

Accelerated Insertion of Materials - Composites



Presented at Mil-Hdbk-17 Forum

by Tony Caiazzo

Materials Sciences Corporation

215-542-8400, ext 331

tony@materials-sciences.com

26 February 2003

Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE FEB 2003		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Accelerated Insertion of Materials Composites				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Materials Sciences Corporation				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 24	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



Acknowledgements

Jointly accomplished by a BOEING Led Team and the U.S. Government under the guidance of NAST

Work funded by DARPA/DSO and administered by NAST through TIA N00421-01-3-0098

Acknowledge the support of Dr. Steve Wax and Dr. Leo Christodoulou of DARPA/DSO

Also:

Gail Hahn (PM), Charley Saff (DPM), & Karl Nelson (DPM) – Boeing Phantom Works

AIM-C Team - Boeing (St. Louis, Seattle, Canoga Park, Philadelphia), Northrop Grumman, Materials Sciences Corporation, Convergent Manufacturing Technologies, Cytec Fiberite, Inc, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford & NASA (Langley)



AIM-C Alignment Tool



The objective of the AIM-C Program is to provide concepts, an approach, and tools that can accelerate the insertion of composite materials into DoD products

AIM-C Will Accomplish This Three Ways

Methodology - *We will evaluate the historical roadblocks to effective implementation of composites and offer a process or protocol to eliminate these roadblocks and a strategy to expand the use of the systems and processes developed.*

Product Development - *We will develop a software tool, resident and accessible through the Internet that will allow rapid evaluation of composite materials for various applications.*

Demonstration/Validation - *We will provide a mechanism for acceptance by primary users of the system and validation by those responsible for certification of the applications in which the new materials may be used.*




Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited






AIM-C System Vision






AIM Methodology Becomes a Requirements Flow Down and a Completion Roll Up



AIM-C Transition Plan



Customer Team – To ensure that the product meets the needs of the funding agents

Design Team – To ensure acceptance among users in industry

Certification Team – To ensure acceptance among the certification agents for structures

Implementation Team – To ensure acceptance among the user community

“Commercialization” Team – To ensure support of users

• Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited



AIM-C Certification Team



Agency	Integration	Structures	Materials	Producibility
Boeing	Charley Saff	Eric Cregger	Pete George	John Griffith
Navy	Don Polakovics	Dave Barrett	Kathy Nesmith	Steve Claus
Air Force	Tim Jennewine	Dick Holzwarth	Katie Thorp	Bob Reifenberg
FAA	Curt Davies	Larry Ilcewicz	David Swartz	Dave Ostrodka
Army	Mark Smith	Jon Schuck	Marc Portanova	Steve Smith
NASA	Mark Shuart	Jim Starnes	Tom Gates	Tom Freeman

To Insure That the Methodology, Verification, and System Validation We Do Satisfies Certifying Agencies



AIM-C Main Menu



Alpha Minus Version [Help](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Setup DKB](#)
 - [Applic](#)
 - [Certifi](#)
- [Sign Off Requirement](#)
- [Edit DKB \(TRL Chart\)](#)
 - [Applic](#)
 - [Certifi](#)
 - [Desig](#)
 - [Asses](#)
 - [Struct](#)
 - [Mater](#)
 - [Fabric](#)
 - [Cost](#)
 - [Supp](#)
 - [Intelle Rights](#)
 - [TRL](#)
 - [Sched](#)
 - [Legal](#)
 - [Legac Inform](#)
 - [Additi Input](#)
 - [Demo 1](#)
 - [Comp Mesh](#)

Designer's Knowledge Base

Coefficient of Thermal Expansion

Thermal Expansion Properties are Reported as a Function of the State Properties Degree of Cure, Temperature, and Moisture Content

Resin

Fiber

State Variables

Degree of Cure

Temperature

Moisture Content

Layup Definition

Calculation Method

Export to CSV

Link to Model


1. Hexcel IM7
2. Hexcel AS4

1. 0/90, +/-0
2. Carpet Plot
3. Unidirectional
4. Custom Defined

1. CAT (Linked Modules)
2. From Data Base



Property To Display

1. Alpha x vs. Layup
2. Alpha y vs. Layup
3. Alpha z vs. Layup
4. Alpha x vs. T at a Given Theta
5. Alpha y vs. T at a Given Theta
6. Alpha z vs. T at a Given Theta





Robust Design Computational System



RDCS Edge of Flange Disbond Study

The Problem

Application Objective


- Investigate the effect of skin-stringer panel geometric parameters on maximum moment at the flange and margin of safety for stringer pull-off
- To aid in the selection of appropriate stiffener geometry and spacing

High Level Description

- **Design variables:** Skin Thickness, Flange Thickness, Stiffener Height, Total Flange Width
- **Response Variables:** Maximum Flange Moment, Pull-off Margin
- **Solvers/Methods:** RDCS, ANSYS/LEFM

Solution Scope

- **RDCS:** Sensitivity analysis, Factorial Design Space Explorations
- **ANSYS:** Static non-linear large deflection analysis
- **Solution Cases:** 81 Large Scale FEM Solutions



RDCS Application Benefits

- **Rapid factorial design calculations for external ANOVA study and response surface with significant cycle time reduction**
- **ANOVA helps identify critical factors and interactions**
- **Accurate surrogate response surface model helps simplify the design process**




• Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited






RDCS Edge of Flange Disbond Study

The Problem



Internal Pressure (or postbuckling) create large pillowing deflections between stringers




These deflections create high moments at the skin-to-stringer bondline. The loads don't vary tremendously along the length – can be analyzed as a 2D problem using the maximum loads (conservative)



RDCS Edge of Flange Disbond Study

ANOVA Results




The major influences are skin thickness, flange width, flange thickness, and their interactions



RDCS Edge of Flange Disbond Study

Interaction Results




- Best edge-of-flange peel margin of safety is when skin is thick and flange is thin
- Flange width has a much greater effect on the margin when skins are thick. The effect is highly nonlinear.



Schematic of Design/Analysis Framework


Long term Strategy





The Oculus Integration System

CO™: A Plug & Play Modeling Environment



- **Integrates Data and Software Applications on-the-fly**
 - Drag & Drop, Plug & Play
 - Simple to create, modify, manage, maintain
- **Enables Real-time data sharing between applications**
 - Secure
 - Controlled
 - Intra/Internet
- **Platform Independent**
 - Distributed
 - Neutral to Platforms and Applications
- **Increases Value of Previous Investments**
 - Software
 - Hardware
 - Networks



Oculus Models

Currently 3 models on MSC's Engine

Functional modules within the Open Hole model



Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited





Oculus Dashboards

Problem Definition - CO

File Edit View Module Navigate Bookmarks Manage Window Help

Home://207.106.229.67:3663/AIM (Structures Module)/Oper

Problem Definition Public

Lamina method 1 unitless

Operating Temp 70 degree fahrenheit z offset 0.000E0

Number of plies 8 unitless

	0	1	2
0	1	0.008	45
1	1	0.008	0.000E0
2	1	0.008	-45
3	1	0.008	90
4	1	0.008	90
5	1	0.008	-45
6	1	0.008	0.000E0
7	1	0.008	90

Layup Info {Material ID (1), Thickn

of Load Sets 3 unitless

	0	1	2	3	4
0	0.125	640	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.160
1	0.125	640	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.160
2	0.125	640	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.160
3	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.000E0	0.000E0

Open Hole Info

Run

Hashin Failure Criteria - CO

File Edit View Module Navigate Bookmarks Manage Window Help

3663/AIM (Structures Module)/Open Hole?Dashboards/Ha

Hashin Failure Criteria Public

Theta = 0 degrees

failedPlyMatrix1	1	unitless	loadFactorMatrix1	44.857 unitless
failedPlyFirstFiber1	4	unitless	loadFactorFirstFiber1	32.560 unitless
failedPlyLastFiber1	7	unitless	loadFactorLastFiber1	104.658 unitless

Theta = 45 degrees

failedPlyMatrix2	4	unitless	loadFactorMatrix2	7.459 unitless
failedPlyFirstFiber2	3	unitless	loadFactorFirstFiber2	9.915 unitless
failedPlyLastFiber2	1	unitless	loadFactorLastFiber2	1066.754 unitless

Theta = 90 degrees

failedPlyMatrix3	4	unitless	loadFactorMatrix3	4.490 unitless
failedPlyFirstFiber3	1	unitless	loadFactorFirstFiber3	7.378 unitless
failedPlyLastFiber3	8	unitless	loadFactorLastFiber3	88.083 unitless

Output dashboard:
Hashin failure info for
OHT



Structures - Hat Stiffened Panel (HSP)

Design/Analysis Procedure

- HSP is a large-scale, complex, detailed design problem
Draw on multiple AIM-C modules.
- Accurate results require very fine grid mesh or small element sizes
Problem is too large in scale to model with one finite element
Thus, a combination of global and local models will be used.
- Submodeling or local modeling capture design details and mfg. defects
Submodels are finely meshed cutouts of the global model.
Global Model results feed the submodels






Parametric Global Structures Module

What do you gain from the Global Models?

- Accurate Load Distribution – Failures depend on correct local loads
- Identification of Local Model Requirements
- Easy assessment of Multiple Load Cases
- Rapid Design Iteration – Ability to perform quick geometry trades
- Assessment of Global Failure Modes – Stability, Deflection

How do they work? Demonstration using a simple one-bay hat model in ANSYS

- Model and run a baseline...Hat under pressure (Linear)






Parametric Global Structures Module Demonstration

Global and Local Failure Modes


Another load case...Hat under in-plane shear ($2500\mu\epsilon$)
(Nonlinear Large Deflection Solution)



Local Bondline
Failure at Noodle
Or Edge-of-Flange?

Radius Bending or
Bow Wave Defect
Failure?

OHC Strain
Exceeded?



- Not buckled yet, but significant bending due to the eccentricity of the stiffener is beginning to form the first buckling mode shape. Max deflection is 0.034". Okay for Aero?

- Identify local model requirements.



Local Models


Design Details

Local Models are used to perform detailed analysis in an area of interest, usually
A potential failure location – often an area of high loading near a structural discontinuity


Two kinds of Local Models:

1. Design Details – a designed-in structural feature (e.g., Open Hole, Edge of Flange)
2. Mfg. Defect – an undesired “feature” produced as a side-effect of the manufacturing process (e.g., waviness, delamination, porosity)



Local Models for Design Details:



“Noodle” Models



Open Hole Models



Edge-of-Flange Models




Bow Wave Defect Analysis Using SUBLAM Linked to RDCS

- SUBLAM was incorporated into RDCS to demonstrate the concept of creating a suite of “defect analysis handbooks” to be inserted in the AIM-C CAT.
- Full factorial design space scans were conducted to compute the sensitivity of local stresses and energy release rates under tensile and compressive loads to four geometric variables.



Variable		Lower Limit	Center Value	Upper Limit
u	Resin pool length	0.05"	0.175"	0.3"
v	Bow-wave length	0.05"	0.125"	0.2"
w	Adhesive thickness	0.0005"	0.00325"	0.006"
x	Resin pool height	0.0005"	0.01425"	0.028"







Bow Wave Defect Analysis – Sample Results

- Peel and shear stresses driven by adhesive thickness and resin pool length.
- Relative contributions depend only slightly on whether load is tensile or compressive.
- Some significant two-way interactions for shear stress, viz., resin pool length and height.
- Bow wave length not a big driver for range studied.

Peel Stress Tension L




Peel Stress Compression L




Peel Stress

Shear Stress Tension L



Shear Stress Compression L



Shear Stress




Bow Wave Defect Analysis – Sample Results


- Contributions to ERR (G) strongly dependent on whether load is tensile or compressive and initial crack (defect) size.

Design Point Set: Tension_short_crack


Contour Variable: G



G (in-lbs/in²) for tensile load as a function of initial defect size and adhesive thickness.



Tension



Compression