

A  
FRAMEWORK  
FOR  
COMPLEX  
SYSTEM  
DEVELOPMENT

Paul B. Adamsen II



CRC Press

Boca Raton London New York Washington, D.C.

## Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

---

Adamsen, Paul B.

A complex system design and management framework / Paul B. Adamsen, II.  
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8493-2296-0 (alk. paper)

1. Systems engineering.

2. Industrial management. I. Title.

TA168 .A28 2000

620'.001'171—dc21

99-086803

CIP

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reprinted material is quoted with permission, and sources are indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

Neither this book nor any part may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

The consent of CRC Press LLC does not extend to copying for general distribution, for promotion, for creating new works, or for resale. Specific permission must be obtained in writing from CRC Press LLC for such copying.

Direct all inquiries to CRC Press LLC, 2000 N.W. Corporate Blvd., Boca Raton, Florida 33431.

**Trademark Notice:** Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation, without intent to infringe.

---

© 2000 by Paul B. Adamsen II

No claim to original U.S. Government works

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-2296-0

Library of Congress Card Number 99-086803

Printed in the United States of America 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

Printed on acid-free paper

---

# *Abstract*

This book outlines a structured framework for complex system design and management. There have been and continue to be many efforts focused on defining the elusive generic System Engineering process. It is suggested that one reason why industry, government, and academic efforts have had limited success in defining a generalized process applicable to many contexts is that the time and logical domains have not been explicitly identified and characterized in distinction. When the logical view is combined with the chronological view, the resulting process often becomes application specific. When these are characterized in distinction, the overall framework is preserved. This book develops a generalized process that maintains this distinction and is thus applicable to many contexts.

The design and management of complex systems involves the execution of technical activities together with managerial activities. Because of the organic connection between these two sets of activities, they must be integrated in order to maximize the potential for success. This integration requires a clear definition of what the system development process is in terms of the technical activities and how they logically interact. In this book, this logical interaction has been defined and is called “control logic.” This “control logic” is then used to develop the logical connections and interactions between the managerial and technical activities.

---

# Preface

Several years ago, the author became involved in system engineering process development at General Electric Astro Space (now Lockheed Martin) for two compelling reasons. First, he had been leading a number of advanced spacecraft design studies for various space physics missions and was becoming increasingly frustrated at the lack of order in terms of the flow of activity and information. The work was getting done thanks to excellent subsystem engineers, but there was an appalling lack of order, even chaos to some degree. The author began to see the need to develop a more organized approach to complex system development. His opportunity came in the autumn of 1993 when Astro experienced an unprecedented string of spacecraft failures.

On Saturday, 21 August 1993, contact was lost with the Astro-built Mars Observer spacecraft, just three days before it was to enter orbit around the planet. To the author's knowledge, after intensive investigation, there has been no definitive determination as to the cause of failure. On that same Saturday, NOAA-13, a TIROS weather satellite launched just 12 days prior, experienced a total system failure — most likely the result of an oversize screw that eventually caused the entire electrical power system to fail. About 45 days after that, on 5 October 1993, there was a malfunction during the launch of the Landsat 6 satellite that caused the spacecraft to plunge into the ocean.

In the midst of these failures, Astro was competing for a major low earth orbit spacecraft contract. It was in this context that the opportunity came for the author to join that engineering team for the purpose of developing a sound system engineering approach for the program. He was tasked to develop a structured approach that avoided standard “boiler plate” and reflected how the system would actually be developed in the real world. That was exactly what he wanted to do as a personal goal and professional objective — the second compelling reason he became involved in system engineering process development.

After several months of research, trial-and-error, and prayer, the author developed a new system engineering process that was summarized in the paper, “A New Look at the System Engineering Process — A Detailed Algorithm.”<sup>1</sup> That process became the basis for the system engineering

<sup>1</sup> Adamsen, Paul B. Jr., A New Look at the System Engineering Process — A Detailed Algorithm, “Systems Engineering in the Global Market Place,” *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Symposium NCOSE*, Vol. 1, July 22-26, 1995, St. Louis, MO.

training course at Astro, which was taught to several hundred junior and senior engineers. It became the starting point for the author's thesis at MIT, and the seed from which this present work has grown.

This book is intended to provide a *framework* for the design and management of complex systems. It is a generalized *framework*, not an exhaustive exposition. The goal has been to distill the essential aspects of system design into a logical process that accurately reflects what should actually occur on a well-organized development program. This book is relatively brief and succinct, which will hopefully extend its usefulness to busy managers, engineers, and students.

### *Who should read this book?*

- System Engineering Managers
- System Engineers
- Engineers involved in complex system development
- Program Managers
- Senior Managers
- Government Procurement Managers
- Customers
- Proposal Managers
- Engineering Educators and Students
- Research and Development Managers

---

# Acknowledgments

I would like to express thanks to the various professors, administrators, and staff of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) System Design and Management (SDM) program for their dedication to the students and their hard work that made the program an enjoyable one. In particular, I would like to mention Dean Thomas L. Magnanti, co-founder of the SDM program, for his example of one who has accomplished much in this life and yet maintains a posture of genuine humility; Prof. Steven D. Eppinger, my thesis advisor, for his helpful comments and encouragement; Prof. John R. Williams for his enthusiasm and encouragement; and Dr. James M. Lyneis for his excellent course on System Dynamics that reshaped much of my thinking, and for his review of Chapter 4.

I would like to thank the following for their reviews of some or all of the manuscript in its various stages of development: Mr. Charles Benet for his review of the ADACS examples, Dr. Madhav S. Phadke for his review of the appendix dealing with Robust Design and QFD, Mr. Louis C. Dollive, Mr. Robert M. Kubow (my father-in-law), Mr. Glenn Davis, Mr. David J. Bean and Mr. John Petheram.

I would like to thank Mr. Henry J. Driesse, Mr. Frank Sweeney, Mr. Alan S. Kaufman, Mr. George Scherer, Mr. John R. Zaccaria, and Mr. Charles L. Kohler for their support at ITT. I would like to thank Mr. Mark Crawley, Mr. John Petheram, Mr. Paul Shattuck, and Mr. Richard Kocinski for their support and encouragement during my employment at Lockheed Martin. Thanks also to Mr. Michael Menzel, who first suggested to me that functional decomposition is dependent upon an assumed concept, and to Mr. Paul Gillet for his input regarding the verification activity.

I would like to express thanks to my church family at Trinity Baptist Church: Pastor Albert N. Martin for his godly example that I long to imitate; Pastor Barton Carlson for his friendship and godly example; Pastors Jeff Smith, Frank Barker, and Lamar Martin for their faithfulness and steadfastness; Miss Elaine Hiller for her many prayers for me and my family; and to the many other members who have upheld us in their prayers.

I would also like to thank my family: Mr. and Mrs. Paul B. Adamsen, Sr., my mom and dad, for their prayers, encouragement, and love; Mr. and Mrs. Robert M. Kubow, my mother- and father-in-law, for their many acts of kindness and generosity to my children, my wife, and to me; my children

— Paul, David, and Lauren — for their prayers, patience, and love; and my beloved wife, Karen, for her prayers, support, patience, friendship, and love.

Finally, I would like to express thanks to my Lord Jesus Christ, who, in answer to my prayers and the prayers of many of God's people, has given me a measure of understanding in the area of complex system development. *Soli Deo Gloria.*\*

\* The views expressed are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff or management of CRC Press LLC.

# *Dedication*

---

*This book is dedicated to my beloved wife and best friend, Karen  
and to my children  
Paul, David, and Lauren*



---

# Contents

## Preface

### Chapter 1 Introduction

- I. Is a Structured Approach Needed?
- II. Technical and Managerial — Integration is Essential
- III. Motivation
- IV. Objectives
- V. Key Questions
- VI. “System” Defined in the Literature
- VII. Working Definition of “System”

### Chapter 2 Literature Search and Rationale for this Book

- I. Existing and Emerging Standards
- II. Individual Works
- III. The Basic Building Block
- IV. Unique Features of this Book
  - A. Time and Logical Domains
  - B. Tier Connectivity
  - C. Modularity
  - D. Coupling of Technical and Managerial Activities
  - E. Clear Presentation of Functional Decomposition
  - F. Explicit Inclusion of the Rework Cycle
  - G. Explicitly Defined Generalized Outputs

### Chapter 3 System Development Framework (SDF) Overview

- I. Two Views Needed For an Accurate Model
  - A. Rationale
  - B. An Illustration
- II. Time and Logical Domain Views Provide a Full Program Description
  - A. Time Domain Focus: Inputs and Outputs
  - B. Logical Domain Focus: Energy Expenditure
- III. The SDF in the Logical Domain
  - A. Control Logic
  - B. Hierarchy

- C. Modularity
- D. Closed Loop
- E. Traceability
- F. Comprehensiveness
- G. Convergence
- H. Risk
- IV. The SDF in the Time Domain
  - A. Incremental Solidification
  - B. Risk Tolerance Defines Scope
  - C. Time-Phased Outputs
- V. System Life Cycle

## **Chapter 4 The Rework Cycle**

- I. What Is The Rework Cycle?
- II. A Simple System Dynamics Model
- III. Rework Mitigation

## **Chapter 5 System Development Framework — Technical**

- I. Develop Requirements — Determine “What” the System Must Do
  - A. Inputs
  - B. Work Generation Activities
    - 1. Derive Context Requirements
    - 2. Generate Functional Description
    - 3. Digression: Why Functional Analysis?
  - C. Rework Discovery Activities
    - 1. Analyze Requirements
    - 2. Analyze Functional Description
- II. Synthesis
  - A. Work Generation Activities: Design and Integration
    - 1. Design
    - 2. Analysis
    - 3. Allocation
    - 4. Functional Decomposition
    - 5. Inter-Level Interface
    - 6. Integration
  - B. Rework Discovery Activities: Design Verification
    - 1. Analysis and Test
    - 2. Producibility, Testability, and Other Specialty Engineering Activities
- III. Trade Analysis
- IV. Optimization and Tailorability
  - A. Optimization
  - B. Tailorability
- V. The Integrated System Development Framework

## **Chapter 6 The System Development Framework — Managerial**

- I. Integrating Technical and Managerial Activities
- II. Developing the Program Structure
- III. Interaction in the Logical Domain
- IV. Interaction in the Time Domain
- V. A Note on Complexity
- VI. Major Milestone Reviews
- VII. What About Metrics?

## **Chapter 7 A Potpourri of SDF-Derived Principles**

- I. General
- II. Risk
- III. Functional Analysis
- IV. Allocation
- V. Process
- VI. Iteration
- VII. Reviews
- VIII. Metrics
- IX. Twenty “Cs” to Consider
- X. Suggestions for Implementation In Industry

## **Appendix A Small Product Development and the SDF**

## **Appendix B Tailored Documentation Worksheet**

## **Appendix C SDF-Derived Major Milestone Review Criteria**

## **Appendix D A SDF-Derived Curriculum**

## **Appendix E Mapping EQFD and Robust Design into the SDF**

## **Appendix F A Simple System Dynamics Model of the SDF**

## **Appendix G SDF Presentation Slides**

## **Bibliography**

---

# *Tables and Figures*

## **Tables**

<a href="#">Table 2.1</a>	Civilian and Military Systems Engineering Standards
<a href="#">Table 2.2</a>	Individual Works
<a href="#">Table 4.1</a>	Focus of SDF Activities Defined in Adamsen (1995)
<a href="#">Table 5.1</a>	ESAT Customer-Imposed Requirements Set

## **Figures**

<a href="#">Figure 2.1</a>	System Design Framework (SDF) Organizing Concept
<a href="#">Figure 2.2</a>	The SDF Basic Building Block
<a href="#">Figure 3.1</a>	Time and Logical Domain Coupling
<a href="#">Figure 3.2</a>	The SDF Logical View
<a href="#">Figure 3.3</a>	The SDF in the Time Domain
<a href="#">Figure 3.4</a>	Full System Life Cycle
<a href="#">Figure 4.1</a>	The Rework Cycle
<a href="#">Figure 4.2</a>	The Rework Cycle in Multiple Phases
<a href="#">Figure 4.3</a>	Dynamics of Quality over Time
<a href="#">Figure 4.4</a>	Rework Growth as a Function of Number of Phases (Quality = 50%)
<a href="#">Figure 4.5</a>	Rework Growth as a Function of Number of Phases (Quality = 70%)
<a href="#">Figure 4.6</a>	Rework Growth as a Function of Number of Phases (Quality = 90%)
<a href="#">Figure 4.7</a>	Cumulative Rework Generated as a Function of Quality Level
<a href="#">Figure 4.8</a>	Rework Generated as a Function of Rework Discovery Effort — Quality = 90%
<a href="#">Figure 4.9</a>	Rework Generated as a Function of Rework Discovery Effort — Quality = 70%
<a href="#">Figure 4.10</a>	Rework Generated as a Function of Rework Discovery Effort — Quality = 50%

- Figure 5.1 “Develop Requirements” in the System Hierarchy
- Figure 5.2 The “Develop Requirements” Activity Decomposed
- Figure 5.3 Requirements Relationships
- Figure 5.4 “Develop Requirements” Work Generation Activities
- Figure 5.5 ESAT Mission/Context Definition
- Figure 5.6 Mapping Selected Implementation to Functions
- Figure 5.7 The  $N^2$  Diagram
- Figure 5.8 ESAT System-level Functional Block Diagram — Orbit Acquisition Phase
- Figure 5.9 Operations Phase
- Figure 5.10 “Perform Satellite Operations” Function Decomposition
- Figure 5.11 Support Payload Operations Decomposition
- Figure 5.12 Decomposition Continuity
- Figure 5.13 “Develop Requirements” Rework Discovery Activities
- Figure 5.14 The “Synthesize” Activity in the System Hierarchy
- Figure 5.15 The “Synthesize” Activity Decomposed
- Figure 5.16 The “Synthesize” Work Generation Activities
- Figure 5.17 Interfaces — Launch and Orbit Acquisition Phase
- Figure 5.18 The Environmental Research Satellite
- Figure 5.19 The GEOSAT Spacecraft
- Figure 5.20 The Defense Support Program (DSP) Spacecraft
- Figure 5.21 TIROS II Spacecraft
- Figure 5.22 Tracking and Data Relay Satellite (TDRS)
- Figure 5.23 The Compton Gamma Ray Observatory (CGRO)
- Figure 5.24 Hubble Space Telescope (HST)
- Figure 5.25 The “Analyze” and “Allocate” Activities
- Figure 5.26 Notional Convergence of Margin and Reduction in Uncertainty
- Figure 5.27 Allocation of Functionality to Implementation
- Figure 5.28 Allocation of Technical Budgets
- Figure 5.29 The Decompose Activity
- Figure 5.30 Functional Decomposition Methodology
- Figure 5.31 The “How” and “What” Relationship
- Figure 5.32 Second Level Decomposition
- Figure 5.33 “Control Attitude” Function Decomposed
- Figure 5.34 “Determine Attitude” Function Decomposed
- Figure 5.35 “Maintain Attitude” Function Decomposed
- Figure 5.36 The “Integrate and Plan Verification” Activity
- Figure 5.37 Integrated Spacecraft System: A Notional System Block Diagram
- Figure 5.38 The “Synthesize” Rework Discovery Activities
- Figure 5.39 The “Do Trades” Activity
- Figure 5.40 The Classic Trade-Off
- Figure 5.41 ADACS Candidate Architectures
- Figure 5.42 The System Development Framework (SDF), Second Level Decomposition
- Figure 5.43 SDF Decomposition Consistency

Figure 6.1	Technical and Managerial Activities
Figure 6.2	The Design Structure Matrix (DSM)
Figure 6.3	Program Structure Development
Figure 6.4	Program Team Interactions
Figure 6.5	Time Domain View
Figure 6.6	Exponential Growth in Complexity
Figure 6.7	Complexity Growth
Figure A1	Ulrich and Eppinger's Front-End Process
Figure A2	Mapping PDP to SDF in Logical Domain
Figure A3	Ulrich and Eppinger's Product Development Process (PDP)
Figure A4	Mapping PDP to SDF in Time Domain
Figure B1	Tailored Documentation Worksheet
Figure F1	Requirements Development Phase
Figure F2	Synthesis Phase
Figure F3	Subsystem Phase

---

# *Acronym List*

ADACS	attitude determination and control system
AKM	apogee kick motor
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Arcmin	arcminute
Arcsec	arcsecond
CAD	computer aided design
CAE	computer aided engineering
CAM	computer aided manufacturing
CCB	configuration control board
C&DH	command and data handling system
CGRO	Compton Gamma Ray Observatory
CMND	command
DP	design parameter
DOD	Department of Defense
DSM	design structure matrix
DSP	defense support program
DSMC	Defense Systems Management College
EIA/IS	Electronic Industries Alliance/Interim Standard
EMC	electro magnetic compatibility
EMI	electro magnetic impulse
EPS	electrical power system
EQFD	enhanced quality function deployment
ERS	earth research satellite
ESAT	example satellite
ETM	engineering test model
FAT	fabrication, assembly, and test
FDIR	failure detection isolation and recovery
FMECA	failure modes effects and criticality analysis
FR	functional requirement
FSS	fine sun sensor

GEOSAT	Geodetic satellite
H/W	hardware
HST	Hubble Space Telescope
Hz	hertz
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
INCOSE	International Council on Systems Engineering
ICD	interface control document
I&T	integration and test
I/F	interface
I/O	input/output
IMU	inertial measurement unit
Kbps	kilobit per second
Km	kilometer
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NOCSE	National Council on Systems Engineering
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OBC	on-board computer
OP'S	operations
PDP	product development process
P/L	payload
PRS	propulsion system
QFD	quality function deployment
R&D	research and development
RD	requirements development
RF	radio frequency
RQMT	requirement
RW	rework
RWA	reaction wheel assembly
S/C	spacecraft
SDF	system development framework
SMS	structure and mechanism system
SS	subsystem
S/W	software
TBD	to be determined



TBR	to be reviewed
TBS	to be supplied
TCS	thermal control system
TDRS	tracking and data relay satellite
TDRSS	tracking and data relay satellite system (includes ground terminals)
TDW	tailored document worksheet
TIROS	television infrared observation satellite
TLM	telemetry
TPM	technical performance measure
TSE	total system elements