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# Introduction

The introduction of this document defines the purpose, scope, and team information for the project.

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to identify the preliminary budget for the Autonomous Panda System (APS). It is intended to provide the customers of the APS with justifications for major item decisions. These justifications include decision matrices, risk analysis and fulfillment of requirements.

## Scope

This document is intended to provide the customers of APS with a list of parts with justification and pricing information. In this list of parts, only major components have been considered. These major components are those with price above $20 [**citation**] and are essential to the early prototyping of the APS. This document also contains a high-level break down of the APS that provides an overview of the initial design of the system.

## Team Information

Table 2 contains the team member names and their corresponding roles.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| Kurt Pedrosa | Team Leader/Scrum Master |
| Merissa Roth | Software Leader |
| Mary Luongo | Hardware Leader/Product Owner |
| Luis Bogran | Development Leader |
| Kok Peng Tan | Developer |

Table 2. Team Information

# Functional Decomposition System

## High-Level Architecture of System

## Decomposition of Vehicle Hardware Layer

## Decomposition of Communication Hardware Layer

# Budget Decision Matrices and Justifications

This section of the document contains the reasoning used during the selection of the major components. The use of decision matrices is main method for selecting all components to be used for the APS. These matrices show the important characteristic of the component and indexed each of them with a weighted score. The development team scored each characteristic of each component and the average score is then calculated. The total score is gathered and the item with the highest total score is then selected as the most desirable component for the system.

## Microcontroller

The microcontrollers considered and descriptions of the decision process are described in the following content. The process was tailored to provide the APS with the optimal microcontroller to control all the subsystems.

### Items Under Consideration

The following items were considered as the microcontroller used to operate the subsystems of the APS. All of the items have been characterized on Table 9 by item identification name, item ID, vendor, and a description.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item ID** | **Vendor** | **Description** |
| Arduino Due | Amazon | A microcontroller based on the ARM Cortex-M3 chip. Contains 54 general-purpose input/output (GPIO) pins. It run at a clock speed of 84 MHz. Contains 96 KB of RAM and 512 KB of Flash memory. It is a popular microcontroller for novice and expert developers. |
| Raspberry Pi Modle B+ | Amazon | A microcontroller with a Broadcom BCM2835 chipset, Micro SD storage, and 40 GPIO pins. Contains 512 MB of RAM (Random Access Memory) and a processor speed of 700 MHz It has gain popularity between the novice and experience developers. |
| UDOO Quad | Udoo | A microcontroller based on an ARM Cortex-A9 chip with a clock speed of 1GHz. On-board integration with the Arduino Due Cortex-M3 chip set. It contains 76 fully available GPIO pins, and two Micro USB storage slots. It is not a popular microprocessor within the developer community but has promising features that may satisfy most novice and expert developers. |
| BeagleBone Black | Amazon |  |

Table 3. Items under consideration for the microcontroller

### Decision Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Price** | **Speed** | **RAM** | **Memory** | **GPIO** | **OS/IDE** | **Ease of use** |
| Arduino Due | $40.22 | 84 MHz | 96 KB | 512 KB | 54 (12 PWM) | Arduino IDE |  |
| Raspberry Pi Model B+ | $38.89 | 700 MHz | 512 MB | SD Card | 40 | Linux |  |
| UDOO Quad | $135 | 1 GHz | 1 GB | SD Card/SATA | 76 | Linux/Aduino IDE |  |
| BeagleBone Black | $65.90 | 1 GHz | 512 MB | 4 GB | 65 | Linux |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Weight** | **Price** | **Speed** | **RAM** | **Memory** | **GPIO** | **OS/IDE** | **Ease of use** |
| Arduino Due | 8 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| Raspberry Pi Model B+ | 9 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| UDOO Quad | 3 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| BeagleBone Black | 5 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Weighted** | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.25 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Total** | **Price** | **Speed** | **RAM** | **Memory** | **GPIO** | **OS/IDE** | **Ease of use** | **Total** |
| Arduino Due | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.25 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.45 | 5.3 |
| Raspberry Pi Model B+ | 1.8 | 1 | 0.5 | 2.25 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.45 | 7.5 |
| UDOO Quad | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1 | 0.25 | 7.65 |
| BeagleBone Black | 1 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 1.75 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.35 | 6.8 |

Table 4. Decision matrix for the microcontroller

### Justification

## Sensors

The following tables list the categories the sensors were compared over, and the weight given to each category. This decision-making process consists of a decision matrix, requirements traceability, requirements fulfillment, and a risk analysis to decide which part will be used.

### Items Under Consideration

The following items listed on table 5 were considered as the possible sensors for the APS. Each item has a unique ID number and its corresponding vendor. The categories each item will be scored on are: availability, price, OS/IDE, and frames per second (FPS).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sensors** | **ID** | **Vendor** |
| Pixy Cam | B00IUYUA80 | Amazon |
| CMUcam4 Robot Vision | RB-Sea-05 | Robotshop |
| Raspberry Pi | RB- Ras-01 | Robotshop |
| Minoru 3D webcam | Rb-Pul-01 | Robotshop |

Table 5. Items under consideration for the sensor

### Decision Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Availability** | **Price** | **OS/IDE** | **FPS** | **Resolution** |  |
| Pixy Cam | Available | $0 | Arduino/C | 50 | (640 x 400) |  |
| CMUcam4 Robot Vision | Buy it | $116.24 | Arduino/C | 30 | VGA (640 x 840) |  |
| Raspberry Pi | Buy it | $29.95 | Raspberry Pi | 30 | 1080 p HD |  |
| Minoru 3D webcam | Buy it | $37.99 | openCV | 30 | 320 x 240 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Weight** | **Availability** | **Price** | **OS** | **FPS** | **Resolution** |  |
| Pixy Cam | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 |  |
| CMucam4 Robot Vision | 5 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 7 |  |
| Raspberry Pi | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 9 |  |
| Minoru 3D webcam | 5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Weighted** | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Total** | **Availability** | **Price** | **OS/IDE** | **FPS** | **Resolution** | **Total** |
| Pixy Cam | 1 | 2.00 | 1.8 | 2 | 1.5 | 8.30 |
| CMucam4 Robot Vision | 0.5 | 1 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.75 | 6.55 |
| Raspberry Pi | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.25 | 7.05 |
| Minoru 3D webcam | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1 | 5.60 |

Table 6. Decision matrix for the sensors

### Justification

### The following describes the process used to justify our decisions over what parts would be used, and the reasoning behind those decisions.

### Availability

The availability score for each item was determined by first scoring the items readily available to the FTFP with a score of 9, the highest possible score. The items that had to be ordered and shipped to the FTFP were given a score of 5. The availability category has a weight of 10%.

### Price

The values for the score over the prices of each item was obtained by setting the least expensive item to have the highest score (9), and the most expensive item to have the lowest score (1). Once the minimum and maximum were determined, the scores for the remaining items were calculated by subtracting the price of the item from the price of the most expensive item, diving it by the most expensive item price, multiplying that by the highest score possible (9), and adding one (1) to the answer. The one (1) is added taking in consideration that the lowest possible value is 1, and the answers are rounded up or down accordingly. Table 7 shows the calculations behind the scores for the price category, with the price category having a weight of 20%. The scores for the following items were calculated using the following equation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Calculation | Score |
| B00IUYUA80 | Least expensive item (free) | 9 |
| RB-Sea-05 | Most expensive item ($116.24) | 1 |
| RB- Ras-01 |  | 8 |
| Rb-Pul-01 |  | 7 |

Table 7. Calculations for the scores of the price of the sensors

### OS/IDE

The scores for the OS/IDE category were based on the previous knowledge and experience of the software engineers at hand. The development team has experience working with Arduino boards and writing and implementing code for Arduino. The items using the OS/IDEs the development team had previous experience with were given the highest score (9), while the items using OS/IDEs unfamiliar to the development team were given a score of (5). The added learning curve of a new OS/IDE or programming language would delay the team and the development of software; therefore a lower score was assigned to those items. The OS/IDE category has a weight of 20%.

### FPS

The frame rate, or frame frequency, or frames per second is the frequency at which the sensor produces unique consecutive images called frames. [reference] The values for the score of the FPS category of each item were obtained by giving the item with the highest frame rate the highest possible score of (9). A minimum value could not be set because the rest of the items have the same frame rate. Once the maximum value was determined, the scores for the remaining items were calculated by subtracting the FPS value of the item from the highest scoring item, then multiplying by the highest score possible (9), and adding one (1) to the answer. The one (1) is added taking in consideration that the lowest possible value is 1, with the answers being rounded up or down accordingly. The FPS category has a weight of 25%. Table 8 shows the calculations performed to obtain the scores.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| B00IUYUA80 | Highest FPS (50) | 9 |
| RB-Sea-05 |  | 5 |
| RB- Ras-01 |  | 5 |
| Rb-Pul-01 |  | 5 |

Table . Calculations for the score of the FPS

**Resolution**

The resolution of the sensors are very important to the performance of the sensors. The values for the score of the resolution category of each item were obtained by giving the item with the highest resolution the highest possible score of (9). The item with the lowest resolution was given the lowest possible score of (1). Once the maximum and minimum values were determined, the scores for the rest of the items were calculated by subtracting the resolution value from the highest resolution value, dividing it by the highest resolution value, multiplying it by 9, the highest possible score, and adding one (1) to the answer. The one is added considering that the lowest possible value is 1, with the answered being rounded up or down accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Calculation | Score |
| B00IUYUA80 |  |  |
| RB-Sea-05 |  |  |
| RB- Ras-01 | Highest resolution (1080) | 9 |
| Rb-Pul-01 | Lowest Resolution (320 x240) | 1 |

## Motors

The following tables and justifications compose a description of the decision-making process that was used to select a motor for the APS. This process includes analytical and quantitative methods as well as reasoning behind these methods documented.

### Items Under Consideration

The following items were considered as possible motors for the APS. Each item in this section has a corresponding item ID and vendor, which has been compiled in Table 12.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motors** | **ID** | **Vendor** |
| Standard Gearmotor | ROB-12399 | Sparkfun |
| Preicision Gearmotor | ROB-12497 | Sparkfun |
| 154:1 Metal Gearmotor 20 D x 44 L mm. | Pololu item #: 1109 | Pololu |
| 100:1 Metal Gearmotor 37 D x 57 L mm. | Pololu item #: 1106 | Pololu |

Table 9. Items under consideration for the motor

### Decision Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Price** | **Voltage** | **RPM** | **Stall Torque** | **Stall Current** | **Weight** |
| Standard Gearmotor | $24.95 | 12 V | 101 | 32.2 N-cm | 0.5 A | 119.07 g |
| Preicision Gearmotor | $34.95 | 12 V | 90 | 98.01 N-cm | 1 A | 240.97 g |
| 154:1 Metal Gearmotor 20 D x 44 L mm. | $19.95 | 6 V | 90 | 84.73 N-cm | 3.3 A | 32.6 g |
| 100:1 Metal Gearmotor 37 D x 57 L mm. | $24.95 | 12 V | 100 | 155.35 N-cm | 5 A | 201.28 g |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Weight** | **Price** | **Voltage** | **RPM** | **Stall Torque** | **Stall Current** | **Weight** |
| Standard Gearmotor | 4 | 4 | 5.61 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 5.6 |
| Preicision Gearmotor | 1 | 4 | 5.00 | 6.7 | 8.2 | 1.0 |
| 154:1 Metal Gearmotor 20 D x 44 L mm. | 5 | 8 | 5.00 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 8.8 |
| 100:1 Metal Gearmotor 37 D x 57 L mm. | 4 | 4 | 5.56 | 10.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Weighted** | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.3 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Total** | **Price** | **Voltage** | **RPM** | **Stall Torque** | **Stall Current** | **Weight** | **Total** |
| Standard Gearmotor | 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.30 | 1.05 | 2.70 | 0.30 | 5.35 |
| Preicision Gearmotor | 0.15 | 0.40 | 0.25 | 2.45 | 2.40 | 0.05 | 5.70 |
| 154:1 Metal Gearmotor 20 D x 44 L mm. | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 2.10 | 1.20 | 0.45 | 5.55 |
| 100:1 Metal Gearmotor 37 D x 57 L mm. | 0.60 | 0.40 | 0.30 | 3.50 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 5.20 |

Table 10. Decision matrix for the motors

### Justification

The following describes the process used in obtaining the scores for the various categories used to rate the motors under consideration in the decision matrix. The data for the motors under consideration was obtained from Sparkfun and Pololu.

**Price**

Table 14 contains the price category scores the price of the motors. The score for the price was obtained by normalizing the price and multiplying the normalized valued by the maximum score of 9 and adding 1. The weighted value of the price category is 15%. The equation below is an example to show how the price score is produced.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| ROB-12399 |  | 4 |
| ROB-12497 |  | 1 |
| Pololu item #: 1109 |  | 5 |
| Pololu item #: 1106 |  | 4 |

Table 11. Calculations for the price of the motor

**Voltage**

The voltage category scores the voltage levels required of the APS for the motors. As the maximum operating voltage of all the items are either 6 V or 12 V, they are given a score of 4 for 12 V as it requires more voltage from the APS and they are given a score of 8 for the 6 V requirement. This category is given a 10% weighted value.

**RPM**

Table 15 contains the RPM category scores the RPM of the motors. The motors chosen were from around the 90-RPM range so as to determine the differences in the torque of the different motors. This was done as the motors for each item can come in many different rpm but the torque would change scaling reasonably with the change in RPM. The score for this is determined by dividing the RPM value by 90 and multiplying by 5, as 90 RPM was the arbitrary choice. As this was an arbitrary choice, the weighted value of the score is 5%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| ROB-12399 |  | 6 |
| ROB-12497 |  | 5 |
| Pololu item #: 1109 |  | 5 |
| Pololu item #: 1106 |  | 6 |

Table 12. Calculations for the RPM of the motor

**Stall Torque**

Table 16 contains the stall torque category scores the stall torque of the APS. This determines the amount of load that the APS can move. If the weight of the APS is above the limit, the motor will stall. The equation to determine the stall torque was derived by calculating the normalized stall torque values multiplied by 9 and subtracting that from 10. As this determines the load that the APS can carry it is given a weight of 35%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| ROB-12399 |  | 3 |
| ROB-12497 |  | 7 |
| Pololu item #: 1109 |  | 6 |
| Pololu item #: 1106 |  | 10 |

Table 13. Calculations for the stall torque of the motor

**Stall Current**

Table 17 contains the stall current category scores the maximum current the APS needs to supply the motors, when they in a stall state. The equation used to determine the scores was derived by normalizing the stall current values multiplying them by 9 and adding 1. The weighted value of this category is 30% as it can affect other systems if the current is too high.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| ROB-12399 |  | 9 |
| ROB-12497 |  | 8 |
| Pololu item #: 1109 |  | 4 |
| Pololu item #: 1106 |  | 1 |

Table 14. Calculations for the stall current of the motor

**Weight**

Table 18 contains the weight category determines the weight of each of the different motors. The scores for this category are determined by normalizing the weights of the motors multiplied by 9 and adding 1. The weighted value of this category is 5%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| ROB-12399 |  | 9 |
| ROB-12497 |  | 1 |
| Pololu item #: 1109 |  | 9 |
| Pololu item #: 1106 |  | 3 |

Table 15. Calculations for the weight of the motor

## Claw

The claw is a crucial part of the APS, as without it, the robot would not be able to complete any of the tasks required. The categories below describe the items under consideration, the decision matrix, and the justification of the decision made.

### Items Under Consideration

Table 19 contains the items under consideration for the claw. The items under consideration have been listed below and contain the product ID and the vendor.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **ID** | **Vendor** |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge | OWI-535 | Amazon |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot | RB-Sct-154 | RobotShop |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper | AX12DUAL\_GRIP | CrustCrawler |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit | AL5D-NS | Lynxmotion |

Table 16. Items under consideration for the claw

### Decision Matrix

Table 20 contains the decision matrix for the claw. Every item under consideration has been evaluated and broken down into different categories. The claw size is how wide the claw will open. The DOF category is the degrees of freedom and how the claw will be able to move.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Claw Size** | **Weight** | **Price** | **DOF** | **Controlled** |  |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge | 2-3 in. | 1.45 lbs. | $44.29 | 5 | RC |  | |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot | 4.25 in. | 3 lbs. | $139.99 | 2 | RC/autonomous |  | |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper | 9 in. | 2 lbs. | $69.00 | 6 | Autonomous |  | |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit | 1.3 in. | 0.6 lbs. | $143.88 | 4 | Autonomous |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Product Weight** | **Claw Size** | **Weight** | **Price** | **DOF** | **Controlled** |  | |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge | 4 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 1 |  | |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 7 |  | |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper | 10 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 |  | |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit | 2 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 9 |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Weighted** | 0.25 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.2 |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Product Total** | **Claw Size** | **Weight** | **Price** | **DOF** | **Controlled** | **Total** | |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge | 1.0 | 1.35 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 6.05 | |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot | 1.75 | 0.75 | 0.6 | 0.75 | 1.4 | 5.25 | |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1.35 | 2.25 | 1.8 | 8.8 | |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit | 0.5 | 1.35 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 5.75 | |

Table 17. Decision matrix for the claw

### Justification

**Price**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge |  | 7 |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot |  | 1 |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper |  | 5 |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit |  | 1 |

Table 18. Calculations for the price of the claw

**Weight**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculations** | **Score** |
| OWI-535 Robotic Arm Edge |  | 5 |
| Stacker 2WD Mobile Robot |  | 1 |
| AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper |  | 4 |
| AL5D Arm Hardware Only - Kit |  | 8 |

Table 19. Calculations for the weight of the claw

## Wheels

The following tables and justifications give a description of the decision-making process that was used to select wheels for the APS. The process included analytical, qualitative, and quantitative methods and it is shown with the reasoning behind these methods.

### Items Under Consideration

The items in Table 23 were considered as different choices for the wheels for the APS. The table includes items from Amazon, SparkFun, and Vex Robotics.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Wheels** | **ID** | **Vendor** |
| Vex Robotics Omni (4 in.) | 217-2584 | Amazon |
| Vex Robotics Mecanum (4 in.) | 217-3644, Right (217-3645, Left) | Amazon |
| Fingertech Mecanum (4 in.) | ROB-11578 | SparkFun |
| Pololu Wheels (42 x 19 mm) | ROB-0889 | SparkFun |

Table 20. Items under consideration for the wheels

### Decision Matrix

The following tables create the quantitative reasons for the wheels chosen for the APS. Table 24 contains the description matrix, which shows the price, weight, load rating, and holonomic ability for each wheel under consideration.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Price** | **Weight** | **Load Rating** | **Holonomic** |
| Vex Robotics Omni | $12.50 | 0.42 lbs. | 200 lbs. | Yes |
| Vex Robotics Mecanum | $15.00 | 0.55 lbs. | 200 lbs. | Yes |
| Fingertech Mecanum | $18.75 | 0.1325 lbs. | 30 lbs. | Yes |
| Pololu Wheels | $3.50 | 0.08 lbs. | Not Found | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Weight** | **Price** | **Weight** | **Load Rating** | **Holonomic** |
| Vex Robotics Omni | 4 | 7 | 9 | 9 |
| Vex Robotics Mecanum | 3 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Fingertech Mecanum | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 |
| Pololu Wheels | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Weighted** | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Total** | **Price** | **Weight** | **Load Rating** | **Holonomic** | **Total** |
| Vex Robotics Omni | 1.0 | 1.75 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 7.25 |
| Vex Robotics Mecanu | 0.75 | 2.25 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 7.5 |
| Fingertech Mecanum | 0.25 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 4.45 |
| Pololu Wheels | 2.0 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.75 |

Table 21. Decision matrix for the wheels

### Justification

The process for the decision making is described in the next paragraphs. The data for these items was found at the websites of Amazon, SparkFun, and Vex Robotics. The wheels were judged based on price, weight, load rating, and the wheels’ holonomic ability.

**Price**

The price was valued at 25% of the decision. The wheels are being sold by the vendors in multiple pack styles. The Vex Robotics Omni (4 in.) wheels are being sold for $24.99 for a two pack. The Vex Robotics Mecanum (4 in.) wheels are being sold for $59.99 for a four pack. The Fingertech Mecanum (4 in.) wheels are being sold for $74.95 for a four pack. The Pololu Wheel (42 mm. x 19 mm.) wheels are being sold for $6.95 for a two pack. Therefore, for the decision matrix the price was first divided by the number of items sold to find the price per each item. The prices were then normalized comparing each price to the greatest price. The normalized prices were multiplied by nine and added to one as shown in Table 25.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| Vex Robotics Omni |  | 4 |
| Vex Robotics Mecanum |  | 3 |
| Fingertech Mecanum |  | 1 |
| Pololu Wheels |  | 8 |

Table 22. Calculation for the price of the wheels

**Weight**

The weight was valued at 25% of the decision. The APS has a maximum weight limit of 50 lbs. and therefore the weight of each wheel was important in choosing the wheels for the APS. The wheels should not be too light to hold the APS; consequently the point values were reversed to have the heavier wheels to be rated higher than the low weight wheels. Table 26 shows the calculation used to find the score for the weight of each type of wheel. The weight of each type of wheel was normalized to the greatest weight. The score was multiplied by nine and added to one. The final score was subtracted from ten to yield the heavier wheels having a higher rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| Vex Robotics Omni |  | 7 |
| Vex Robotics Mecanum |  | 9 |
| Fingertech Mecanum |  | 2 |
| Pololu Wheels |  | 1 |

Table 23. Calculation for the weight of the wheels

**Load Rating**

The APS has a maximum weight limit of 50 lbs., thus the load rating was valued at 20% of the decision. Two types of wheels had equivalent load ratings (200 lbs.) and had the point value of nine as they had the best rating value. One wheel type, Pololu Wheels (42 x 19 mm), had no load rating available for it so it has the lowest value possible of one. This left the Fingertech Mecanum as the lowest rated value, but larger than the unknown value. Consequently, the value for the Fingertech Mecanum was given as the mid-range value, five.

**Holonomic**

Each wheel type was judged whether it had any holonomic ability or not. Each wheel was given either a nine, for yes, or a one, for a no. To minimize the complexity of the robotic arm it was decided to utilize wheels that had holonomic abilities. Therefore, holonomic ability has a value of 30% for the decision matrix.

## Battery

The following tables and justifications compose a description of the decision-making process that was used to select the batteries that will be used for the APS. This process includes analytical and quantitative methods as well as reasoning behind these methods documented.

### Items Under Consideration

The following items were considered as possible batteries for the APS. Each item in this section has a corresponding item ID and vendor, which has been compiled in Table 27.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motors** | **ID** | **Vendor** |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2000mAh | PRT-08483 | Sparkfun |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2200mAh 7.4V | PRT-11856 | Sparkfun |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 20C Lipo Pack | T2200.3S.20 | Hobbyking |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 25C Lipo Pack | T2200.3S.25 | Hobbyking |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 30C Lipo Pack | T2200.3S.30 | Hobbyking |

Table 24. The items under consideration for the batteries

### Decision Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product** | **Price** | **Capacity** | **Discharge Rate** | **Voltage** | **Weight** |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2000mAh | $12.95 | 2000 mAh | 2 C | 3.7 V | 36.00 g |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2200mAh 7.4V | $13.95 | 2200 mAh | 30 C | 7.4 V | 206.00 g |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 20C Lipo Pack | $8.50 | 2200 mAh | 20 C | 11.1 V | 188.00 g |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 25C Lipo Pack | $10.60 | 2200 mAh | 25 C | 11.1 V | 188.00 g |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 30C Lipo Pack | $13.50 | 2200 mAh | 30 C | 11.1 V | 197.00 g |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Weight** | **Price** | **Capacity** | **Discharge Rate** | **Voltage** | **Weight** |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2000mAh | 1.65 | 4 | 1.6 | 4 | 8.43 |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2200mAh 7.4V | 1 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 1 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 20C Lipo Pack | 4.52 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 1.79 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 25C Lipo Pack | 3.16 | 5 | 8.5 | 10 | 1.79 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 30C Lipo Pack | 1.29 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 1.39 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Weighted** | 0.15 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.25 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Product Total** | **Price** | **Capacity** | **Discharge Rate** | **Voltage** | **Weight** | **Total** |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2000mAh | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 3.30 |
| Polymer Lithium Ion Battery-2200mAh 7.4V | 0.15 | 1.25 | 3.0 | 1.75 | 0.05 | 6.20 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 20C Lipo Pack | 0.75 | 1.25 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 6.70 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 25C Lipo Pack | 0.45 | 1.25 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 7.00 |
| Turnigy 2200mAh 3S 30C Lipo Pack | 0.15 | 1.25 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 0.05 | 6.95 |

Table 25. Decision matrix for the batteries

### Justification

The following describes the process used in obtaining the scores for the various categories used to rate the batteries under consideration in the decision matrix. The data for the batteries under consideration was obtained from Sparkfun and Hobbyking.

**Price**

The score for the price was obtained by normalizing the price and multiplying the normalized valued by the maximum score of 9 and adding 1. The weighted value of the price category was 15%. Table 29 contains the calculations for the price of the battery

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| PRT-08483 |  | 2 |
| PRT-11856 |  | 1 |
| T2200.3S.20 |  | 5 |
| T2200.3S.25 |  | 3 |
| T2200.3S.30 |  | 3 |

Table 26. Calculations for the price of the batteries

**Capacity**

The capacity category scores the different capacities of the batteries. As the capacities of the batteries do not vary much, 2200 mAh for four of the batteries under consideration and the last one at 2000 mAh. A score of five was given to the 2200-mAh batteries and a score of four was given to the battery with 2000 mAh. As the capacity determines the capacity of the battery, it was given a weighted score of 25%.

**Discharge Rate**

The discharge rate, C rating, of the batteries scores the discharge relative to the battery capacity, a 100-mAh capacity at a 5 C rate will have a total capacity of 500 mA. The equation to determine the score was derived by normalizing the C rating multiplied by 9 and subtracting that from 10. As the discharge rate determines the total capacity of the battery, it was given a weighted score of 30%. Table 30 contains the calculations for the discharge rate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| PRT-08483 |  | 2 |
| PRT-11856 |  | 1 |
| T2200.3S.20 |  | 5 |
| T2200.3S.25 |  | 3 |
| T2200.3S.30 |  | 3 |

Table 27. Calculations for the discharge rate of the batteries

**Voltage**

Table 31 contains the voltage category scores the voltage output of the battery. This determines the normalized voltage output of the battery. The equation to determine the score for the voltage was to normalize the voltage multiply by 9 and subtract that from 10 to get the score. The weighted value of this category is 25%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| PRT-08483 |  | 4 |
| PRT-11856 |  | 7 |
| T2200.3S.20 |  | 10 |
| T2200.3S.25 |  | 10 |
| T2200.3S.30 |  | 10 |

Table 28. Calculations for the voltage of the batteries

**Weight**

Table 32 contains the weight category determines the weight of each of the different motors. The scores for this category are determined by normalizing the weights of the motors multiplied by 9 and adding 1. The weighted value of this category is 5%.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Calculation** | **Score** |
| PRT-08483 |  | 8 |
| PRT-11856 |  | 1 |
| T2200.3S.20 |  | 2 |
| T2200.3S.25 |  | 2 |
| T2200.3S.30 |  | 1 |

Table 29. Calculations for the weight of the batteries

# Requirements Traceability

The following items describe the how each requirement in the Funky Town Fancy Panda’s (FTFP) system requirement specification (SRS) traces to the parts needed to build the APS. The following tables will refer to the IEEE SoutheastCon 2015 Hardware Competition (SHC) rules for requirements traceability purposes.

## Microcontroller

Table 27 contains the requirements related to the microcontroller and how each requirement will be fulfilled.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **Fulfillment** |
|  |  |  |

Table 30. Requirements traceability for the microcontroller

## Sensors

Table 28 contains the requirements related to the sensors and how each requirement will be fulfilled.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **SHC Rules Traceability** | **Fulfillment** |
| 4.1.3 | The APS shall monitor the red LED on the floor. | Once the signal in shut off the timer is started and the round begins. | The Pixy Cam uses hue and saturation as its primary means of images detection. |
| 4.1.5 | The APS shall follow the line on the floor. | Drive on the white line (must cover the line all of the time). |  |
| 4.1.6 | The APS shall remain within the playing board. | The competition round will end if any part of the robot leaves the playing board. |  |
| 4.1.7.1 | The APS shall identify the game station. | Each toy will be placed in a white block. |  |
| 4.1.8 | The APS shall stop moving once the finish line is crossed. | The competition round will end when the robot crosses the finish line. |  |
| 4.2.2 | The APS shall play with the Simon Carabiner for 15 seconds. | Play Simon for 15 seconds. Correctly match the lights and sounds. |  |
| 4.2.3 | The APS shall rotate one (1) row of the Rubik’s Cube 180 degrees. | Twist one row 180 degrees on the Rubik’s Cube. |  |
| 4.2.8 | The APS shall pick up one (1) playing card from the stack of cards. | Pick up one card from the deck and hold it to cross the finish line. |  |

Table 31. Requirements traceability for the sensors

## Motors

Table 29 contains the requirements related to the motor and how each requirement will be fulfilled.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **SHC Rules Traceability** | **Fulfillment** |
| 4.1.4 | The APS shall start moving when the red LED powers off. | Once the signal in shut off the timer is started and the vehicle will have a maximum of five minutes navigate and play each of the games. |  |
| 4.1.6 | The APS shall remain within the playing board. | The competition round will end if any part of the robot leaves the playing board. |  |
| 4.1.8 | The APS shall stop moving once the finish line is crossed. | The competition round will end when the robot crosses the finish line. |  |

Table 32. Requirements traceability for the motors

## Claw

Table 30 contains the requirements related to the arm and how each requirement will be fulfilled.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **SHC Rules Traceability** | **Fulfillment** |
| 4.2.1 | The APS shall press the middle button on the Simon Carabiner to start playing. | The timer starts and points are earned when the robot presses the center button on Simon. |  |
| 4.2.2 | The APS shall play with the Simon Carabiner for 15 seconds. | Play Simon for 15 seconds. |  |
| 4.2.3 | The APS shall rotate one (1) row of the Rubik’s Cube 180 degrees. | Twist one row 180 degrees on the Rubik's Cube. | The AX-12 Dual Robotic Gripper has 6 DOF allowing it to rotate the row 180 degrees. |
| 4.2.6 | The APS shall draw “IEEE” on the Etch-a-Sketch using the knobs located on the Etch-a-Sketch. | Draw “IEEE” on the Etch-a-Sketch. |  |
| 4.2.8 | The APS shall pick up one (1) playing card from the stack of cards. | Pick up one card from the deck. |  |

Table 33. Requirements traceability for the claw

## Frame

Table 31 contains the requirements related to the frame and how each requirement will be fulfilled

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **SHC Rules Traceability** | **Fulfillment** |
| 5.2/5.3 | The APS shall fit within a 1 ft. x 1 ft. x 1 ft. area before and after the competition begins. | The vehicle must fit in a 1 ft. x 1 ft. square and may not be taller than 1 ft. |  |

Table 34. Requirements traceability for the frame

## Battery

Table 32 contains the requirements related to the battery and how each requirement will be fulfilled.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Requirement Text** | **SHC Rules Traceability** | **Fulfillment** |
| 4.1.1 | The APS shall receive power from an independent, on-board, battery. | It must be self-propelled, autonomous and may not be remotely controlled in any manner. |  |

Table 35. Requirements traceability for the batteries

# Risk Analysis

Each component has an amount of risk in its use on the APS. This section details some risks associated with each component used as part of the APS. The quantitative value of each risk was determined by personal experience and research of each component. The chance that the risk could occur is rated in a range of one to nine. One is the least likely for that risk to occur and nine being the most likely to occur. The severity of each is risk is rated in the same scale of one to nine; one being the least severe and nine is the most severe.

## Microcontroller

Table 33 details the risks associated with the microcontrollers.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 36. Risks and alleviations associated with the microcontrollers

## Sensors

Table 34 details the risks associated with the sensors.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 37. Risks and alleviations associated with the sensors

## Motors

Table 35 details the risks associated with the motors.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 38. Risks and alleviations associated with the motors

## Claw

Table 36 details the risks associated with the claw.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
| Claw falling off | 3 | 9 |  |
| Damage to claw | 4 | 8 |  |

Table 39. Risks and alleviations associated with the claw

## Wheels

Table 37 details the risks associated with the wheels.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
| Damage to the wheels |  |  |  |
| Loss of a wheel |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table . Risks and alleviations associated with the wheels

## Frame

Table 38 details the risks associated with the frames.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
| Frame falling apart | 3 | 9 |  |
| Bolts falling off | 5 | 9 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 41. Risks and alleviations associated with the frame

## Battery

Table 39 details the risks associated with the battery.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Probability** | **Severity** | **Risk Mitigation** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 42. Risks and alleviations associated with the battery

# Total System Budget

# Glossary

# Acronyms & Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Entry** | **Expanded Phrase** |
| APS | Autonomous Panda System |
| DOF | Degrees of Freedom |
| FPS | Frames per Second |
| FTFP | Funky Town Fancy Pandas |
| GPIO | General-Purpose Input/Output |
| ID | Identification |
| IDE | Integrated development environment |
| IEEE | [The] Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers |
| LED | Light-emitted Diode |
| OS | Operating System |
| RAM | Random Access Memory |
| RC | Remote Control |
| SHC | SoutheastCon 2015 Hardware Competition |
| SRS | System Requirement Specification |

Table 43. The acronyms and abbreviations used throughout this budget proposal
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