
- **10607** Growth

### 7. Window/Remote Viewing
- **10701** Viewing Requirements
- **10702** Window Optical Characteristics
- **10703** Window Configuration
- **10704** Window Access
- **10705** Window Location and Number
- **10706** Window Maintenance/Protection
- **10707** Indirect Viewing Options

### 8. Stowage/Storage
- **10901** Crew Equipment Stowage
10902 FOOD/GALLEY STOWAGE EQUIPMENT
10903 TRASH-WASTE STOWAGE/STORAGE
10904 DATA FILE STOWAGE
10905 STOWAGE VOLUME CONFIGURATION
10906 GROWTH

2 CREW SUPPORT

201 INTERNAL ENVIRON
   * 20101 ATMOSPHERE REVITALIZATION
   * 20102 WATER MANAGEMENT
   20103 CONTAMINATION/ODOR CONTROL
   20107 GROWTH

202 EXTERNAL ENVIRON
   * 20201 RADIATION - PARTICLES
   * 20202 TRAPPED PROTONS
   * 20203 TRAPPED ELECTRONS
   * 20204 HIGH-Z, HIGH-E PARTICLES
   * 20205 SOLAR FLARES
   * 20206 ULTRAVIOLET/INFRARED
   * 20208 MICROMETEOROIDS
   * 20210 GROWTH
   * 20212 GROUND SUPPORT

203 INDUCED ENVIRON (Int/Ext)
   * 20302 ELECTROMAGNETIC
   * 20304 LASER
   * 20305 GROWTH

204 AREA LIGHTING
   * 20401 ILLUMINATION & DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS
   * 20402 GLARE CONTROL
   * 20403 FIXTURES/LUMINAIRES
   * 20404 CONTROLS
   * 20405 GROWTH

205 ACOUSTICS
   * 20501 NOISE CONTROL
   * 20502 PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS
   * 20503 PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS
   * 20504 FUNCTIONAL TASK/WORK AREA ENVIRONMENTS

206 SAFETY
   * 20601 CREW SAFETY

207 HEALTH MAINTENANCE
   * 20701 PHYSIOLOGICAL CONDITIONING/COUNTERMEASURES
   * 20702 PHYSIOLOGICAL STATUS MONITORING
   * 20703 DISEASE PREVENTION
   * 20704 ACCIDENT PREVENTION
   * 20705 STRESS MANAGEMENT

208 MEDICAL CARE
   20801 DIAGNOSIS & TREATMENT
   20804 MEDICAL RECORDS, COMM, & INFO MGMT
   20805 GROWTH
209 RECREATION
  20901 TYPES
  20902 FACILITIES
  20903 EQUIPMENT
  20904 SUPPORT
  20906 PLANNING

210 PERSONNEL HYGIENE
  21001 BODY WASTE MANAGEMENT
  21002 WHOLE-BODY CLEANING
  21003 PARTIAL-BODY CLEANING
  21004 BODY GROOMING
  21005 GROWTH

211 FOOD/WATER SYSTEMS
  21101 MENU
  21103 FOOD PACKAGING
  21104 FOOD DISPENSING
  21105 FOOD PREPARATION
  21106 FOOD SERVING
  21107 FOOD CLEAN-UP
  21108 POTABLE WATER
  21109 GROWTH

212 HOUSEKEEPING
  21201 CONTAMINATION
  21202 CLEANING EQUIPMENT
  21203 TASKS
  21204 SCHEDULES
  * 21205 CLOTHES WASHER/DRYER
  21206 DISHWASHER

213 WASTE/TRASH MANAGEMENT
  21301 TRASH GENERATION
  21302 TRASH COLLECTION
  21303 TRASH SORTING
  21304 MICROBIAL STABILIZATION
  21305 WASTE/TRASH TRANSFER
  21306 VOLUME REDUCTION
  21307 WASTE/TRASH DISPOSAL
  21308 GROWTH

214 SUPPLY SUPPORT
  * 21401 RESUPPLY REQUIREMENTS
  * 21402 INVENTORY MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL
  * 21404 TRANSPORTATION AND HANDLING
  * 21407 PRESERVATION, PACKING & PACKAGING

215 RESTRAINT SYSTEMS
  21501 FOOT RESTRAINTS
  21502 BODY RESTRAINTS
  21503 EQUIPMENT RESTRAINTS
  21504 SLEEP RESTRAINTS
  * 21505 PORTABLE RESTRAINTS
  21506 HANDHOLDS

216 MOBILITY AIDS
  21601 INSTALLED EQUIPMENT
  21602 PORTABLE GEAR

A-5
217 COMMUNICATIONS
  * 21701 SYSTEMS
  * 21702 LOCATIONS
  * 21703 FUNCTIONAL TYPES
  * 21705 RECORDKEEPING
  * 21706 NONNORMAL COMMUNICATIONS

218 QUALITY ASSURANCE
  * 21801 PROCEDURES VERIFICATION
  * 21802 CONDITION VERIFICATION
  * 21803 CONTROL
  * 21804 EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION/CERTIFICATION
  * 21805 ANOMALY INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS & EVALUATION
  * 21806 REPORTING AND RECORDING
  * 21807 DETECTION, ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION

219 CLOTHING
  21901 IV CLOTHING (UNDERWEAR AND OUTERWEAR)
  21903 GROWTH

220 VIBRATION
  * 22001 VIBRATION CONTROL

3 CREW ACTIVITIES

301 CREW TRAINING
  30101 TRAINING METHODS
  30102 TRAINING DEVICES & MEDIA
  30103 TRAINING LOCATION
  30105 TRAINING FOR ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
  30107 GROWTH

303 MAINTAINABILITY
  * 30301 ACCESSIBILITY
  * 30302 COMMONALITY
  * 30303 MAINTAINABILITY HARDWARE CHARACTERISTICS
  * 30304 TESTABILITY/DIAGNOSTICS
  * 30305 ORU DEFINITION/CONFIGURATION
  * 30306 MAINTAINABILITY AIDS
  * 30307 CREW SKILLS
  * 30308 GROWTH

304 MAINTENANCE
  * 30401 MAINTENANCE CONCEPT
  * 30402 SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE TASKS
  * 30403 UNSCHEDULED MAINTENANCE TASKS
  * 30404 TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION
  * 30405 CUSTOMER SCHEDULED MAINTENANCE TASKS
  * 30406 CUSTOMER UNSCHEDULED MAINTENANCE TASKS
  * 30407 CUSTOMER TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION

305 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT
  * 30501 FUNCTIONAL LIMITATION
  * 30502 COMMONALITY/STANDARDIZATION
  * 30503 ARRANGEMENT
  * 30504 LOCATION
  * 30505 IDENTIFICATION/LABELING
306 ACTIVITY PLANNING/SCHEDULING
* 30601 DUTY CYCLES
* 30602 JOB ROTATION
* 30603 SCHEDULING METHODS

307 MAN-MACHINE ROLES
* 30701 MAN-MACHINE ROLE
* 30702 GROUND MAN-MACHINE ROLES
* 30703 GROWTH

308 ORGANIZATION
  30801 ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
  30802 METHODS TO ENHANCE COMPATIBILITY

309 STATION AUTONOMY
* 30901 AUTONOMY
* 30903 GROWTH

4 IVA SYSTEMS

401 WORKSTATIONS
* 40101 WORKSTATION DEFINITION
* 40102 WORKSTATION GENERAL REQUIREMENTS
* 40103 WORKSTATION UNIQUE REQUIREMENTS
  40104 PORTABLE WORKSTATION

402 DATA MANAGEMENT
* 40201 GENERAL DATA MANAGEMENT
  40203 OPERATING SYSTEM
  40205 MEMORY CAPABILITY
* 40206 INTERFACE COMPATIBILITY
  40207 MAINTENANCE/REPAIR
  40209 APPLICATION PROGRAMS

5 IVA/EVA INTERFACE

501 AIRLOCK
  50101 SYSTEMS
  50102 FUNCTIONAL/PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS
  50103 HYPERBARIC
  50104 EVA SUPPORT
  50105 MAINTAINABILITY
  50106 MATERIALS PROCESSES
  50107 COMMONALITY
  50108 SAFETY/TRAINING

** 502 SERVICING AREA

** 503 SUPPLY SUPPORT

504 STOWAGE/STORAGE
  50401 EMU EQUIPMENT
  50402 EEU EQUIPMENT
  50403 RESTRAINTS/TETHERS/EVA TOOLS
  50404 EMU/EEU SERVICING & CHECKOUT EQPT. STORAGE
  50405 MAINTENANCE & REPLACEMENT PARTS
** 505 ATMOSPHERE

506 PERSONNEL HYGIENE
   50601 IN-SUIT BODY WASTE MANAGEMENT
   50602 SUIT HYGIENE

507 TRAINING/PROCEDURES
   50701 GENERAL

** 508 COMMUNICATIONS

** 509 DATA MANAGEMENT

55x MAN-TENDED
   55101 GENERAL LAYOUT
   55102 TRAFFIC FLOW
   55103 DECOR
   55104 MATERIALS
   55105 ANTHROPOMETRY
   55106 MODULARITY
   55107 WINDOWS/REMOTE VIEWING
   55109 STOWAGE/STORAGE
   55201 INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT
   55202 EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT
   55203 INDUCED ENVIRONMENT
   55204 AREA LIGHTING
   55205 NOISE & VIBRATION
   55206 CREW SAFETY
   55213 WASTE/TRASH MANAGEMENT
   55214 SUPPLY SUPPORT
   55215 RESTRAINT SYSTEMS
   55216 MOBILITY AIDS
   55217 COMMUNICATIONS
   55218 QUALITY ASSURANCE
   55301 CREW TRAINING
   55303 MAINTAINABILITY
   55304 MAINTENANCE
   55305 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT
   55306 ACTIVITY PLANNING AND SCHEDULING
   55307 MAN-MACHINE ROLES
   55309 STATION AUTONOMY
   55401 WORKSTATIONS
   55402 DATA MANAGEMENT

* IVA Subelements having Requirements and Issues of concern to EVA Systems.

** Requirements generated by Advanced EVA Systems Design Requirement Study.
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### REPORT FORMAT 3.1  DESIGN/OPERATIONS REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTERIOR ARCHITECTURE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>MODULARITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10603</td>
<td>EXISTING STANDARDS AND CONVENTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CROSS REFERENCE TO RFP PARAGRAPH NO:** C-4(2.1.5;2.2.10.1)

**Revised:** 9/23/85

### REQUIREMENTS

- **01** *(Design equipment racks per TBD criteria to provide flexibility in various module configurations.)*
  - 145(p 2-5)

- **02** Equipment racks shall accommodate a standard 19 inch (single) and 38 inch (double) width (48.26 cm and 96.52 cm).
  - 143(p 7-3, 144(p 3-84, pp. 7.1.3.2)
  - 143(p 85, pp. 3.4.1, 11.1, 145)

- **03** *(Provide standardized utility interfaces in modular design.)*
  - 144(p 3-84, 145)
  - 13.4.1.2, 3.4.1
  - 1.3, 3.4.1
  - 1.4, 145

### CANDIDATE SOLUTIONS

None

### CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

None

* An "ISSUE" has been defined for study to confirm or complete definition of this preliminary requirement.

---

**Format 3.1, with Detailed Description**

C.3
APPENDIX D

SYSTEM LEVEL CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

(See Paragraph 3.2.1, Task 2.1, Critical Assumptions)
SYSTEM LEVEL CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

1. Space Station, Manned, is as described in Phase B RFP Reference Configuration, with crew of six. See JSC-19989, Aug. 84.

2. Phase B Milestones are:

   - **CSD** 19 April 85
   - **RUR #1** 3-19 July 85
   - **RUR #2** 4-18 Oct 85
   - **IRR** 3-17 Jan 86
   - **SRR** 7-21 Mar 86
   - **ISR** 1-15 Jul 86
   - **SDR** 17 Nov-1 Dec 86
   - **EOC** 18 Jan 87
   - **ATP-Phase C/D** 18 Apr 87
   - **PDR** 18 Apr 88
   - **CDR** 18 Apr 90

3. EMU-suited access within the modules will be only for regaining an environment for safe IVA entry, e.g., for leak repair and ECLS system (pressure, contamination control) repair in any habitable module. Minimal depressurized entry may also be required at module depressurization for growth, i.e., attaching additional modules.

4. Space Station, Man-Tended, is as described in Phase B Reference Configuration (See 7th paragraph, page 5 of JSC-19989) and RFP page C-5-11, paragraph 2.4.

5. The Man-Tended station (Lab module) is non-pressurized. (This critical assumption is relevant only to Subelements 55XXX.)

6. Man-Tended operations will be supported by an STS crew living on the shuttle.

7. The Man-Tended module will be reoutfitted for manned IOC. (Requirements do not incorporate considerations for conversion to a pressurized module.)

Because the man-tended module will be pressurized the IVA requirements within Groups 1 through 4 are applicable to both man-tended and nominal options. Section 55XXX is applicable to non-pressurized work areas.
NOTE:

1. The Requirements of 55XXX do not apply if the man-tended module is pressurized, i.e., the 55XXX Requirements were written for unpressurized conditions during man-tended operations.

2. If the man-tended module is pressurized, those Requirements in Groups 1 through 4 should be utilized as applicable.
APPENDIX E

LIST OF MANAGEMENT PLANS WITH INCORPORATED ISSUES
# LIST OF MANAGEMENT PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MGMT PLAN NO.</th>
<th>ISSUE NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101M01</td>
<td>1010201</td>
<td>Compartment Arrangement and Volume Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010401</td>
<td>Minimum Activity Area Volume Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010701</td>
<td>Multi-Use vs. Dedicated Space Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010801</td>
<td>Compartment/Area Adjacency Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102M01</td>
<td>1020101</td>
<td>Traffic Frequency and Workstation Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1020301</td>
<td>Traffic Frequency Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103M01</td>
<td>1030101</td>
<td>Interior Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030201</td>
<td>Interior Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1030301</td>
<td>Interior Design Modifiability Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103M02</td>
<td>1030302</td>
<td>Interior Location Coordinate System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104M01</td>
<td>1040001</td>
<td>Hab Interior Materials Selection Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105M01</td>
<td>1050201</td>
<td>Anthropometric Data Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050301</td>
<td>Neutral Body Posture Data Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1050401</td>
<td>Growth and Anthropometric Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106M01</td>
<td>1060101</td>
<td>Interior Volume Rearrangement Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106M02</td>
<td>1060102</td>
<td>Standard Hardware and Interface Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109M01</td>
<td>1090101</td>
<td>Equipment and Food Stowage; IOC and Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1090601</td>
<td>Stowage Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stowage Volume and Configuration for Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT PLAN NO.</td>
<td>ISSUE NO.</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109M02</td>
<td>109040</td>
<td>Data File Stowage Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109M03</td>
<td>1090301</td>
<td>Trash-Waste Stowage and Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201M01</td>
<td>2010101</td>
<td>Atmosphere Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201M03</td>
<td>2010202</td>
<td>Maintain/Test Potable Water Purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201M04</td>
<td>2010203</td>
<td>Water Allocation for Crew Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201M05</td>
<td>2010301</td>
<td>Contamination: Limits and Gaseous Load Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010302</td>
<td>Gaseous Contaminant Load Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010303</td>
<td>Microbial Load Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201M06</td>
<td>2010303</td>
<td>Contamination Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M01</td>
<td>2020101</td>
<td>Radiation Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020102</td>
<td>Personnel Dosimetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M02</td>
<td>2020103</td>
<td>Shielding Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020104</td>
<td>Optimal Shielding Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020105</td>
<td>Window Radiation Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020801</td>
<td>Micrometeorite and Debris Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021001</td>
<td>Radiation Shielding Strategy for Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M03</td>
<td>2020502</td>
<td>Solar Flare Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020501</td>
<td>Solar Flare Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020503</td>
<td>Solar Flare Contingency Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020504</td>
<td>Solar Flare Warning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT PLAN NO.</td>
<td>ISSUE NO.</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M04</td>
<td>2020401</td>
<td>HZE Particle Protection Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M05</td>
<td>2021201</td>
<td>Ground Support for Radiation Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202M06</td>
<td>2020106</td>
<td>Radiation Awareness Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Induced Environment Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030201</td>
<td></td>
<td>EM Leakage Specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030202</td>
<td></td>
<td>RF/Microwave Exposure Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030401</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laser Light Protection Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030501</td>
<td></td>
<td>Synergistic Induced Environ Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204M01</td>
<td>2040101</td>
<td>Physiological Effects of Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205M01</td>
<td>2050101</td>
<td>Prediction of Low Frequency Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205M02</td>
<td>2050102</td>
<td>Low Frequency Noise Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205M03</td>
<td>2050201</td>
<td>Long Duration 0-G Noise Exposure Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207M01</td>
<td>2070104</td>
<td>Zero-G Sports and Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207M02</td>
<td>2070301</td>
<td>Animal Payload Bioisolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207M03</td>
<td>2070401</td>
<td>Task Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207M0401</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-G Visual Performance Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207M0402</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Task Performance Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209M01</td>
<td>2090101</td>
<td>Zero-G Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Recreational Preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-G Recreational Activities, Equipment, and Matls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090202</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility for Group Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility for Individualized Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT PLAN NO.</td>
<td>ISSUE NO.</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211M01</td>
<td>2110801</td>
<td>Portable Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Housekeeping Items and Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2120201</td>
<td>Cleaning Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2120202</td>
<td>Housekeeping Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2120701</td>
<td>Housekeeping Equipment - Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213M01</td>
<td>2130202</td>
<td>Waste and Trash Collection Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213M02</td>
<td>2130701</td>
<td>Contingency Trash Disposal Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213M03</td>
<td>2130101</td>
<td>Waste Trash Generation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213M05</td>
<td>2130501</td>
<td>Waste/Trash Equipment Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213M06</td>
<td>2130601</td>
<td>Trash Compactor Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214M02</td>
<td>2140102</td>
<td>Module Docking Aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214M03</td>
<td>2140201</td>
<td>Inventory Management System Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150101</td>
<td>Standardized Footwear/Foot Restraint System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150301</td>
<td>Cable and Hose Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150302</td>
<td>Equipment Restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150201</td>
<td>Body Restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2150501</td>
<td>Crew Portable Restraint System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment Restraint and Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2160201</td>
<td>Containment and Translation of Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2160101</td>
<td>Crew Translation Aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT PLAN NO.</td>
<td>ISSUE NO.</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadvertent Impact Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M01</td>
<td>2180601</td>
<td>On-Orbit Configuration Mods Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M02</td>
<td>2180501</td>
<td>On-Orbit Problem Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M03</td>
<td>2180301</td>
<td>Fluid System Conn Integrity Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M04</td>
<td>2180701</td>
<td>Habitable Volume Leak Point Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M05</td>
<td></td>
<td>QA Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2180201</td>
<td>QA On-Orbit Verification Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2180202</td>
<td>QA Verification Tools and Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M07</td>
<td>2180203</td>
<td>Fluid System Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M08</td>
<td>2180302</td>
<td>Equipment Status Marking On-Orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M09</td>
<td>2180602</td>
<td>On-Orbit Quality Assurance Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218M10</td>
<td>2180401</td>
<td>On-Orbit System Certification Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2200101</td>
<td>Equipment Vibration/Mounting Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2050103</td>
<td>Zero-G Equipment Noise Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-Orbit Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3010103</td>
<td>On-Orbit OJT Training Cost and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3010403</td>
<td>On-Orbit Refresher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3010301</td>
<td>Non-Critical Task Training On-Orbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303M01</td>
<td>3030102</td>
<td>Wall Access/Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crew Activity Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3060102</td>
<td>Shift Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3060103</td>
<td>Mission Length Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3060104</td>
<td>Varied Crew Schedule Models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MGMT PLAN NO.</th>
<th>ISSUE NO.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306M02</td>
<td>3060106</td>
<td>Rec/Leisure Time Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M03</td>
<td>3060108</td>
<td>Rest Break Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M04</td>
<td>3060111</td>
<td>Shift Effects on Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M05</td>
<td>3060301</td>
<td>Factors for Work Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M06</td>
<td>3060302</td>
<td>Develop Expert Sched System Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M02</td>
<td>308M01</td>
<td>IVA/EVA Tasks and Learning Curves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M04</td>
<td>308M02</td>
<td>Grd Support for Long-Range Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M05</td>
<td>308M03</td>
<td>Important/Essential Skills for Job Rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306M06</td>
<td>308M04</td>
<td>Productivity Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309M01</td>
<td>310M01</td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309M02</td>
<td>310M02</td>
<td>Air-to-Ground Problem Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309M03</td>
<td>310M03</td>
<td>Autonomy Tech Selection/Time Phasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309M05</td>
<td>310M05</td>
<td>On-Orbit vs. Grd Task Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309M06</td>
<td>310M06</td>
<td>Anthropometric Computer Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310M01</td>
<td>310M07</td>
<td>Workload Assessment Computer Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310M02</td>
<td>310M08</td>
<td>Workstation Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401M01</td>
<td>401M01</td>
<td>Task Verification at Workstations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401M02</td>
<td>401M02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE STUDY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Interior Design Guidelines (103M01)
OBJECTIVES:

(01) Develop interior design guidelines for color, texture, graphics and lighting to provide a comfortable, stimulating, non-monotonous work and off-duty environment.

(02) Devise and evaluate interior design features that will allow variations in color, lighting or textures to maintain a varied and stimulating living and work environment.

(03) Develop integrated coding criteria using color, graphics, textures, and labeling approaches for identification/orientation purposes that avoid visual clutter or information overload.

BACKGROUND:

There is evidence to indicate that interior design features such as color affect human performance. For example, Soviet Space Station experience indicates that monotonous surroundings lead to boredom, fatigue, and possibly loss of job interest. Based on Soviet experience, there may also be a relationship between color and motion sickness. (1) The human factors literature (2) reveals that color and lighting produces the following responses:

- Certain colors make a space appear larger than it actually is while others cause a space to "close in" on the observer.
- Certain colors cause a space to seem "warm" while others make it seem "cool".
- Some colors appear to have a definite effect on the mood of the observer, i.e., some colors may be stimulating while other are quieting.
- Some colors seem to clash with each other and therefore produce a feeling of irritation to observers who are especially sensitive to color incompatibilities.

While it is generally acknowledged that interior design features can have a significant effect on human performance, our knowledge base does not allow clearcut specification of interior design guidelines without a detailed study of specific space station needs.
The present issue resolution management plan provides a technical approach for developing interior design guidelines and specifications. It also addresses design features for modifying the interior decor for stimulus variation purposes. Finally, the technical approach considers the development of coding criteria that are harmonious with the decor scheme to facilitate identification of spaces and maintaining orientation in the zero-g environment.

**INPUTS:**

A. Work and living space configurations  
B. MULTI-USE VS DEDICATED SPACE DETERMINATIONS (Issue 1010701)  
C. HABITABILITY INTERIOR MATERIALS SELECTION REQUIREMENT (Issue 1040001)  
D. ACTIVITY AREA VOLUMES (Issue 1010201)  
E. Crew characteristics  
F. Crew activities in specific locations  
G. Crew information needs  
H. MODULE/ACTIVITY AREA ORIENTATION STANDARD (Issue 1010301)  
I. SS MOTION SICKNESS COUNTERMEASURES (Issue 2070107)

**CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS:**

(01) The interior decor scheme should be tailored primarily to the needs of the U.S. crew population. Secondary attention should be given to accommodating foreign participants.

(02) A full scale, one-g, space station mission simulation will be developed to simulate 90 day missions.

**SPECIAL REMARKS:**

(01) Judgement regarding aesthetic preferences in relation to color, graphics, texture and lighting are highly subjective. Consequently interior design guidelines require close coordination with the candidate crew population to meet their specific needs.

(02) Concern with labeling, in the context of this study plan, is confined to the color of label characters and the color of label backgrounds in relation to the overall Space Station color-decor scheme.

(03) Consideration of lighting in the present study plan is confined to the interactive effects of light and color from an aesthetic standpoint rather than general lighting requirements for effective task accomplishment.

(04) The interrelationship between color and motion sickness will be addressed separately in the management Issue #2070107 SPACE STATION MOTION SICKNESS COUNTERMEASURES.

**REFERENCES:**
(01) Boeing Aerospace Co., Soviet Space Stations as Analogs, D180-28182-1, Oct 1983

STUDY TASKS:

(01) Literature review to establish known effects of color, texture, graphics and lighting on human performance. Consult with subject matter experts within NASA and academia.

(02) Develop design concepts for varying the interior design characteristics, allowing for personalization of living spaces and accommodating the culturally-shaped preferences of foreign visitors.

(03) Data-gathering from space station design efforts to establish crew activities in specific space station locations and the information-orientation needs of the crew.

(04) Develop scale models that can be used to develop, present, and evaluate candidate color-decor schemes. Also establish coding practices for identification and orientation purposes that are compatible with the candidate color-decor schemes.

(05) Conduct a structured survey of a representative sample of the crew population and subject-matter experts in evaluating the candidate decor schemes and in selecting a preferred approach. Include foreign test subjects in this evaluation.

(06) Develop full scale mockups or utilize existing mockups of space station living and work areas and implement the preferred decor scheme selected on the basis of the scale model evaluation.

(07) Use full-scale mockups to verify the suitability of color-decor schemes, modifiability of features and identification-orientation coding features utilizing representative members of the crew population.

(08) Assuming the separate development of a full scale, one-g space station mission simulator for ninety-day confinement studies, implement the selected color-decor identification scheme and obtain subjective evaluation data from test subjects. Perform as add-on to primary study.

(09) Formulate interior design specifications for the space station.

SPECIAL STUDY NEEDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK(S)</th>
<th>NEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Model-making capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>Access to full scale mockups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Access to mission simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>Availability of space station configuration data, crew task analyses data, and material selection guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>Access to the candidate crew population and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NASA experts.

**SPECIAL SKILLS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK(S)</th>
<th>SKILL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,4,6</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,5,7,8</td>
<td>Human Factors; Environmental Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,7</td>
<td>Crew Syst Design, Interior Design Specialists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERFORMING ORGANIZATION:**

(01) Managing: NASA Laboratories

(02) Doing: Aerospace Firms (Prime)
          Industrial Design Firms (Sub)

**STUDY PRODUCTS:**

Detailed design specifications for:

(01) Space Station interior design features for the various living and work spaces: color, graphics, texture, and lighting in terms of their impact on decor.

(02) Design features to allow modificability of decor to provide stimulus variation and personalization of spaces.

(03) Recommended coding-labeling approaches that are harmonious with the overall decor scheme and that provide effective indication and orientation cues for crew members.

**PRODUCTS WILL PERMIT COMPLETION OF THE UNDEFINED REQUIREMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBELEMENT NO. &amp; TITLE</th>
<th>Undefined Rqmt #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10301 Decor, Texture, Graphics &amp; Lighting</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10302 Interior Design Modifiability</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10303 Coding</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY TASKS</td>
<td>(m/m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modifiability Design Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SS Design Data-Gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY TASKS</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop Scale Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Structured Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Full-scale Mockups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY TASKS</td>
<td>PHASE B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mockup Reviews</td>
<td>(2m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Simulator Evaluation</td>
<td>(4m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Specifications</td>
<td>(2m/m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL M/M = 32
SUMMARY SCHEDULE/COST FACTORS

STUDY SPAN: Oct 85-May 88 *CM = 31

CATEGORY

LABOR
- NASA Project Mgmt
- Study Mgmt
- Study Tasks
  - Analyst, Eng'g
  - Special Skills:
    Ind Design
    HF, Env. Psych.
    CS, Int Design

FACTOR/MM(CM)* COST $.

16.0 mm
2.0 mm
6.0 mm
19.5 mm
4.5 mm

SPECIAL FACILITIES
1-g SS Simulator
4 cm

TRAVEL
Coordination w/NASA, Aerospace Co.'s.
15 K

MATERIALS
Mockup fabrication
10 K

TEST PROGRAM
Test Subjects for mockup evaluation
10 K

OTHER (List)

* MM = Manmonths; CM = Calendar Months