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In-Space Manufacturing (ISM)

“If what you’re doing is not seen by some people as science fiction, it’s probably not transformative enough.”

-Sergey Brin
The AES In-space Manufacturing (ISM) project serves as Agency resource for identifying, designing, & implementing on-demand, sustainable manufacturing solutions for fabrication, maintenance, & repair during Exploration missions.

ISM Objective

ISM Parts/Systems Design Database & Test Articles

Answers WHAT we need to make
- Top-down, quantitative analyses of ISM benefits to crew time, cost, mass, & reliability (w/EMC).
- Provide expertise to NASA User community on AM design optimization & materials.
- Test high-impact parts/systems to inform Exploration technology requirements (bottoms-up).
- Develop In-space Parts Design Database, processes, & materials.

ISM Technology Development & Testing

Answers HOW we will make it
- Define NASA requirements for ISM Technologies based on ISS & EMC Applications identified (micro-g effects, performance, & operations)
- Collaborate and establish mechanisms to leverage industry to develop the technologies needed for NASA missions.
- Utilize ISS as test-bed for developing ‘FabLab' to serve as springboard for cis-lunar ‘proving ground’ missions.

Unique Agency Expertise & Leveraging of Industry

Leverage industry to meet NASA needs (i.e. Agency knowledge-base for terrestrial technology).

In-space Manufacturing provides Exploration mission benefits to cost, mass, crew time & reliability

‘One-stop shop’ for AM design, materials, & technology expertise for NASA User Community.

Proactive influence during Exploration design phase required for meaningful implementation

Test-bed > Proving Ground > Earth Independent

Multi-material ‘FabLab’ Test-bed

AMF

Recycler

3DP Demo
**ISS Platform**
- In-space Manufacturing Rack
  - 3D Print Tech Demo (plastic)
  - Additive Manufacturing Facility
  - Recycling
  - On-demand Utilization
  - Catalogue
  - Printable Electronics
  - In-space Metals
  - Syn Bio & ISRU
- External In-space Mfctr. & Repair Demo

**Earth-Based Platform**
- Define Capacity and Capability Requirements (work with EMC Systems on ECLSS, Structures, Logistics & Maintenance, etc.)
- Certification & Inspection Process
- Material Characterization Database (in-situ & ex-situ)
- Additive Manufacturing Systems Automation Development
- Ground-based Technology Maturation & Demonstrations (i.e. ACME Project)
- Develop, Test, and Utilize Simulants & Binders for use as AM Feedstock

**Planetary Surfaces Platform**
- Additive Construction, Repair & Recycle/Reclamation Technologies (both In-situ and Ex-situ)
- Provisioning of Regolith Simulant Materials for Feedstock Utilization
- Execution and Handling of Materials for Fabrication and/or Repair Purposes
- Synthetic Biology Collaboration

**Earth-Reliant Proving Ground**
- Space Launch System
- Commercial Cargo and Crew

**Earth Independent**
- Asteroids

**Path to Exploration**
The 3D Print project delivered the first 3D printer on the ISS and investigated the effects of consistent microgravity on melt deposition additive manufacturing by printing parts in space.

Fused deposition modeling:
1) nozzle ejecting molten plastic,
2) deposited material (modeled part),
3) controlled movable table

### 3D Print Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td>33 cm x 30 cm x 36 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print Volume</strong></td>
<td>6 cm x 12 cm x 6 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass</strong></td>
<td>20 kg (w/out packing material or spares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Est. Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>95 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution</strong></td>
<td>.35 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Power</strong></td>
<td>176W (draw from MSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software</strong></td>
<td>MIS SliceR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traverse</strong></td>
<td>Linear Guide Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedstock</strong></td>
<td>ABS Plastic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase I Operations Timeline

- Technology Demonstration Mission via a Small Business Innovation Research contract with Made in Space, Inc.
- Ground Control Samples were made in May 2014 on the flight unit in the MSG mock-up facility at MSFC
- The 3D Print Tech Demo launched to ISS on SpaceX-4 (September 2014)
- Installed in the Microgravity Science Glovebox on ISS in November 2014
- Flight Samples were made in November – December 2014
- Specimens underwent testing from May-September 2015
  - Small number of specimens make comparison between ground and flight specimens difficult
- Data from 3DP phase I out-briefed at a technical interchange meeting at NASA MSFC on Dec. 2-3, 2015
- Results will be published as a NASA technical publication in summer 2016
Phase I Prints

Completed Phase 1 Technology Demonstration Goals

- Demonstrated critical operational function of the printer
- Completed test plan for 42 ground control and flight specimens
- Identified influence factors that may explain differences between data sets

Phase II – June/July 2016
- Better statistical sampling

Mechanical Property Test Articles

- Tensile
- Compression
- Flex

Functional Tools

- Crowfoot
- Ratchet
- Cubesat Clip
- Container
- Torque

Printer Performance Capability
Notes on Printer Operations

- Feedstock for ground and flight are the same material and originate from the same manufacturing lot, but are from different canisters.

- Flight feedstock 5-6 months older than ground feedstock at time of printing.

- Changes in build tray over course of prints:
  - Four separate build trays used for flight prints.

- Z-calibration distance (and tip to tray distance, which is determined by the z-calibration setting) was changed slightly during the course of flight prints based on visual feedback:
  - Z-Calibration was held constant for ground prints.

![Diagram showing build plate, extruder tip, and calibration distances.](image)
Testing of Phase I Prints

Photographic and Visual Inspection
Inspect samples for evidence of:
• Delamination between layers
• Curling or deformation of samples
• Voids or pores
• Sample removal damage

Mass Measurement
Measure mass of samples:
• Laboratory scale accurate to 0.01 mg
• Note any discrepancy between flight and ground samples

Structured Light Scanning
Scan external geometry of samples:
• Accurate to ± 12.7 µm
• Compare scan data CAD model to original CAD model
• Measure volume from scan data
• Measure feature dimensions: length, width, height, diameter, etc.

Data Obtained
- Thorough documentation of sample quality
- Archival Photographs
- Geometric Accuracy
- Average Sample Volume
- Average Sample Mass
- Internal structure
- Densification
- Mechanical Properties
- Comparison to ABS characterization data
- Microstructure data
- Layer adhesion quality
- Microgravity effects on deposition

CT Scanning / X-Ray
Inspect internal tomography of samples:
• Internal voids or pores
• Measure layer thickness / bead width
• Note any discrepancy in spacing between filament lines

Mechanical (Destructive) Testing
Mechanical Samples only:
• ASTM D638: Tensile Test
• ASTM D790: Flexural Test
• ASTM D695: Compression Test

Optical / SEM Microscopy
Inspect for discrepancies between flight and ground samples:
• External anomalies noted in previous tests
• Microstructure
• Areas of delamination
• Fracture surface of tensile samples
Testing of Phase I Prints

Optical microscope image of tensile specimen post-mechanical testing

Flight tensile fracture surface

Closeup of ground tensile fracture surface

Image from CT scan of flight tensile specimen

Compression specimen

Structured Light Scan of Flight Flexural Specimen

Bottom Surface Crowfoot (Flight Specimen)
3DP Phase I Key Observations: Material Properties

- **Density**
  - Flight specimens slightly more dense than ground specimens
  - Compression specimens show opposite trend
  - Gravimetric density strongly correlated with other mechanical properties

- **Tensile and Flexure**
  - Flight specimens stronger and stiffer than ground counterparts

- **Compression**
  - Flight specimens are weaker than ground specimens

### Mechanical Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Property</th>
<th>Percent Difference (WRT Ground)</th>
<th>Coefficient of Variation (Flight)</th>
<th>Coefficient of Variation (Ground)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate tensile strength (KSI)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulus of Elasticity (MSI)</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture Elongation (%)</td>
<td>-30.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Strength (KSI)</td>
<td>-25.1%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive Modulus (MSI)</td>
<td>-33.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural Strength (PSI)</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexural Modulus (KSI)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen Type</th>
<th>Percent Difference (WRT Ground)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tensile</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexure</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optical microscope image of tensile specimen
**3DP Phase I Key Observations: XRay and CT**

- CT scans show an abrupt step change in density about halfway through the thickness of many specimens
  - More pronounced densification in lower half of flight specimens
  - Differences in densities (measured as mean CT) between upper and lower half of specimens is not statistically significant
- Probable voids detected throughout flight and ground articles; no significant difference in number or size of voids between the flight and ground sets

Image from CT scan of flight tensile specimen

Lower density in upper section of part
3DP Phase I Key Observations: Structured Light Scanning

Flight Flexural Specimen

Ground Tensile Specimen

Protrusions along bottom edges indicate that extruder tip may have been too close to the print tray (more pronounced for flight prints)

Warping of Samples
- may indicate inconsistent cooling of the specimen leading to internal stress build-up
- Damage sustained during specimen removal process

Roundness of Circular Samples
- Flight specimens slightly more out of round based on structured light scanning results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eccentricity</th>
<th>Elliptical Cross-Sectional Area (mm²)</th>
<th>Percent Error of Cross-Section WRT CAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>4.11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>2.96 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sidewall surface of compression specimen
3DP Phase I Key Observations: Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)

- Structural differences are seen within both ground and flight specimen groups
- Ground sample surfaces are generally more “open” than flight specimens

- Fracture surfaces for ground specimens have open central filaments and dense fiber agglomeration on sides
- Fracture surfaces for flight specimens have dense filament agglomeration on sides and bottom

Image credit: Dr. Richard Grugel, NASA MSFC
3DP Phase I Key Observations: Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raster orientation</th>
<th>Mean yield strength (PSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal (0)</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal (45)</td>
<td>2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transverse (90)</td>
<td>2081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default (+/- 45)</td>
<td>2741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground and flight specimens built with +/-45 orientation
More filament bonding on bottom of flight specimens
Likely explains increased strength of flight specimens and reduced elongation

3DP Phase I Key Observations: Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)

- Both calibration coupons (ground and flight) show evidence of filament slump.
- Results not suggestive of microgravity effect on materials processing, although differences in manufacturing processing conditions between flight and ground specimens preclude a definitive assessment.
- Phase II prints (completed July 16) will provide additional data.

Image credit: Dr. Richard Grugel, NASA MSFC
3DP Phase I Key Observations:
Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)

- Comparison of internal structure for ground compression specimen G013 (left) and flight compression specimen F016 (right) post-destructive testing.
- Ground compression specimens exhibit better fiber bonding.
- Likely explains difference comparative weakness of flight specimens.
- Source of structural variations may be changes in tip to tray distance for flight prints (follow-on ground based study and phase II prints will provide additional data)

Image credit: Dr. Richard Grugel, NASA MSFC
3DP Phase I Executive Summary

- The Phase I parts (first 21 parts printed) underwent testing and evaluation at the Materials and Processes Laboratory at NASA Marshall Space Flight Center and were compared with “ground truth” samples printed prior to printer’s launch to ISS.
  - Phase I report published as NASA technical publication in summer 2016
- Differences noted in testing between the ground and flight specimens could not be definitively linked to microgravity as a processing variable
- Based on the Phase I results, the ISM team developed a go forward plan which includes: (1) Clear objectives defined for Phase II on-orbit prints and (2) Additional ground-based characterization work in order to address variables related to the 3DP data set
- Complementary microstructural and macrostructural modeling work of FDM at Ames Research Center underway
  - ISM team providing data for model validation
3DP Phase I Follow-On Work

Ground Based Investigations

- Study of effect of tip-to-tray distance on part quality and performance
  - Systematic variation of this distance using 3DP backup flight unit
  - Study envelopes commanded values for ground and flight prints
  - Test regime includes surface metrology, mass measurement, structured light scanning, XRay/CT, mechanical testing and SEM
  - Complete by October 2016

Further Analysis of Phase I Specimens

- Chemical composition analysis using Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy
  - Demonstrated no significant chemical differences between ground and flight prints in terms of functional groups present and relative concentrations
- Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) of calibration coupons specimens (sparser fill) and SEM of layer quality (square column) specimens
  - No microgravity effects observed to date with SEM

On-Orbit Investigations

- Better statistical sampling with specimens from Phase II operations
- Phase II prints (34 additional specimens) completed in June and July 2016

SEM Image
- Deformed ABS Filament with microcracks
Additional ISM Activities

- Interface with and design of components for ISS stakeholders
  - Oxygen Generation Assembly Adapter allows ISS crew to obtain consistent and accurate airflow velocity measurements for Environmental Control and Life Support Systems (ECLSS) hardware
  - Air Nozzle Adapter (will be used to inflate refillable stowage bags for ISS demo test)
  - Robonaut camera calibration mount (senior design project with Vanderbilt University)
  - OGA and air nozzle will be printed with Additive Manufacturing Facility (AMF)
- Defined phase II prints based on phase I results
  - Streamlined process for operations to conserve crew time
  - Phase II prints took place in June/July 2016
- Made in Space Additive Manufacturing Facility (AMF) commercial printer is now on ISS
  - Multi-user facility
Additional ISM Activities

- Tethers Unlimited (TUI) developing an in-space recycler and printer for recycling of printed parts into feedstock
- NASA Science Technology Mission Directorate (STMD) External In-space Manufacturing Tipping Point Project with Made in Space, Inc. entitled “Versatile In-Space Robotic Precision Manufacturing and Assembly System”
- Additive Construction by Mobile Emplacement (ACME)
  - project is in conjunction with the Army Corps of Engineers and is co-led by MSFC and KSC
  - Development of additive construction technologies for use with in-situ resources
- Procurement of Nscrypt machine
  - Multimaterial 3D printer
  - printable electronics capability
- Ongoing development work toward ISS “FabLab”
  - Trade studies of manufacturing processes for in-space applications
  - Logistics analyses
  - Material characterization activities to understand machine and material capabilities and inform requirements development
ISS Serves as a Key Exploration Test-bed for the Required Technology Maturation & Demonstrations
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Future Engineers listed as ‘Breakthrough Award’ in Nov. Issue of Popular Mechanics

- National FE Challenge Teen Winner, Ryan B., at California Science Center with Astronaut Leland Melvin 11/16/15
- “Design Consultation” with FE Winner, R.J. Hillan, NASA ISM team members, and MIS Design Lead, Mike Snyder 12/4/15

3D Print included as Top 15 ISS events for the ISS 15th Anniversary Infographic Released 11/2/15

Media Event with ISM and Former ISS Commander Butch Wilmore 11/16/15

FE Junior Division Winner, Emily T., with her winning design, the Flower Tea Cage 10/27/15

NASA Systems Eng. Excellence Award for 3D Print Demo