

**AN INTERACTIVE MODELING ENVIRONMENT
FOR AUTOMOTIVE EXTERIOR DESIGN**

By

Yi Ren

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate
Faculty of University of Michigan
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING
Major Subject: MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Approved:

Professor Panos. Y. Papalambros, Thesis Adviser

Professor Noboru Kikuchi, Committee Member

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

March 2009
(For Graduation April 2009)

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ix
ABSTRACT	x
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Motivation	1
1.2 Research objective and contributions	6
1.3 Thesis outline	8
2. Background	9
2.1 Geometric modeling	9
2.1.1 Parametric modeling	9
2.1.2 Application of parametric modeling	11
2.1.3 What is still needed	12
2.2 Interactive genetic algorithm	12
2.2.1 IGA flow	13
2.2.2 IGA issues	14
2.2.3 What is still needed	15
2.3 Data analysis methods	16
2.3.1 Principal component analysis	16
2.3.2 Multidimensional scaling	16
2.4 Development environment	18
2.4.1 Review of existing modeling tools	19
2.4.2 Commercial software packages	19
2.4.3 Open source software	20
2.4.4 Web3D application	20
2.4.5 Introduction to Google Sketchup and Ruby	20

3. Geometric Modeling	22
3.1 Model description	22
3.1.1 Definitions of modeling elements	23
3.1.2 Surface modeling framework	26
3.2 Design constraints	28
3.2.1 Continuity constraints	28
3.2.2 Curvature continuity with constrained control points	40
3.2.3 Engineering constraints	52
3.3 Conclusion on variables, parameters and constraints	53
3.4 Implementation and results	53
3.5 Feedback on modeling techniques	56
4. Interactive Design Exploration	58
4.1 Interactive genetic algorithm	58
4.1.1 Overview	58
4.1.2 Generational and steady state IGA	58
4.1.3 Rating the fitness	59
4.1.4 Parent selection	59
4.1.5 Crossover	60
4.1.6 Mutation	62
4.2 Engineering attributes	64
4.2.1 Capacity	66
4.2.2 Roominess	66
4.3 User interface design and issues	67
4.3.1 Interface specifications	68
4.3.2 Remaining issues	71
5. Demonstration Study	73
5.1 The interface	73
5.2 Pure crossover	74
5.3 Pure mutation	80
5.4 Conclusion	82

6. Future Direction	84
6.1 Geometric modeling improvement	84
6.1.1 Details to the model	84
6.1.2 Change of basis function	84
6.1.3 Increase modeling speed	84
6.2 Interactive genetic algorithm improvement	85
6.2.1 Increase convergence	85
6.3 User interface improvement	85
6.3.1 Improve visualization	85
6.3.2 Online interface	86
6.4 Data analysis	86
6.4.1 Analysis using PCA	87
6.4.2 Analysis using MDS	89
6.4.3 Analysis on user heterogeneity	90
7. Conclusion	91
7.1 Parametric modeling environment	91
7.2 Interactive genetic algorithm	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY	93
APPENDICES	
A. Control Point and Surface Indices	97
B. Ruby Codes	101
B.1 IGA.rb	101
B.2 Matchbox.rb	108
B.3 Population.rb	130
B.4 Genotype.rb	133
B.5 Wireframe.rb	134
B.6 Bezier surf.rb	136
B.7 Bezier curve.rb	140
B.8 Analysis.rb	141

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Review of survey techniques	5
3.1	Variable list	54
3.2	Variable list: Continue	55
3.3	Parameter list	55
4.1	Roominess Model	67
6.1	Data analysis: PCA results 1	88
6.2	Data analysis: PCA results 2	89

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	A typical flow of Kansei Engineering studies	4
1.2	Kansei Engineering studies produce mapping between Kansei words and design components	4
1.3	2D vehicle silhouette generator random results	7
1.4	A close look at a single random design	7
1.5	Interactive design interface using Google Sketchup	8
2.1	IEC: General flow	14
3.1	Geometrical Modeling: Coordinate system	23
3.2	Geometrical Modeling: Bezier curve - with 3 control points	24
3.3	Geometrical Modeling: Bezier surface - with 9 control points	25
3.4	Geometrical Modeling: Local curve notation	26
3.5	Geometrical Modeling: Framework - front	27
3.6	Geometrical Modeling: Framework - rear	27
3.7	Geometrical Modeling: Surface continuity	29
3.8	Geometrical Modeling: Curvature continuity	32
3.9	Geometrical Modeling: Spline with different signs of ϕ and ψ	34
3.10	Geometrical Modeling: Conclusion on continuity	36
3.11	Geometrical Modeling: All continuity constraints - front	36
3.12	Geometrical Modeling: All continuity constraints - rear	36
3.13	Geometrical Modeling: Application on tangent continuity	38
3.14	Geometrical Modeling: Create surfaces with overall tangent continuity .	39
3.15	Geometrical Modeling: Application on curvature continuity	40
3.16	Geometrical Modeling: Create surfaces with curvature continuity on the joint edge	41

3.17	Geometrical Modeling: Spline that has one control point infinitively far away	42
3.18	Geometrical Modeling: One dimensional case for curvature continuity with constrained control points	43
3.19	Geometrical Modeling: Local coordinates	43
3.20	Geometrical Modeling: Projection of control polygons	44
3.21	Geometrical Modeling: Boundaries for control points	44
3.22	Geometrical Modeling: Conclusion on curvature continuity with constrained control points	51
3.23	Geometrical Modeling: Engineering constraint - Front wheel position . .	53
3.24	Geometrical Modeling: Gallery - with mesh	56
3.25	Geometrical Modeling: Rendering options. Left: SketchUp rendering (Default); Right: PODIUM rendering (By Jacob from SketchUcation Forum)	57
4.1	IGA: Selection scheme - Roulette wheel	61
4.2	IGA: Determine mutation parameters c and δ w.r.t convergence criterion	65
4.3	IGA: Determine mutation parameters c and δ w.r.t variation criterion .	65
4.4	IGA: Roominess model specification [3]	67
4.5	User interface: Rendering options from SketchUp	68
4.6	User interface: Visual smoothness from SketchUp	69
4.7	User interface: Fitness indicator	70
4.8	User interface: Volume and roominess indicator	70
4.9	User interface: Perspective view may visually distort same designs as different ones	72
5.1	Sketchup interface	73
5.2	Program developed in this study	74
5.3	“Rearrange” function	75
5.4	Initial randomized designs	76
5.5	Model 1 views	76

5.6	Model 2 views	77
5.7	First iteration of Model 1 and 2	77
5.8	Crossover experiments	78
5.9	Last iteration of Model 1 and 2	79
5.10	An offspring with mixed parental features	79
5.11	Comparison of parent and children designs	79
5.12	More crossover examples	81
5.13	Mutation convergence and resulting designs with different mutation parameter values	82
5.14	Mutated designs with $c = 3$	82
5.15	Mutation convergence with $c = 3$	83
6.1	Data analysis: PCA example 1	87
6.2	Data analysis: PCA example 2	88
A.1	APPENDIX: Control point and surface indices	98
A.2	APPENDIX: Control point and surface indices - continue	99
A.3	APPENDIX: Control point and surface indices - continue (2)	100

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The completion of this project could not have been achieved without the assistance of numerous individuals who served as critical sources of support and guidance. First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Professor Panos Papalambros, and committee member, Professor Noboru Kikuchi, who contributed much support and knowledge. I want to thank Dr. Jarod Kelly for his innovative idea and technical support.

I would like to thank all my friends in the University of Michigan, and the entire Optimal Design Laboratory who encouraged, supported, and provided feedback.

Finally and most importantly, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my family for their love, patience and understanding.

This work has been partially supported by the Ford BlockM project at the University of Michigan. This support is gratefully acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

Multidisciplinary design activities require negotiation among different disciplines including engineering, aesthetics and business. In the design of complex artifacts, negotiation exists throughout the conceptual, physical and digital design phases, and it often introduces iterative modification of the design geometry to balance objectives from the different disciplines. In current automotive industry practice, iteration is reduced by using a sequential design procedure: the exterior design is first created with styling objectives constrained by basic engineering boundaries; the model is then modified to meet engineering objectives more closely but only to the extent that the original styling character does not change. This procedure provides good solutions in reasonable time but better solutions may be explored if iterations could take place efficiently in early product development stages.

This kind of iterations can take place within a system optimization framework, such as Analytical Target Cascading, developed to coordinate subsystem design solutions into an overall solution. It is worth examining whether such a framework can be applied to the automotive exterior design problem, taking shape preferences into account. This can be achieved if a quantitative representation of shape preference is available, which requires defining the relationship between preference and the mathematical form of automotive exterior design.

As a first step in developing this relationship, this thesis presents a three-dimensional surface parametric modeling environment for representing basic exterior vehicle shapes. Google SketchUp is used to develop the representation because it allows rapid modeling through coding. Parametric representation allows shapes to be modified quickly and inexpensively based on user preference input. This representation is then used in conjunction with an Interactive Genetic Algorithm to demonstrate its value in eliciting user shape preferences. The developed interacting modeling environment is a building block towards a system optimization capability that integrates engineering attributes with customer shape preferences in automotive product development.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Multidisciplinary design activities require negotiation among different disciplines including engineering, aesthetics and business. In the design of complex artifacts such as automotive exteriors, such negotiation exists throughout the conceptual, physical and digital design phases, and it often introduces iterative modification of the design geometry to balance objectives from the different disciplines. In current automotive industry practice, iteration is reduced by using a sequential design procedure: the exterior design is first created with styling objectives constrained by basic engineering boundaries; the model is then modified to meet engineering objectives more closely but only to the extent that the original styling character does not change [1]. This procedure provides good solutions in reasonable time but better solutions may be explored if iterations could take place efficiently in early product development stages.

This kind of iterations can take place within a system optimization framework, such as Analytical Target Cascading (ATC) [2], which is developed to coordinate subsystem design solutions into an overall solution. This technique has shown its value in linking marketing and engineering design decisions [4]. Therefore, it is worth studying if the same framework can be extended to the automotive exterior design problem, taking shape preferences into account. Here we use the general term “shape” instead of “aesthetic” because it is unnecessary to strictly isolate aesthetic preference from other type of preferences such as “luxury” in this early stage of exploration.

Such extension can be achieved if a quantitative representation of shape preference is available. This requires defining the relationship between preference and the mathematical form of automotive exterior design. Some prevailing survey techniques correlating preference and design include Self Explicated Preference Ranking [9], Pairwise Comparison [11], Conjoint Analysis [12] and Kansei Engineering [6]. A