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ABSTRACT

The iterative design process is one of many strategies used in new product development. Top-down development strategies, like waterfall development, place a heavy emphasis on planning and simulation. The iterative process, on the other hand, is better suited to the management of small to medium scale projects.

Over the past four months, I have worked with engineers at Johnson Space Center on a multitude of electronics projects. By describing the work I have done these last few months, analyzing the factors that have driven design decisions, and examining the testing and verification process, I will demonstrate that iterative design is the obvious choice for research and development projects.
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INTRODUCTION

In engineering, there are many ways to solve a problem. It is nearly impossible to find an engineering solution that is universally wrong; however, some approaches are better suited to solving specific problems than others. The iterative design process is one of many strategies used in new product development. Top-down development strategies, like waterfall development, place a heavy emphasis on planning and simulation. Projects run from a top-down perspective produce few working prototypes, if any, and often jump straight from design to construction of a final product. This style of project management is well suited to large and costly undertakings, such as those often found in construction. The iterative process, on the other hand, is much better suited to the management of small to medium scale projects.^[1]^

Unlike top-down models which hold nearly all production until the design phase is completed, the iterative model integrates design and prototyping throughout the entire life of a project. The first goal of an iterative design project is defining requirements and developing a working prototype. The initial prototype is field tested, if applicable, and used to gather user feedback. The data collected from testing and feedback is used to refine requirements and guide the construction of a new prototype. The cycle of construction, testing, and refinement continues until further changes are not needed and the project can be considered complete.

This semester, I was a member of the Modular Instrumentation System (MIS) project at Johnson Space Center (JSC). The MIS project is a shining example of how the iterative design process is an excellent model for engineering work in a research and development environment. By describing the work I have done these last few months, analyzing the factors that have driven design decisions, and examining the testing and
verification process, I will demonstrate that iterative design is better by far for small R&D projects than a top-down development strategy.

WORK EXPERIENCE – MANY HATS

Over the spring 2013 semester, I have performed many diverse tasks as a member of the Command and Data Handling Branch (EV2) at JSC. EV2 handles the development and implementation of new space avionics hardware. As the broad scope of “space avionics hardware” implies, my branch is actively working on many different development projects at any given time. In addition to my work with MIS, I have contributed to a number of side projects, acquiring many new skills and greatly expanding my engineering toolkit in the process. I will not have the chance to touch on every item, but a list of the experience I have gained this semester is listed in Table I.

| Engineering Fundamentals | — Experience with a complete development cycle  
| — Introduction to the iterative design process  
| — Attended TSTI systems engineering course |
| Design | — Electronic circuit design  
| — Printed circuit board layout  
| — Embedded programming fundamentals |
| Software | — Altium circuit board design software  
| — Pro-Engineer CAD software  
| — TI Code Composer software development kit |
| Technical Work | — Prototyping using 3D printers  
| — Surface mount soldering  
| — Circuit board modification/repair  
| — Machine shop tools |

Table I: Summary of new experience and skills gained this tour

My previous experience as an avionics technician in the Air Force translates well to the lab environment. Many of the small technical tasks I have performed for EV2 have revolved around physical modifications to circuit boards and enclosures. Enclosure modification primarily involves drilling and bending sheet metal. However, circuit board
modifications can be an intricate and complicated process. In situations where the circuit paths must be modified, knives are used to cut copper traces on the surface of the board. These traces can be extremely small; most on the MIS board are a eight thousandths of an inch wide. Once the traces are cut, jumper wire is soldered to components on the board to create new electrical paths. Examples of jumper wire soldering and trace cutting can be seen in Figure 1. Due to the delicate nature of the work, some circuit board modifications can take many hours to complete.

In addition to technical work, I have had the opportunity to directly involve myself in the prototyping process. Early in my tour, I worked closely with a JSC engineer in the emerging field of wearable electronics. Building upon the work of Georgia Tech researchers [2], we constructed a working proof of concept of a hybrid resistive/capacitive button using an Arduino prototyping kit, a box of electrical components, and a few wires.
The primary challenge in the field of wearable technology is integrating rigid electronic components with flexible fabrics. The Georgia Tech-inspired hybrid button eliminates this problem almost entirely by moving all of the electronic components away from the physical button. The button itself is simply a pair of wires that registers a “press” when a finger comes into contact with both at the same time. Note in Figure 3, how the electronic components are not located anywhere near the button itself. These components can be mounted anywhere on or, more importantly, off the garment. Now that the proof-of-concept has been constructed, tested, and verified, it will be trivial for NASA engineers to move forward with a prototype which incorporates conductive thread woven into a garment.

As a final technical assignment, I was asked to develop a new revision of the Modular Instrumentation System enclosure. The current enclosure is costly and, as with any engineering design, there is always room for refinement. After learning to use the modeling software, I simplified the existing enclosure by redesigning individual pieces to be location and orientation agnostic. That is, rather than have unique parts for the top, bottom, left, and right of the box, there are simply universal “end” and “side” pieces. By reducing the number of unique parts and decreasing the complexity of the design, I was able to cut the cost of manufacture by nearly 25%.

Figure 3: Prototype electronic textile button. Note that the button is only the two white wires, while the rest of the components are located on the "distant" breadboard.
I was also given the opportunity to learn to use one of the on-site 3-D printers to construct a prototype of the enclosure. The box depicted in Figure 4 is not the final design, but it does help to illustrate how prototyping machines have revolutionized mechanical design. The 3-D printed box allowed me to physically interact with my work and verify clearances between parts. My experience assembling and testing this box guided decisions as I worked on the final version of the enclosure. This prototype is made of extruded plastic and cannot be fitted with an MIS system; however it was virtually free to produce and serves the same purpose as a milled prototype. It does not make sense to spend $1000+ for a professionally manufactured aluminum box whose design is guaranteed to change before final production. We saved both design time and procurement funds while simultaneously gathering valuable feedback – a win-win situation in the design world.

THE MODULAR INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEM

While much of my time this spring was spent completing technical tasks and doing work with the wearable electronics lab, my primary duty was designing a printed circuit board (PCB) for MIS. In January, I was tasked with the development of a PCB capable of collecting sensor data while mounted inside a rocket. The board I designed is

Figure 4: A prototype MIS stack and 3-D printed enclosure
the basis for a suborbital proof-of-concept experiment, and will be a part of the first MIS system launched into space. The precedent-setting launch will officially mark the system as flight-proven hardware, and open it up as a viable equipment choice for missions to the international space station and beyond[^3].

As far as the system itself is concerned, MIS is made up of a series of small form factor boards (3”x1.7”) that connect to each other vertically through on-board connectors. A set of MIS boards connected together is referred to as a “stack.” Each board in a stack serves a specific purpose and is equipment agnostic. That is, an MIS processor board is designed to connect to any MIS sensor board, and any combination of processors and sensors can communicate through any MIS communications board, and so on. The idea is to create families of reusable hardware that users can pick and choose to meet their requirements without going through the time consuming and expensive process of developing custom electronics. New MIS hardware is still under active development, and I am fortunate to have had the chance to join this project at such an early stage.

**JOB AMPLIFICATION – DESIGNING AN MIS BOARD**

I came into this tour with only a rudimentary knowledge of logic structures and basic circuit analysis. From this perspective, designing and building a circuit board from scratch is no small task! Over the past four months, I have not only managed to design a prototype sensor board – I have assembled it, programmed it, tested it, and am in the process of designing a system demonstration.

There are many steps involved in the development of a piece of hardware, and each one is critically important. This is especially true when that hardware is expected to fly into space. I followed an iterative process when designing this circuit board, starting
by sitting down with my project manager and establishing design requirements. Once the requirements were established, I selected parts and designed the board. After passing peer review, the design was sent out to be constructed by a manufacturing house. Upon receiving the physical boards, I populated them with electronic components using specialized equipment. As the final step in the process, I wrote microcontroller code to test and verify my design. During testing and verification, I corrected mistakes found in testing and tweaked the design to improve performance and the user experience. If I were a full-time employee, the next iteration would begin with a review of the requirements against the results of testing. In my case, however, I will pass my work off to another engineer for the next iteration. This process of continual refinement ensures that the final product is streamlined and free of serious design flaws at flight time.

**REQUIREMENTS**

Design requirements can be broken down into two broad categories: static and dynamic. Static requirements are often the result of physical restrictions or the operating environment. For example, all MIS boards are required to have the same form factor, and because they are stacked, care must be taken to ensure that components do not interfere with other boards. Additionally, the location of the connectors and screw holes that are used to assemble the stack must be in the same location on each board. Finally, since this hardware is intended to fly into space, it must be as small, lightweight, low-power, and radiation-tolerant as possible. As the name implies, “static” requirements are nearly always absolute and unalterable once set.

In software design, design requirements can be described as a moving target because they change with user demand[^4]. Unlike software changes, however, hardware
changes are costly. New parts cost money, and it takes time and labor to verify new designs. For this reason, every cycle of iterative hardware design should be spiraling inward toward a final end-state. Under ideal conditions, each revision will call for fewer changes until the cost of improvement exceeds the expected benefit. I picked up this MIS project in its initial phase of development, so the dynamic nature of early requirements is very easy to see. My initial board design was completed in January. After three months of reviews and requirements meetings, the final “version 0” design looks nothing like the original, and its capabilities have been greatly expanded. Table II and Figure 5 do a good job of illustrating how the sensor board design has grown between January and April.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Sensing Requirements</th>
<th>Current Sensing Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— External carbon dioxide</td>
<td>— External carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— External absolute pressure</td>
<td>— External absolute pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— External temperature/humidity</td>
<td>— External temperature/humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Internal temperature/humidity</td>
<td>— Internal temperature/humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Accelerometer</td>
<td>— Remote accelerometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Gyroscope</td>
<td>— Remote gyroscope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Thermocouple remote temp. x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Remote temp/humid. (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— GPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Initial requirements versus current capabilities

Figure 5: Initial sensor board design (left) and expanded two-board sensor set (center and right)
COMPONENT SELECTION

Variety is an electronic designer’s best friend, but can also be their worst nightmare. If an engineer is looking for a component that serves a specific purpose, chances are he or she will have no trouble finding at least one. The problem is that there are often too many to choose from. It is not uncommon to look for a particular kind of sensor, for example, and find a mountain of parts, each one only slightly different from its counterparts.

In situations where components are in abundance, requirements often help to narrow down the field of candidate parts. For example, one of my sensing requirements is to be able to take external absolute pressure readings. The sensor I select must be able to survive in the vacuum of space – which is particularly important since not all pressure sensors are designed to handle a true vacuum. Additionally, it must be capable of running on 3.3 volts or less and be able to communicate digitally. Finally, it must mount to the surface of a PCB and be equipped with a means of attaching a hose or some other form of external measurement apparatus. In the end, my requirements narrowed my choice of sensors from several thousand to four, and I was able to easily choose a part that was best suited to satisfy my project’s requirements.

The selection of everything from expensive sensors to tiny microswitches were guided by the same process. There was a great deal of research involved, and I spent several hours on each major component, pouring over manufacturer websites and data sheets to find parts that were best suited to the task. In some cases, using the requirements left me with no parts to choose from. At this point, a designer must consider which requirements are flexible enough to compromise in favor of adhering
more strictly to others. In many situations, this is the only way to find parts suited to the job without expensive custom development.

This is called requirements trading, and an example of this can be found in the selection of a GPS receiver for my sensor board. Even low power GPS receivers require a lot of power to run. To find a receiver that would satisfy the MIS power requirements, I had to find a compromise between battery life and signal quality. Low power GPS units take much longer to lock than a standard unit, but systems which use MIS sensor hardware will be collecting data for long periods of time. They will not require rapid GPS response times. Therefore, if locking and tracking is sluggish, it really does not matter. Knowing this guided me to a low-power receiver which takes a long time to lock, but uses modern tracking technology to maintain that lock in high speed applications.

**BOARD LAYOUT**

Circuit board layout is one of the more complicated aspects of electronic design work. Choosing the correct electronic components is important, and that research can be quite time consuming; however, there are volumes upon volumes of guidelines and considerations that must be kept in mind when laying out a circuit board. This is especially true for sensitive radio frequency (RF) circuits. Having a large number of board lines, or traces, further complicates matters because there are minimum spacing requirements, especially for delicate digital signal lines. Even the simplest boards can become very challenging to lay out if there are many traces to place.

Signal integrity is the biggest concern when it comes to PCB layout. Signal integrity means exactly what the name implies: maintaining the quality of the digital signals that are transmitted between electronic components on the circuit boards. Digital
electronic signals are transmitted in the form of ones and zeroes. On the board level, a zero is typically zero volts, and a one is some arbitrary voltage – usually 3 or 5 volts. This means that when data is being transmitted, there are traces where the voltage is switching quickly between 0 and 3 or 5 volts dozens of times a microsecond.

Rapidly changing voltages create electromagnetic fields. This is a fundamental property of electromagnetic physics. Keeping this in mind, it is important to note that the opposite is true as well – electromagnetic fields can create, or induce, current in wires and PCB traces. What this means for designers is that signal traces, called critical traces in the world of PCB design, have special spacing considerations, and must be spaced farther apart to keep them from interfering with one another. This is especially true for RF circuits, because the extremely high frequency signals traveling across RF lines are very sensitive and must be protected to prevent interference. Figure 6 illustrates the difference between traces that will likely interfere with each other, and those that will not.

Cross interference and signal integrity are not a major factors when dealing with analog signals and traces that provide power to parts; however, all of the parts selected for the MIS sensor board are digital. This means that nearly all of the traces on the board carry digital signals and have special spacing requirements. Considering the small size of an MIS PCB and the large number of sensors, the task of layout was quite challenging.

Figure 6: Layout of traces (red lines) before (left) and after (right) review and redesign. Note the bunching of traces on the left, and the improved spacing on the right. Proper spacing translates to a massive improvement in overall signal integrity.
BOARD MANUFACTURE AND ASSEMBLY

Within the larger iterative architecture of the MIS project, there are many embedded iterative tasks. PCB layout is one such task: layouts are designed, reviewed, redesigned, re-reviewed, and so on until a final design is agreed upon. In the world of programming, these embedded iterative processes would be called “nested loops.” Engineering is full of examples of the usefulness of iterative processes, and it is easy to see why. Without several cycles of review and redesign, there is a good chance that small, simple mistakes will find their way into the prototype. An unfortunate reality of PCB design is that simple mistakes often translate to unusable boards and thousands of wasted dollars. Once a final PCB layout is agreed upon, the design goes out to a third party for manufacturing.

My department deals almost exclusively with prototyping. Due to the small quantities involved in this type of work, it often falls upon us to assemble, or populate, our circuit boards. Board population is a straightforward process. There are machines equipped with special lifting and magnification tools, which are designed especially to pick up and place tiny electronic components. These “pick and place” machines greatly accelerate the assembly process. Using the machine allowed me to populate ten circuit boards by hand, placing nearly five hundred discrete components, over the course of several hours. Attaching these parts using hand soldering techniques is possible, but the amount of time required would be orders of magnitude greater. Additionally, doing anything by hand when it comes to circuit boards, especially intricate soldering work, would create many opportunities for human error to introduce itself as a factor in the assembly process.
TESTING AND VERIFICATION

Once the circuit boards are assembled, the only remaining step is testing and verification. There are full time test engineers and programmers employed at JSC, but it often falls upon the design engineers to write test code and verify their own designs when working with initial prototypes. For this task, I was given the opportunity to learn to program microcontrollers in a language called Embedded C.

Like PCB layout, board testing and verification can be broken down into an iterative subprocess. First, I write code that allows me to take readings from each individual sensor. My only priority at this point is to talk to the components on the board one at a time and see if I get a proper response.

It is virtually impossible to catch every single flaw in a design before the first prototype is manufactured, so the first cycle of the design process is extremely important in catching all major faults so that they do not propagate into the final design. It is in this first phase of testing where hardware problems are found and corrected, as Figure 7 illustrates. Good documentation is important, as mistakes must be corrected in the design files so they do not carry on into the next iteration.

Once the components have all been tested and troubleshooting individually, the next step is to talk to all of them at the same time. This is where layout decisions are put to the test. When working with single components, communications efficiency is not much of a design consideration. However, if some components cannot talk to the processor quickly enough, they will hog the

Figure 7: Jumper wires are used to correct board layout errors. In this case, they are redirecting digital signal traces.
communications lines and bog down the entire stack. Additionally, if the electrical traces are not spaced properly to preserve signal integrity, this is where problems will begin to show up. Signal integrity problems often manifest as intermittent errors or erroneous readings from sensors. In situations where such problems cannot be fixed simply through cutting and rerouting traces, sometimes creative programming can come to the rescue and turn a buggy board into a fully functional prototype [6].

Finally, once the intra-board communications have been tested and verified, the board must be calibrated. Tests must be designed to check the accuracy of the sensors, and if custom code must be written for specific boards to “software-calibrate” the sensors, this is when it will be done.

Once calibration testing is complete, the prototype can be considered finished. At this point, the design should be tested in field conditions or with users to ensure that the designer has properly met their needs. At the time of writing this paper, I am currently working on writing a user interface so that others can interact with my design and offer valuable feedback which will be used to guide the next iteration or the process.

**ITERATIVE DESIGN IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

There is an old military saying which states that even the most thoughtful, best laid battle plans never survive contact with an enemy. While there are no battles being fought within circuit boards, this sentiment holds true in design work. No matter how many eyes look over a design, no matter how many times it is reviewed, there will be uncaught mistakes. These mistakes are just a part of the process and should be expected[7]. What makes prototyping extremely important is the fact that a large majority of these mistakes become glaringly obvious in the testing and verification
process, and they must be corrected before the design can be verified. In this sense, it can be said that “no circuit board design flaw survives contact with testing and verification.”

The lack of regular feedback and verification throughout the design process is one major failing of top-down waterfall development models. Top-down development works well in situations where costs are high and an overarching design paradigm has already been established – such as in bridge building. Bridge designers do not have to design a new type of bridge from scratch every time because there are already operating models to base their work upon. However, in a research and development environment where there are new products and ideas being developed, it is much better to start with a rough initial prototype that meets the basic requirements, and then spiral down toward an end state that meets all of the needs of the end-user.

Without regular testing and feedback, it can be very difficult to tell if the end product will be something that the customer can actually use. This is where iterative development shines, as it provides designers with regular feedback that helps to guide their designs in the right direction. In new product development, simulation and analysis is almost never a better choice than hardware testing and user feedback.

**CONCLUSION**

Simulation and analysis is no substitution for real testing and physical interaction is no substitution. It is for this reason that the iterative design process is well suited to a development environment where new products are being created. The MIS project is still in its infancy. The constant stream of feedback collected from users and tests ensures that every revision results in a prototype that spirals in toward meeting the requirements of its customers without major design flaws. The iterative design process is quite
obviously the right choice for research and development projects, and I am thankful to have had the chance to have experienced it firsthand.
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