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MBSE Pillars

- SE Fundamentals
- MBSE Tools
- MBSE Language
You must understand the fundamentals of Systems Engineering to solve complex problems.
You must have access to and understand how to use one or more MBSE tools ex: OpenMBEE (commercial & custom developed tools)
You must understand one or more MBSE languages ex: SysML
• Large telescope projects are no different than other complex systems of systems...

• We still need to apply core SE processes
• Difference: formal Systems Engineering, i.e. MBSE, is historically unfamiliar
MBSE Challenges

- SE concepts are subtle and obscure
  - Broad scope
  - More than one solution
  - More than one approach
  - Balancing act: cost, schedule, performance

- Expressing concepts in a model demands the use of refined tools/language which are both flexible and useful
  - Flexibility in tools/language demands rigor from the modeler (SE)

- Learning curve, time commitment, and managerial buy-in

- Limited (but growing!) resources for learning MBSE with SysML

- Need to move toward a dominant standard for communicating SE ideas \(\rightarrow\) SysML
MBSE with SysML

- Enables rigorous system analysis
  - Decomposition of system components to understand interactions necessary to meet objectives under defined constraints
- Multi-scale integration (software, hardware, data, people, processes)
  - Notations and processes to communicate simplified vision while allowing drill-down for exploration
  - Multiple views for separation of concerns
  - Traceability through system hierarchy
  - Facilitates impact analysis of design changes
- Enhances SE objectives to specify, analyze, design, verify, and validate systems
- Standardized integrated SysML model > non-standardized communication in disjoint sets of documents and diagrams
- Modeling $\rightarrow$ optimization
Why MBSE?

- Emphasizes rigor and precision, best practices
- Helps manage complexity
- Horizontal (life cycle) and vertical (multiple domain) integration

TMT SysML model

- Created to better understand and communicate complex system behavior
- Executable SysML model to capture requirements, use cases, system decomposition, subsystem relationships
- Analyze system design against power, mass, duration requirements
- Produce engineering documents (ICDs, etc.)
- Use standard language and techniques (communication)
MBSE: TMT Application

- TMT SysML Model does not model the entire telescope
- Main objective is to model operational scenarios and demonstrate that requirements are satisfied by the design
- Motivator for TMT MBSE = optimization
- Ex: JPL modeling of APS subsystem
  - Use Case: Post segment-exchange alignment, 2h requirement
  - Component characteristics (power, mass)
  - Relationships (TCS, M1CS)
- Ex: Monte Carlo simulations for acquisition and slew time
  - To minimize loss of observing time, TMT should be able to move from one target to another and acquire it in 3 min or less
First generation challenge team (SE$^2$) was a collaboration between European Southern Observatory (ESO) and German Chapter of INCOSE (GfSE), est. 2007

Active Phasing Experiment (APE) case study

Next generation challenge team (SE$^3$)
  - Updated MBSE Wiki Page
  - Building on work from SE$^2$ to refurbish first revision of SE Cookbook
  - Add TMT experiences

Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) case study
Challenge Team Goals

- Demonstrate benefits of MBSE with SysML as the basis for integrated engineering and management of complex systems
  - Optimization, standardization, automation
  - Better system understanding through simulations and analyses
  - Early efforts go a long way (reduced risk/cost, expand knowledge)

- New revision of SE Cookbook for MBSE with SysML
  - Best practices to support common SE tasks
  - Patterns and practices for model construction
  - Express system concepts to diverse stakeholders

- SEBOK TMT Case Study for Fall 2017 publication

- Ongoing collaboration in telescope community
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