



PERGAMON

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Acta Astronautica III (III) III-III

ACTA  
ASTRONAUTICA[www.elsevier.com/locate/actaastro](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/actaastro)

## Flexibility in system design and implications for aerospace systems

Joseph H. Saleh, Daniel E. Hastings, Dava J. Newman\*

*Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77, Massachusetts Avenue,  
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

Received 24 September 2001; received in revised form 9 August 2002; accepted 19 September 2002

### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to review the concept of flexibility as discussed in various fields of investigations, to extract its characteristic features, and to explore its implications in the case of aerospace system design. In order to discuss any subject matter clearly, it is necessary to begin with a clear set of definitions. Indeed much can be gained through careful and consistent definitions of terms alone. Flexibility however is a word rich with ambiguity. While it is being increasingly used in various fields, few attempts have been made to formally define, quantify, and propose ways for achieving flexibility. This paper proposes to fill in part of this gap by synthesizing a clear and consistent definition of flexibility. It will do so by reviewing the usage of the term in various fields of inquiries, and show that it is indeed possible to clearly and unambiguously characterize flexibility, and to disentangle it from closely related concepts.

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

### 1. Introduction

The ephemeral nature of human life has been a major theme for philosophers, theologians, poets, and others, ever since the dawn of history. A myriad of human behaviors and artifacts (intellectual, artistic, even political institutions) stem from, or find the original impetus for their existence in an individual or collectivity's relationship with *time*. Just like "we are [physiologically] the children of gravity, we cannot see it or touch it, but it has guided the evolutionary destiny of every species, and has dictated the size and shape

or our organs and limbs",<sup>1</sup> so are many of our psychological dispositions, behaviors, and constructs the children of our relationship with *time* (we cannot see it or touch it...) and the recognition of the transiency of human life.

Less profound but no less thought-provoking, is the transiency of human handiwork. Of all the structures and artifacts of antiquity, only an infinitesimal remnant survives today. Examples abound as well in more recent periods of industries, equipments, and products that exhibit an ephemeral relationship with *time*, and stand as modern reminders of the transiency of such artifacts. Typically, a product progresses through a life cycle characterized by periods of growth, maturity, and decline, then it dies out because of physical,

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +617-258-8799; fax: +617-253-4196.

E-mail address: [dnewman@mit.edu](mailto:dnewman@mit.edu) (D.J. Newman).

<sup>1</sup> D. Newman. "Human Spaceflight from MIR to Mars". AIAA-SF June 2000 Dinner Meeting, Sunnyvale.




Fig. 1. B-52s moldering in the Sun at the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center, better known as the aircraft graveyard.

functional, or economical degradation or inadequacy. At Cape Canaveral, for instance, lie the remnants of the race to the Moon: concrete launch pads, bunkers, and steel gantries in ruins from the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo missions. Similarly, outside Tucson, in the Arizona desert, one finds the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center, better known as the aircraft graveyard where over four thousand aircraft lie moldering in the sun (see Fig. 1). These modern ruins, familiar technological objects, stand as reminders that nothing is permanent. Through physical or functional degradation, or loss of economic usefulness, the hand of time lies heavy on the work of humans.

Several terms are used to describe this particular aspect of a product's relationship with time, namely the span of time from fielding a product to its retirement or replacement. These are "life span", "design lifetime" or product "clockspeed", to name a few. But what drives a system's life span? Terborgh [1] in his seminal work *Dynamic Equipment Policy*, provides the following interesting discussion on unpredictability and changes in a product's environment, competition, and equipment's inexorable progression towards obsolescence and replacement:

Capital goods live out their mortal span in an atmosphere of combat, a struggle for life [...]. Machines must defend themselves in a world where species spring up overnight, where the

landscape is never twice the same, where the fitful winds of change are never stilled. [In the world of "capital goods"] death comes usually by degrees, through a process that may be described as functional degradation. It is a kind of progressive larceny, by which the ever-changing but ever-present competitors of an existing machine rob it of its function, forcing it bit by bit into lower grade and less valuable types of service until there remains at last nothing it can do to justify further existence.

In other words, "machines", or systems in general, are constantly faced with both changes and unpredictability in their environments, as well as functional aggression from competing products. The systems that thrive longer, or have longer life span, are the ones that are capable of coping with unpredictability and changes in their environment (analyst's perspective). Conversely, if a system is to be designed for an extended design lifetime, the ability to cope with unpredictability and changes has to be embedded in the system (designer's perspective).

This is not without reminding another type of struggle for life and survival of the fittest: that of biological species. In his *Origin of Species*, Darwin introduces the universality of the struggle for existence in the following terms:

We shall now discuss in a little more detail the struggle for existence. The elder De Candolle and Lyell have largely and philosophically shown that all organic beings are exposed to sever competition [...]. Nothing is easier to admit the truth of the universal struggle for life [...]. I should premise that I use the term Struggle for Existence in a large and metaphorical sense, including not only the life of the individual, but success in leaving a progeny.

Given this omnipresence of the *struggle for existence*, the process of Natural Selection operates "daily and hourly, scrutinizing the slightest variations; rejecting those that are bad, preserving [...] all that are good": Individuals or species that are better equipped to adapt to changing environments tend to be preserved longer, according to Darwin's evolutionary theory.




Fig. 2. Simple model relating a system’s (living or inert) life span and its flexibility, which will loosely be defined for the time being as the ability of a system to handle changes.




Fig. 3. The Trilogy: Time, uncertainty, and flexibility. Systems that have a longer life span are the ones that are capable of coping with uncertainty and changes in their environment (analyst’s perspective). Conversely, if a system is to be designed for an extended design lifetime, the ability to cope with uncertainty and changes has to be embedded in the system (designer’s perspective).

The analogy with Terborgh’s work is noticeable: Both living organisms and human handiwork, complex engineering systems, for instance, strive in an ever-changing, competitively aggressive environment. Individuals or systems that are better equipped to adapt to changing environments, live longer, or outlive more *rigid* organisms or systems. The relationship between the inherent ability of an organism, or an inert system, to cope with changes and its life span is graphically illustrated in Fig. 2 (see also Fig. 3).

Two separate observations make the investigation of the above-mentioned (and illustrated) relationship

in the case of engineering systems a worthy endeavor:

1. On the one hand, current complex engineering systems are being designed for increasingly longer design lifetime. In recent years, several space programs, for instance, have chosen to increase their space segment design lifetime. Over the last two decades, communication satellites in the geo-stationary ring, for instance, have seen their design lifetime on average increase from 7 to 15 years. Similarly, a helicopter delivered today can exceed 30 years or 20,000 h of operation. In most cases, increasing a system’s design lifetime is driven by—and justified by—traditional economic analysis using Discounted Cash Flow techniques such as the classical Net Present Value (NPV), and the desire to maximize the Return On Investment. However, extending a system’s design lifetime has several side effects: Fielded systems with long design lifetimes can become obsolete, technically and commercially, before the end of their mission. In many cases, the initial circumstances from which the original system requirements were derived change or are modified during the system’s operational lifetime. In the case of high-value assets, it is desirable to have systems that are flexible and can adapt to new or emergent missions and roles, instead of fielding new ones. Flexibility is thus a key property that should be embedded in high-value assets, particularly as they are being designed for increasingly longer design lifetime. But how can one design for flexibility? What are the design practices for embedding flexibility in design? What are the trade-offs associated with designing for flexibility (value of flexibility, cost penalty, performance penalty, etc.)?
2. On the other hand, flexibility has become in recent years a key concept in many fields, particularly in most design endeavors. Indeed, for a multitude of disciplines, such as urban planning [2], architecture [3], finance [4], manufacturing [5], software design [6] and others, flexibility is hailed as critical. However, few attempts have been made to formally and unambiguously define it. Intuitively, flexibility is understood as the ability to respond to change. Although essential, this feature nevertheless fails to distinguish it from other properties such as robustness. Furthermore, the literature on design is

replete with terms related to a system's ability to handle change, such as adaptability, changeability, agility, elasticity, etc. But when one seeks to grasp their concrete content, such terms often fail. So what are the characteristic features of flexibility? How can one formally define it and quantify it?

The two above observations render the analysis of issues of flexibility, both from a conceptual and practical perspective, an interesting task. A comprehensive treatment of flexibility in system design should address the following questions:

1. What is flexibility? Can it be formally defined?
2. Why or when is flexibility needed in system design?
3. How can one design for flexibility? What are the design principles for embedding flexibility in system design?
4. What are the trade-offs associated with designing for flexibility? What is the value of flexibility, how can its value be quantified, and what are the penalties (cost, performance, risk, etc.), if any, associated with it?

This paper will focus on the first question: It proposes to review the concept of flexibility as discussed in different fields of investigations, to extract its characteristic features, and to explore its implications in the case of aerospace system design. The following questions are part of an on-going research and will be addressed separately in the subsequent papers.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the ambiguity in the technical usage of the term flexibility. Section 3 provides a selected literature review of different fields of investigations that have addressed issues of flexibility. Section 4 proposes a definition of flexibility of a design, and carefully disentangles it from discussions on flexibility in the design process. A brief literature review of Robust Control and Robust Design is also provided and a definition of robustness is synthesized. Flexibility (of a design) and robustness are then contrasted, and a distinction is drawn as well between flexibility and universality of a design. Section 5 discusses three examples of flexible systems and the need for flexibility in system design, and illustrates the relationship between flexibility and a system's design lifetime. Section 6 touches on issues of flexibility in the context of distributed

satellite systems. Section 7 contains the summary and conclusions.

## 2. Flexibility: a word rich with ambiguity

Flexibility has become in recent years a key concept in many fields, particularly in most design endeavors. Indeed, for a multitude of disciplines, such as urban planning [2], architecture [3], finance [4], manufacturing [5], software design [6] and others, flexibility is hailed as critical. However, few attempts have been made to formally and unambiguously define it. Intuitively, flexibility is understood as the ability to respond to change. Although essential, this feature nevertheless fails to distinguish it from other properties such as robustness. Furthermore, the literature on design is replete with terms related to a system's ability to handle change, such as adaptability, changeability, agility, elasticity, etc. But when one seeks to grasp their concrete content, such terms often fail.

One source of ambiguity therefore arises from the failure of the familiar characterization of flexibility, i.e., the ability to handle change, to distinguish it from other properties, particularly in the light of the proliferation of its pseudo-synonyms. The following extract [7] is a good representative of this ambiguity where flexibility and robustness are used almost interchangeably, and in which "robust design [provides] flexible solutions":

The robust design concept is extended to make decisions that are flexible to be allowed to vary within a range (called type II robust design)... The concept behind type II robust design for providing flexible solutions is represented in Fig. 4. For purposes of the illustration, assume that the performance is a function of only one variable  $x$ . Generally, in this type of robust design, to reduce the variation of response caused by variations of the design variables, instead of seeking the optimum value, a designer is interested in identifying the flat part of a curve near the performance target. If the objective is to move the performance towards  $M$  and if a robust design is not sought, then obviously  $x = \mu_{\text{opt}}$  is a better choice. However for a robust design  $x = \mu_{\text{robust}}$  is a better choice.




Fig. 4. Type II robust design: Developing flexible solutions. Adapted from [7]. Variation of the design parameter around  $\mu_{opt}$  causes greater variation in the performance than when the design parameter is set to  $\mu_{robust}$ .

The above example sets the objective of “achieving flexible solutions” and equates that with (type II) robust solutions. Flexibility is thus turned into a by-product of the robust design methodology. It is arguable however, whether such a discussion captures any distinctive feature of flexibility.

As discussed earlier, a comprehensive treatment of flexibility in system design should address the following questions:

1. What is flexibility?
2. Why or when is flexibility needed in system design?
3. How can we design for flexibility? What are the design principles for embedding flexibility in system design?
4. What are the trade-offs associated with designing for flexibility? What is the value of flexibility and what are the penalties (cost, performance, risk, etc.), if any, associated with it?

The literature of the different fields of inquiries mentioned above seldom addresses these questions holistically. Instead the focus is on one particular question at the detriment of the others, often the first and second question. The literature on Real Options is good example of this trend where the focus is primarily on capturing the *value* of flexibility. The following extract [8] is the opening paragraph of a reference text on the subject; it illustrates the emphasis of the subject

on the value of flexibility:

Flexibility has value. While this statement is obvious at the conceptual level, it is surprisingly subtle at the applied level. Professional managers have long intuited that [flexibility is an important element] in valuation and planning decisions. But precisely how valuable is flexibility and how can its value be quantified?

### 3. Discussions of flexibility: a selected literature review

This section briefly reviews the various definitions of flexibility provided by three distinct fields of investigations: Flexibility in manufacturing systems, flexibility in multidisciplinary design processes, and real options thinking and managerial flexibility.

#### 3.1. Flexibility in manufacturing systems

In the manufacturing community, different types of flexibility are defined based on the nature of *change* the production system can accommodate. The sheer amount of literature on flexible manufacturing systems (FMS) is daunting. A great number of topics are addressed ranging from the design of manufacturing cells and machine grouping, to the scheduling, loading, and control of FMS [5]. This section briefly reviews a handful of definitions among the numerous types of flexibility that are defined in this literature. *Volume flexibility* is defined as the ability of a production system to handle changes in daily or weekly volume of the same product, thus allowing the factory to operate profitably at varying overall production levels. *Product mix flexibility* is defined as the ability to manufacture a variety of products without major modification of existing facilities. *Routing flexibility* is defined as the ability to process a given set of parts on alternative machines. *Operation flexibility* is defined as the ability to interchange the ordering of operations on a given part, thus allowing the ease of scheduling of its production [9,10].

Flexibility in this environment is not only viewed as a reactive capability, it is also regarded as a competitive weapon which not only allows a company

to *respond* to change, but also to create change and set the market pace for rapid production and innovation [11].

Agility is another term related to the ability to respond to change. It was first introduced in manufacturing environments then broadened to encompass the extended enterprise. It is often loosely defined, and used to characterize different things in a business environment. For instance, in *Pathways to Agility*, Oleson [12] describes “agile strategic planning processes”, “agile automation”, and discusses the need for “agile business relationships” with suppliers and customers. He defines agility as the “ability to respond with ease to unexpected but anticipated events”. Similarly, Fricke et al. [13] define agility as the “property of a system to implement changes rapidly”, and flexibility as the “property of a system to be changed easily and without undesired effects.” “Agility” is thus used as a desired qualitative attribute for an enterprise to thrive in a hyper-competitive environment. It is difficult however to see how the definitions of flexibility and agility provided by Fricke et al. [13] differ or overlap, and to grasp the concrete content of “agility”.

### 3.2. Multidisciplinary design and flexibility in the design process

Current research has addressed the issue of *flexibility* in multidisciplinary design. The focus of those efforts has been on achieving “flexibility in the design process.” Typical approaches have consisted of incorporating designers’ preferences with degrees of satisfaction in specifying design requirements. Thurston [14] for example uses utility-theory-based *preference functions* to express designers’ preference over single or multiple attributes. Wallace et al. [15] define *specification functions* to indicate the subjective probability that performance levels are achieved. Mohandas and Sandgren [16] recommend the use of *fuzzy goals* to model the degree of satisfaction level.

These approaches, along with others such as the interval methods and probabilistic-based methods, were developed, according to Chen and Yuan [17], in response to the following concern: “How does one capture the uncertainty—which characterizes the early stages of design—and offers *flexibility* in specifying

the design requirements so that the designs that are marginally outside the precise level of performance are not worthless?”

Chen and Lewis [7] define their understanding of flexibility in the design process as follows:

Our aim is to provide flexibility in the design process and to help further resolve the conflicts and disputes of rationality between the interests of multiple disciplines. By flexibility we mean that instead of looking for a single point solution in one discipline’s model, we look for a range of solutions that involve information passing between multiple players (disciplines). With this flexibility, the design freedom of individual disciplines [...] could be significantly improved. Ultimately, this process will result in better products in less time because fewer iterations are needed.

Flexibility in the design process therefore entails expressing degrees of desirability in specifying design requirements. A recent report by the United States General Accounting Office on *Best Practices* in requirements specifications [18] echoes this description and emphasizes the need for a *flexible* behavior on behalf of the customers and developers in setting requirements:

Flexibility in setting requirements is key to closing gaps between customer expectations and developer resources. While knowledge is essential to identifying gaps between expectations and resources, it takes *flexibility* on part of both the customer and the product developer to close the gaps. Flexibility represents the customer’s ability and willingness to lower product expectations, coupled with the product developer’s willingness and ability to invest more resources to reduce technical risks and other gaps before program start [...]. In successful cases, requirements were flexible until the decision was made to commit to product development [...]. This made it acceptable to reduce, eliminate, or defer some customer wants so that the product’s requirements could be matched with the resources available to deliver the product within the desired cycle time.

### 3.3. Real options and managerial flexibility

Today's market require that important investment decisions be made in very uncertain environments, when the market size, the time to market, the cost of development, the competitors' moves, and so on simply are not known.

Managerial flexibility refers to the ability of management to affect the course of a project by acting in response to the resolution of market uncertainty over time. A flexible project may allow for downside protection against unfavorable market events, e.g., by abandoning the project, or introduce growth opportunities in the case of favorable conditions. Thus, managerial flexibility reduces a project's exposure to uncertainty while providing management with the ability to respond to unfolding events. This concept is introduced in the context of Decision Tree Analysis and Real Options thinking. It is used in making a persuasive case against traditional valuation tools for capturing the value of staged or contingent investments (option to initiate a project, option to expand, to wait-and-see, etc.). A growing body of literature exists that describes the shortcoming of Discounted Cash Flow tools such as the classical NPV or IRR, and proposes ways of applying "Option Thinking" to valuing managerial flexibility. The reader is referred to Amram and Kulatilaka [4], Faulkner [19], Triantis [20], or Trigeorgis and Mason [21], or for more elaborate discussions of option thinking and managerial flexibility.

On a parallel note, a plan of action is called rigid if it contains few contingent decisions, and flexible if it contains many such decisions. Plans made long in advance of the "action" are normally associated with rigidity, thus implying that to be flexible, one must be willing to wait and see, to defer decisions until one has taken into account the way a situation develops. Hence, flexibility in this context implies remaining uncommitted to the extent of allowing oneself some leeway to design ways of dealing with unforeseen events [22].

## 4. Flexibility of a design

A common theme across the previous discussions of flexibility is the ability to handle change. This

characterization of flexibility however is not sufficient to distinguish it from other properties such as robustness. The ambiguity arises from the ill-defined term "change". A clear definition of flexibility should provide the following information:

- A time reference associated with the occurrence of change, i.e., when is the "change" happening during the life cycle of the system.
- A characterization of what is changing, e.g., the system's environment, the system itself, or the customer's needs of the system.
- An indication for providing metrics of flexibility, or the ability to rank different designs according to their flexibility.

### 4.1. Time frame attached to a system's life cycle

A system's life cycle (Fig. 5) starts with the identification of customer's needs and proceeds towards the definition, design, production, operations, and disposal of a particular system. Prior to fielding, the process need not be sequential: Different development models exist, e.g., the waterfall model, the spiral model, that offer a particular perspective, insights, and solutions to product development lifecycle problems. Each model generally constraints the sequence in which work is performed starting when the product is conceptualized and ending when the product has satisfied the acceptance criteria [24].

In the particular case of a space system, the life cycle typically progresses through four phases [25]:

- Concept exploration, the initial study phase of a space mission which results in a broad definition of the space mission and its components.
- Detailed development, the formal design phase, which results in a detailed definition of the system components and, in larger programs, development of test hardware or software.
- Production and deployment, the construction of the ground and flight hardware and software and launch of the full constellation of satellites.
- Operations and support, the day-to-day operation of the space system, its maintenance and support, and finally its de-orbit or recovery at the end of the mission life.




Fig. 5. Example of a system life cycle. Adapted from [23].




Fig. 6. Above, NASA’s space program development phases and the associated “gates” or milestones of the program: MCR mission concept review, MDR mission design review, PDR preliminary design review, CDR critical design review, ORR operational readiness review, DR decommissioning review. Not all the program’s milestones are represented. Adapted from [25].

These phases are named differently depending on whether the sponsor is NASA or DoD or some other agency (Fig. 6).

The system’s life cycle provides an appropriate time reference for our purposes as described in Fig. 7.

Although the development process is rarely sequential, the program’s milestones, e.g., the preliminary design review and the critical design review (CDR), ensure that  $T_{prod}$  and  $T_{ops}$  are well defined in the case of space systems. Changes may occur any time.

Current research that have addressed the issue of achieving flexibility in the multidisciplinary design [7,17,26] have dealt with different ways of specifying requirements and handling their dynamics or changes occurring prior to  $T_{ops}$ . This was undertaken in order to resolve the conflicts of rationality between the interests of multiple disciplines involved in a common design endeavor. This is the time period—prior to  $T_{ops}$ —with which “flexibility in the design process” is concerned. Process flexibility include activities, methods and tools devised to mitigate the risks—cost, schedule, and performance—resulting from requirement changes occurring before fielding a system (see Fig. 7).

This is not the focus of this work. We will mainly be concerned with changes occurring after  $T_{ops}$ . But what are these changes about? Changes can occur in the system’s environment (political, cultural, organizational, physical, etc.), in the system itself (e.g., wear and tear), or in its requirements—capabilities and attributes—resulting from changing customer needs.

#### 4.2. Definition: flexibility of a design

We define flexibility of a design as the property of a system that allows it to respond to changes in its initial objectives and requirements—both in terms of capabilities and attributes—occurring after the system has been fielded, i.e., is in operation, in a timely and cost-effective way.

“Requirements”, “capabilities” and “attributes” are used in the sense defined by the IEEE Standard 1233, 1998 Edition:

A requirement is:

- (a) A condition or capability needed by a user to solve a problem or achieve an objective.




Fig. 7. Time frame attached to a system's life cycle, and time periods associated with process flexibility versus flexibility of a design.

- (b) A condition or capability that must be met or possessed by a system or system component to satisfy a contract, standard, specification, or other formally imposed document.
- (c) A documented representation of a condition or capability as in definition of (a) or (b).

Requirements can be taken from customer needs and can be derived from technical analysis.

*Capability (or functionality):* Capabilities are the fundamental requirements of the system and represent the features or functions of the system needed or desired by the customer. A capability should usually be stated in such a way that it describes what the system must do. The capability should be stated in a way that is solution independent.

This definition provides a mean for distinguishing between requirements as capabilities and the attributes of these requirements. The following examples illustrate this distinction:

1. *Requirement:* Move people from New York to California at a maximum speed of 5300 km/h [27].  
*Capability:* Move people between California and New York.  
*Attribute:* Cruising speed of 2500 km/h.  
*Constraint:* Maximum speed of 5300 km/h.

2. *Requirement:* The Mars Global Surveyor Spacecraft shall be capable of providing delta-V of 1290 m/s, inclusive of finite burn losses from thrust vector misalignment, gravity losses, and all other maneuver inefficiencies [28].  
*Capability:* Provide propulsive capability.  
*Attribute:* Delta-V = 1290 m/s.  
*Constraints:* Despite various losses (thrust vector misalignment, gravity, etc.).

A corollary of our definition of flexibility is that a flexible system can be modified in a timely and cost-effective way in order to satisfy different requirements at different points in time. These requirements, or requirement changes, as well as the time of occurrences of these changes, can be known or unknown a priori.

Examples of flexible designs will be discussed shortly after the concept of flexibility is disentangled from that of robustness and universality.

#### 4.3. On robustness: a brief survey of Robust Control and Robust Design

As stated previously, the distinction between the two concepts, robustness and flexibility, is a subject rich with ambiguity. Any attempt to define flexibility should address this issue. In order to discuss this

concern, the following paragraphs review the concept of robustness as devised in two major areas of engineering undertaking, namely in feedback control systems—Robust Control—and Robust Design, also known as Taguchi’s method. The purpose of this discussion is present a conceptual understanding of *robustness* of a design so that it forms a background against which the above definition of *flexibility* can be contrasted.

#### 4.3.1. Robust control

Controls engineers have developed a set of sophisticated mathematical tools to handle *disturbances* and *model uncertainty* in systems they wish to control. The main ingredients of present day robust control theory were already present in the classical work of Bode in 1945 [29]. The following discussion addresses some of the key ideas underlying Robust Control. The reader interested in the subject can review the work by Ackermann [30], Doyle et al. [31], Francis [32], or R. Sanchez-Pena et al. [29].

The goal of Robust Control and the essence of robustness—from a system’s control perspective—are clearly stated by Stefani et al. [33]:

The ultimate goal of a control-system designer is to build a system that will work in the real environment. Since the real environment may change with time—components may age or their parameters may vary with temperature or other environmental conditions—or the operating conditions may vary, load change, disturbances, the control system must be able to withstand these variations.

Assuming the environment does not change, the second fact of life is the issue of model uncertainty. A mathematical representation of a system often involves simplifying and sometimes wishful assumptions. Nonlinearities are either unknown, and hence unmodeled, or modeled and later ignored to simplify the analysis. Different components of systems—actuators, sensors, amplifiers, gears, belts—are sometimes modeled by constant gains, even though they may have dynamics and nonlinearities. Dynamic structures, e.g., aircrafts, satellites, missiles, have complicated dynamics in high frequencies, and these may initially be ignored. Since control systems are

typically designed using much-simplified models of systems, they may not work on the real plant in real environments. The particular property that a control system must possess in order for it to operate properly [ensure stability and achieve a set of pre-defined performance specifications] in realistic situations is called *robustness*.

The above are some of the key conceptual issues Robust Control deals with. Next, we examine some of the fundamentals of the Robust Design methodology. While these two fields—Robust Control and Robust Design—have rarely interacted, they have nevertheless manipulated similar concepts and dealt with comparable problems at some level of abstraction, even though their tools and their specific domain of applicability differ. The purpose of the following discussion is to extract the essence of robustness in the particular field of Robust Design.

#### 4.3.2. Robust design

Robust Design is a design methodology developed in order to make a product’s performance insensitive to raw material variation, manufacturing variability, and variations in the operating environment [34]. It was developed in the late 1950s by Genishi Tagushi [35] and builds upon ideas from statistical experimental design.

Robust products work well even when produced in real factories and used by real customers under real conditions of use. For instance when buying a car, a customer wants one that will start readily in northern Canada in the winter and not overheat in southern Arizona in the summer for example. In other words, he or she wants a car that is robust with respect to variations of use conditions. He or she also prefers a car that is as good at 50,000 miles as when new, that is robust against time and wear [34]. The sources of undesirable variation, also called noises in this framework, are the following:

- Variation in conditions of use.
- Deterioration or variation with time and use.
- Production or manufacturing variations.

These three types of noises cause degradation of performance or deviation away from ideal customer satisfaction. In this context, robustness is a characteristic of a system that minimizes these deviations,

keeping performance economically close to ideal customer satisfaction [36]. The *ideal quality* a customer can receive is that every product delivers the target performance each time the product is used, under all intended operating conditions, and throughout its intended lifetime [34]. Put differently, robustness is a characteristic of a system whose performance is least sensitive to variations in operating environment, variation in raw material, thus allowing the use of low-grade material and components, and variation in manufacturing, thus reducing labor and material cost for rework and scrap.

One of the goals of Robust Design is to exploit nonlinearities in the relation between a product quality characteristic and the various product parameters and noise factors in order to find a combination of product parameters values that gives the smallest variation in the value of the quality characteristic around the desired target value. This can be easily understood using the following mathematical formulation. Let  $\mathbf{x}=(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$  denote the noise factors and  $\mathbf{z}=(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_j)^T$  the product parameters—called controlling factors—whose values can be set by the designer, then if the quality characteristic of the product is given by

$$y = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}). \quad (1)$$

The deviation  $\Delta y$  of the quality characteristic from the target value caused by small deviations  $\Delta x_i$  of the noise factors from their nominal values can be approximated by the first terms of the Taylor series expansion of  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  around  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and  $\mathbf{z}_0$  where  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is the expected value of the noise factors and  $\mathbf{z}_0$  the unknown nominal settings of the product parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta y \cong & \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right) \Delta x_1 + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \right) \Delta x_2 + \dots \\ & + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right) \Delta x_n. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The partial derivatives are evaluated at  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and  $\mathbf{z}_0$ . The above notation for the sensitivity coefficient is shorthand for

$$\left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right) \equiv \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right)_{\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{z}_0}. \quad (3)$$

If the deviations in the noise factors are uncorrelated, the variance of quality characteristic can be

expressed in terms of the variances of the individual noise factors as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_y^2 = & \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right)^2 \sigma_{x_1}^2 + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \right)^2 \sigma_{x_2}^2 + \dots \\ & + \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right)^2 \sigma_{x_n}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Thus, the variance of the quality characteristic is the sum of the products of the variances of the noise factors times the sensitivity coefficients. The sensitivity coefficients are themselves function of the control factors as expressed in Eq. (3). As can be seen from Eq. (4), the variance of the quality characteristic can be minimized by either selecting the control factors  $\mathbf{z}_0$  such that the sensitivity coefficients are minimum, or by reducing the variances of some of the noise factors, typically the tolerances on system's components. The first action is referred to as *parameter design*; the second is called *tolerance design*. Fig. 8 illustrates the difference between achieving robustness via parameter design versus tolerance design.

The above plot shows that a reduction in the variation of the quality characteristic of a product can be achieved by appropriately setting the design parameter, or control factor, at a point where the sensitivity—defined in Eq. (3)—is small, e.g., choosing point B over point A. This is referred to as parameter design and does not affect the manufacturing cost of the component, as opposed to tolerance design that consists of reducing the tolerances on the design parameters, and is associated with more costly parts. From this perspective, it is clear that parameter design should be carried out prior to tolerance design in order to deliver robust products. This is a fundamental idea in Robust Design.

#### 4.3.3. Synthesizing a definition of robustness

From the previous discussion, we can synthesize a general definition of robustness as the property of a system which allows it to satisfy a *fixed* set of requirements, *despite* changes occurring after the system has entered service, in the environment or within the system itself, from the nominal or expected environment or the system design parameters.

For instance, in the case of Robust Design, the objective is to maintain a target performance despite the various noise factors such as the variations in the



for such a spacecraft design lifetime are the following:

1. Maintain on-board functionalities after launch, despite changes in software and hardware characteristics due to radiation impacts, malfunctions, aging, etc. This is indicative of the need for robustness of the design, i.e., robustness has to be built-in into the spacecraft.
2. Create new functionalities on-board for changes in requirements occurring after launch, as events unfold, new environments are explored, and/or new data becomes available, etc. Such changes are bound to happen given the extensive spacecraft design lifetime. This is indicative of the need for flexibility of the design, i.e., flexibility has to be embedded in the spacecraft.

#### 4.5. Distinction between universality and flexibility of a design

Another distinction can be made, based on the definition of flexibility provided above, between two concepts that are potentially to be confused with one another: That of flexibility versus universality of a design. A software for instance that can be used in a variety of situations *without change or modification*, is considered “universal” not flexible. *Flexible* software [37] is one that can be easily changed—extended, contracted, or else—in order to be used in a variety of ways. Similarly, spacecraft that carry multiple instruments and performs multiple missions simultaneously are NOT considered flexible according to the definition of flexibility provided above. Likewise, a design is considered flexible if it is *easily changeable* to be used in a variety of ways. The time and cost required to implement the changes are two indicators of the “ease of change” of a design and reflect its flexibility.

### 5. Examples: flexibility and product design lifetime

The following examples illustrate the relationship between flexibility and design lifetime. The first example contrasts the operational lifetime of the Boeing B-52 with that of the Convair B-58, and makes the case that the B-52 was a highly flexible design. The

second example discusses the need for flexibility in the rotorcraft industry, particularly in the light of the current restrictive military spending and the fact that helicopters are being designed for increasingly longer lifetimes. The third example argues that the Galileo spacecraft, by completing its initial objectives and performing a new or extended mission, constitutes an instance of flexibility in space systems.

#### 5.1. Designing for flexibility: the Boeing B-52 versus the Convair B-58

In order to illustrate the relationship between a product’s life span, the initial circumstances from which the system’s requirements were derived and the various environments in which it can operate, the Boeing B-52 Stratofortress is presented as an example of a flexible design, and is contrasted with the Convair B-58 Hustler. The purpose of this section is not to delve into the particular design practices that enabled the B-52 to remain in operation long after the B-58 was retired, but simply to illustrate the above-mentioned relationship.

The B-52 is a long-range, heavy bomber that can perform a variety of missions. It is capable of flying at high subsonic speeds (Mach 0.86) at altitudes up to 50,000 ft, and carry both conventional and nuclear ordnance. In a conventional conflict, the B-52 can perform a variety of missions such as air interdiction, offensive counter-air, or maritime operations. It is capable of dropping or launching the widest array of weapons in the US inventory including gravity bombs, cluster bombs, and guided missiles. The venerable aircraft has also been used to ferry both manned and unmanned systems for altitude drop and orbital insertion.

The B-52 first entered service in 1955 with the Strategic Air Command. The initial specifications were issued on November 23rd 1945. For the first 10 years of its Air Force service, it operated in a cold war atmosphere. Current engineering analysis shows the B-52 life span can be extended beyond the year 2045. Thus, it will be a “century” aircraft. It has assumed important conventional roles in Vietnam and the Gulf war. These are very different environments from which the initial system requirements were derived—different environments thus different threats, hence the need to alter the tactics in order

survive and prevail—no other weapons system offers the flexibility of the B-52. It is referred to as the bomber that “is not getting older, just getting better” because it was capable of accommodating numerous improvements over the years. Upgrades since the early 1980s have included many new and improved systems:

- Offensive avionics.
- Environmental control.
- Auto-pilot.
- Enhanced electronic countermeasures.
- Conventional air-launched cruise missile.

The Convair B-58 Hustler on the other hand, was the first supersonic bomber to enter service with the USAF in March 1960. Despite its high performance and sophisticated equipment, the service of the B-58 was brief; the aircraft flew for only a decade before being consigned to storage. Part of the reason for this rather short service was due to the aircraft’s rather high accident rate. Another factor was the intercontinental ballistic missile, which entered service at the same time as the B-58 and removed its primary mission. Of course, the same was true of the B-52 but it proved flexible enough to find widespread use in other mission areas. Aside from the technical problems that plagued the B-58, the aircraft in some sense lacked the flexibility of the B-52 to adapt to new missions and roles in new environments.

It is tempting at this point to probe the original requirements of both the B-52 and B-58, and to identify the particular design choices that rendered on one hand the B-52 a flexible design to remain in operation for almost a century, and on the other hand the B-58 a short-lived inflexible design. The study should investigate for example the impact of the requirement to fly at supersonic speeds for the B-58 on the wing design and the airframe, and how this choice, later during the operational life of the B-58, prevented it from accommodating different weapons and performing other missions than the one the it was initially designed for. This is however beyond the scope of this section. The purpose of this example, as stated above, is to illustrate the relationship between flexibility and product life-span, and not to delve into the particular design choices that render a product flexible.

## 5.2. *The need for flexibility in the rotorcraft industry*

Helicopters tend to have an operational life span exceeding 30 years. In many cases, this is long after the circumstances for the original requirements have been removed. Hence, the missions and roles of a rotorcraft are most likely to change over its life span. Also, the embedded technologies within the rotorcraft continue to evolve after the product has been fielded. Due to the high value of these already fielded products, there is a tendency among the operators to modify the fielded rotorcraft to adapt to new missions and roles as opposed procuring new ones. Furthermore, the current state military spending in the United States forces traditional military contractors to seek non-traditional business segments of the market. Therefore, fewer products have to be designed for an extended life span and with the ability to perform new and diverse missions. Rotorcrafts in particular have to be designed with the ability to be modified after entering service in order to perform new and emergent missions. In other words, flexibility has to be embedded in the initial design.

Consider for instance the Sikorsky medium lift helicopter S-70 or its UH-60 designation for its military role. The helicopter was developed in the early 1970s in response to the US Army rotary-winged aircraft program referred to as the Utility Tactical Transport Aircraft System (UTTAS). In short, the UTTAS program required a helicopter to perform multiple missions such as troop transport, air cavalry, and medical evacuation. The program also included standards for the helicopter’s combat survivability, reliability, maintainability, as well as adverse weather and nighttime operational capabilities. Designed as a military utility helicopter, the UH-60/S-70 has now over 35 derivatives performing a variety of missions, e.g., troop transport, cargo movement, medical evacuation, VIP transport, and has been sold in over 90 countries [38]. The need to access new markets, or to satisfy specific customers requirements, led to the development of these derivatives. However, it is the intrinsic ability of the UH-60/S-70 baseline architecture to accommodate changes following new customers requirements—in a timely and cost-effective way in order to achieve a different configuration vehicle—that made it possible to develop

these derivatives. Holmes [38] argues that the use of platform design for medium lift helicopters enabled the expansion of the mission roles and capabilities of the UH-60/S-70, thus provided the flexibility of its baseline architecture.

### 5.3. Galileo's mission to Jupiter and the Galileo Europa Mission (GEM) extension

The Galileo spacecraft is a NASA robotic mission to explore Jupiter. The spacecraft consisted of an orbiter and an atmospheric entry probe designed to enter Jupiter's atmosphere and provide a weather report on temperature, pressure, composition, wind, and lightning of Jupiter's atmosphere. The spacecraft was launched on-board the Space Shuttle Atlantis in 1989 and reached Jupiter in 1995.

The initial science objectives of the Galileo orbiter included the following:

- 1a. Investigating the circulation and dynamics of the Jovian atmosphere and ionosphere.
- 2a. Characterizing the vector magnetic field and the energy spectra, composition, and distribution of energetic particles and plasma to a distance of  $150R_J$ .
- 3a. Conducting long-term observation of its magnetosphere.
- 4a. Characterizing the morphology, geology, and physical state of the Galilean satellites.

On December 1997, Galileo successfully completed its original mission objectives: A 2-year study of the Jovian system. Since the resilient spacecraft was capable of much more, it was decided to extent the mission, now called the Galileo-Europa Mission (GEM), in order to study in detail Jupiter's icy moon Europa and its fiery moon Io. The new major science objectives of the GEM are the following:

- 1b. Europa: Study and characterize crust, atmosphere, and possible ocean (i.e., implication for exobiology) using imaging, gravity, and space physics data
- 2b. Io Plasma Taurus: Explore and map Io Plasma Taurus as orbit approaches Io.
- 3b. Io: Intensive study of Io's volcanic processes, atmosphere, and magnetosphere environment

The fact that the orbiter has completed its initial mission and performed a *new* or extended mission constitutes one instance of flexibility of a space system as defined above—ability to respond to changes in a system's initial objectives and requirements occurring after the system has been fielded. This flexibility was in part due to the various design margins that the orbiter had, e.g., its design lifetime exceeded the time required to complete its science objectives ( $\Delta V$  margin, etc.). Other instances of flexibility in space systems are discussed below.

## 6. Flexibility in the context of Distributed Satellite Systems (DSS) and TechSat21

Distributed space architectures, or the spreading of functionalities across multiple spacecraft, thus forming a virtual satellite, enable new missions to be performed, and often offer reduced cost or improved capabilities over monolithic designs. Martin and Stalard [39] discuss the application of DSS to synthesize a large space aperture:

Since the satellites are not connected by structures, they can be separated over very large baselines that could not be considered for monolithic apertures. This feature can be beneficial for such missions as space-based radar, or large apertures for detection of slow moving targets in clutter. [...] Another mission application [of DSS] is mobile jam resistant communications [...] or interferometric imaging...

The ability to reconfigure a cluster's geometry for instance allows modifying the revisit time (RT) requirement. This in one particular instance of flexibility—ability to respond to changes in the requirements occurring after the system has been fielded—that is characteristic of DSS and that is not feasible with a monolithic design. Furthermore, the ability to modify the RT on-orbit implies that it need not be specified prior to launch or further up-front in the development phase of the system.

The idea that critical system requirements need not be narrowly specified prior to launch, because changes can be accommodated afterwards, is one particular advantage of the property of flexibility in design. It

seems particularly important and valuable in defense oriented space systems for instance where the development times are of the order of 5–10 years, and changes are very likely to occur, as well as for systems that operate in uncertain environments.

TechSat21 is an Air Force Research Laboratory program designed to explore new technologies for lightweight and low-cost clusters of micro-satellites. One instance of flexibility of TechSat21, for example, results from the ability to modify of the cluster geometry in order to operate in a geo-location mode instead of the nominal Radar mode. This is illustrated in Fig. 10.

Fig. 11 illustrates two different types of flexibility associated with TechSat21: The first involves the ability of the system to change its mode of operation—in the parlance of the IEEE Standard 1233, this is relevant of the system's *capability*—whereas the second type involves the ability to modify the *attribute* of the requirement (tune-in performance).

## 7. Summary and conclusions

This paper reviewed the concept of flexibility as discussed in various fields of investigations and extracted its characteristics features. Flexibility of a design is here defined as the property of a system that allows it to respond to changes in its initial objectives and requirements—both in terms of capabilities and attributes—occurring after the system has been fielded, i.e., is in operation, in a timely and cost-effective way.

In order to discuss any subject matter clearly, it is necessary to begin with a clear set of definitions. Indeed much can be gained through careful and consistent definitions of terms alone. Flexibility however has been a word rich with ambiguity. The first section of this paper identified the various sources of ambiguity in discussions of issues of flexibility: These include the failure of the familiar characterization of flexibility—ability to handle change—to distinguish it from other properties, particularly in the light of the proliferation of its pseudo-synonyms. A selected literature review is then provided and a definition of flexibility is synthesized.

A brief literature review of Robust Control and robust Design is also presented. Robustness is de-

finied as the property of a system that allows it to satisfy a *fixed* set of requirements, *despite* changes occurring after the system has entered service, in the environment or within the system itself, from the nominal or expected environment or the system design parameters.

Robustness and flexibility are then contrasted, and a distinction is drawn as well between flexibility and universality of a design. Flexibility of a design is also disentangled from issues of flexibility in the design process: The latter include activities, methods, and tools devised to mitigate the risks—cost, schedule, and performance—resulting from requirement changes occurring during the design process, i.e., before fielding a system.

Several examples of flexible systems are finally discussed, and illustrate the relationship between flexibility and a system's design lifetime. The examples included the (accidentally) flexible B52—to remain in operation for almost a century—versus the short-lived inflexible B58, the Galileo spacecraft; its initial mission to Jupiter and its extended mission to Io and Europa (the Galileo Europa Mission), as well as instances of flexibility in the context of distributed satellite systems.

Aside from the particular points referred to above, this paper also laid a framework for a clear and comprehensive discussion of issues of flexibility: One may disagree with the particular definitions provided herein, that's fair. The reader is encouraged to create his or her own set of definitions but should make sure that they are unambiguous, self-consistent, and lead to useful concepts. However, a comprehensive treatment of flexibility in system design should address the following questions:

1. What is flexibility?
2. Why or when is flexibility needed in system design?
3. How can we design for flexibility? What are the design principles for embedding flexibility in system design?
4. What are the trade-offs associated with designing for flexibility? What is the value of flexibility and what are the penalties (cost, performance, risk, etc.), if any, associated with it?

This paper focused on the first question and extracted the characteristics features of flexibility.




Fig. 10. Reconfiguring the cluster geometry allows “other” missions to be performed. This is not feasible with a monolithic space system design.



Fig. 11. Two generic types of flexibility: The ability to modify the mode of operation of a system (dial-in mission), and the ability to modify the attribute of a requirement (tune-in performance).

The following questions will be addressed in subsequent papers.

**References**

[1] G. Terborgh, Dynamic Equipment Policy, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1949.

[2] R. McKinnon. The Concept of Flexibility and Urban Systems, Center of Urban Studies, University of Illinois, 1978.

[3] M.A. Fox, B.P. Yeh, Intelligent kinetic systems in architecture, in: *Managing Interactions in Smart Environments (MANSE)*, Springer, London, 1999.

[4] M. Amram, N. Kulatilaka, *Real Options: Managing Strategic Investments in an Uncertain World*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 1999.

[5] A. Raouf, M. Ben-Daya (Eds.), *Flexible Manufacturing Systems: Recent Developments*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.

[6] J.A. Highsmith III, *Adaptive Software Development: A Collaborative Approach To Managing Complex Systems*, Dorset House Publishing, New York, 1999.

[7] W. Chen, K. Lewis, Robust design approach for achieving flexibility in multidisciplinary design, *AIAA Journal* 37(8) (1999) 982–989.

[8] L. Trigeorgis, *Real Options: Managerial Flexibility and Strategy in Resource Allocation*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.

[9] F. Suarez, M. Cusumano, C. Fine, *Flexibility and Performance: A Literature Critique and Strategic Framework*, Sloan School WP 329891-BPS, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 1991.

[10] T. Taylor, *Evaluating and selecting manufacturing flexibility*, S.M. Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991.

[11] M. Piore, *Corporate reform in American manufacturing and the challenge to economic reform*, Mimeo, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1989.

[12] J. Oleson, *Pathways to Agility*, Wiley, New York, 1998.

[13] E. Fricke, A. Schulz, S. Wenzel, H. Negele, *Design for changeability of integrated systems within a hyper-competitive environment*, in: *INCOSE Colorado 2000 Conference*, Denver, March 2000.

[14] D.L. Thurston, A formal method for subjective design evaluation with multiple attributes, *Research in Engineering Design* 3 (1991) 105–122.

- [15] D.R. Wallace, M. Jakiela, W.C. Flowers, Design search under probabilistic specifications using genetic algorithms, *Computer-Aided Design* 28(5) (1996) 404–406.
- [16] S.U. Mohandas, E. Sandgren, Multiobjective optimization dealing with uncertainty, *Advances in Design Automation* 19-2 (1989) 241–248.
- [17] W. Chen, C. Yuan, A probabilistic-based design model for achieving flexibility in design, *Journal of Mechanical Design* 121 (1999) 77–83.
- [18] General Accounting Office. Best practices: better matching of needs and resources will lead to better weapon system outcomes, GAO-01-288, March 2001.
- [19] T. Faulkner, Applying options thinking to R& D valuation, *Research-Technology Management* 39(3) (1996) 50–56.
- [20] A.J. Triantis, J.E. Hodder, Valuing flexibility as a Complex Option, *Journal of Finance*, 45(2) (1990) 549–565.
- [21] L. Trigeorgis, J. Mason, Valuing managerial flexibility, *Midland Corporate Finance Journal* 5 (1987) 14–21.
- [22] A. Rappaport, *Two-Person Game Theory*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1969.
- [23] B.S. Blanchard, *System Engineering and Management*, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1998.
- [24] *Requirements Management Guidebook*, SWELT: RM0.3-9/30/96. Department of the Navy, Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington, VA 22243–5120.
- [25] J. Wertz, W. Larson (Eds.), *Space Mission Analysis and Design*, Microcosm Press and Kluwer Academic Publishers, Torrance, CA, 1999.
- [26] K. Lewis, F. Mistree, Modeling interactions in multidisciplinary design: a game theoretic approach, *AIAA Journal* 35(8) (1999) 1387–1392.
- [27] *IEEE Guide for Developing System Requirements Specifications*, 1998 Edition.
- [28] *Mars Global Surveyor: Spacecraft Requirements*, JPL D-11509, 1996.
- [29] R. Sanchez-Pena, M. Sznaier, *Robust Systems: Theory and Applications*, Wiley, New York, 1998.
- [30] J. Ackerman, *Robust Control: Systems with Uncertain Physical Parameters*, Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [31] J.C. Doyle, B. Francis, A. Tannenbaum, *Feedback Control Theory*, Maxwell/Macmillan, New York City, New York, 1992.
- [32] B. Francis, *A Course in  $H_\infty$  Control Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1987.
- [33] R.T. Stefani, C.J. Savant, B. Shahian, G.H. Hostetter, *Design of Feedback Control Systems*, Saunders College Publishing, Fort Worth, 1994.
- [34] M.S. Phadke, *Quality Engineering Using Robust Design*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989.
- [35] G. Taguchi, *Systems of Experimental Design* (English translation, edited by D. Clausing), UNIPUB/Kraus International Publications, New York, 1987.
- [36] D. Clausing, *Total Quality Development: A Stepby-Step Guide to World-Class Concurrent Engineering*, ASME Press, New York, 1994.
- [37] D. Parnas, Designing software for ease of extension and contraction, *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* SE-5 (1979) 128–138.
- [38] C. Holmes, Effective platform designs for medium lift helicopters, S.M. Thesis, *Systems Design and Management*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1999.
- [39] M. Martin, M. Stallard, *Distributed Satellite Missions and Technologies: The TechSat21 Program*, AIAA-99-4479. Space Technology Conference and Exposition, 28–30 September 1999, Albuquerque, New Mexico.