



Stefan Erschen

Optimal Decomposition of High-Dimensional Solution Spaces for Chassis Design

Fachgebiet für Computational Mechanics
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Fabian Duddeck
Technische Universität München



Professur für Computational Mechanics

Optimal Decomposition of High-Dimensional Solution Spaces for Chassis Design

Dipl.-Ing. Univ. Stefan Erschen

Vollständiger Abdruck der von der Ingenieurfacultät Bau Geo Umwelt der Technischen Universität München zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Doktor-Ingenieurs (Dr.-Ing.) genehmigten Dissertation.

Vorsitzender: Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kai-Uwe Bletzinger

Prüfender der Dissertation:

1. Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Fabian Duddeck

2. Prof. Dr. Markus Zimmermann

3. Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Matthias Gerdts

Die Dissertation wurde am 22.11.2017 bei der Technischen Universität München eingereicht und durch die Ingenieurfacultät Bau Geo Umwelt am 05.03.2018 angenommen.

Schriftenreihe des Fachgebiets für Computational Mechanics

Band 6

Stefan Erschen

**Optimal Decomposition of High-Dimensional
Solution Spaces for Chassis Design**

Shaker Verlag
Aachen 2018

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: München, Techn. Univ., Diss., 2018

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-8440-5931-1

ISSN 2193-2700

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 101818 • D-52018 Aachen

Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9

Internet: www.shaker.de • e-mail: info@shaker.de

Preface

This thesis is based on the results obtained during my time as a PhD student from 2013 to 2016. During those years I was involved in a joint research project between the Technical University Munich (TUM) and the BMW Group being simultaneously a member of the *TUM Graduate School* and the *BMW ProMotion Program* in Munich. At the TUM, I participated mainly in the activities of the research group of Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Fabian Duddeck, Associate Professorship of Computational Mechanics while at BMW, I worked in the development department for driving dynamics, preliminary design.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervising Professor Fabian Duddeck for giving me the opportunity to join his research group, providing me support whenever necessary and enriching my work with a critical review and fruitful discussions.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Markus Zimmermann for supervising me at BMW. I particularly appreciate that he gave me the opportunity to do research in an industrial environment, that he shared his expertise in Solution Spaces, in which he has done extensive research in recent years. Furthermore, I would like to point out the numerous valuable discussions we had and still have together.

I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Matthias Gerdt, Universität der Bundeswehr München, for inspiring discussions and technical support as well as for agreeing to be part of the committee.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Prof. Dr.-Ing. Florian Holzapfel, TUM, for being my mentor during my time as PhD student.

I also would like to thank all of my colleagues at the TUM as well as at BMW for supporting me through helpful discussions, technical support and encouragement. Special thanks to my colleagues, Markus Eichstetter, Daniel Mögele, Martin Münster, Christian Schulz, Marc-Eric Vogt, Jens Wimmeler, Martin Wahle and Amir Zare.

I would like to thank my family and friends for proof reading and their valuable comments, and would like to express my deepest gratitude to my father, who enriched this thesis with his admirable sketches.

Last but not least, I would like to emphasize the work done by the numerous interns and Master candidates, special thanks to Thorsten Rauch and Marco Daub. Without their work this thesis would not have been possible.

Stefan Erschen
Munich, 2018

Abstract

Today, one challenge in vehicle development is dealing with increased complexity, i.e. as a consequence of a *large number of interacting components and subsystems*, *many requirements*, often in conflict to each other, and a *large variety of vehicles* that must be considered. In general, complexity leads to time-consuming and hence cost-intensive development processes. In contrast, an increasing number of competitors require efficient product development in terms of time and cost.

Design methodologies such as concurrent engineering and set-based design exist to handle complex design problems more efficiently. One aspect of *concurrent engineering* is that components and subsystems are developed simultaneously rather than subsequently. This potentially reduces the overall development time, however, due to interactions among the components and subsystems, concurrent engineering increases uncertainties due to lack of knowledge. The idea of *set-based design* is to consider a set of permissible designs, which is narrowed throughout the development when more information, e.g. precise customer needs, cost, manufacturability, etc. is available. Although, this requires more effort in early development stages, it minimizes necessary iteration loops due to lack of knowledge and becomes more efficient overall compared to design strategies where one single design is considered only. Set-based design in conjunction with concurrent engineering is a powerful combination of two design strategies, compensating the shortcomings of the individual methodologies and enabling efficient development processes.

Recently, many set-based design approaches, particularly relying on numerical simulation, were proposed to increase the efficiency of development processes. One approach is based on the computation of box-shaped Solution Spaces, representing permissible design alternatives that satisfy all specified requirements. Box-shaped Solution Spaces are compatible to concurrent engineering, since requirements on the system are formulated as independent requirements on components and subsystems, which can be developed in detail independently and simultaneously as a result.

This thesis proposes improved approaches to compute Solution Spaces, such that uncertainties due to lack of knowledge are taken into account at its best, such that the result is compatible to concurrent engineering and such that the approaches are applicable to development problems particularly in chassis design.

Firstly, a gradient-based approach is proposed for optimizing the number of design alternatives via a search of box-shaped Solution Spaces with maximum volume. The underlying optimization problem is analyzed, and the approach is validated via analytic test problems. The results are compared to an existing technique using a stochastic Solution Space algorithm.

Motivated by the fact that box-shaped Solution Spaces are possibly sub-optimal to

represent the whole set of permissible designs, approaches based on a two-dimensional decomposition of high-dimensional Solution Spaces are introduced. This enables an improved handling of uncertainties in the early development phase. Two approaches are presented and the underlying optimization problems are analyzed and discussed. Both approaches are validated again by analytic test problems.

Furthermore, the approaches are compared in terms of their numerical complexity, and the advantages and disadvantages of box-shaped Solution Spaces compared to a two-dimensional decomposition of Solution Spaces are discussed.

Finally, the applicability of the approaches is demonstrated by industrial examples in the field of chassis design. The examples comprise the development of single vehicles as well as the development of a set of vehicles, where the components need to be designed such that requirements on the driving dynamical behavior are satisfied.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Context and motivation | 2 |
| 1.2 | Aims of the work | 13 |
| 1.3 | Overview of the methods | 14 |
| 1.4 | Structure of the thesis | 14 |
| 2 | State of the Art | 17 |
| 2.1 | Set-based design | 18 |
| 2.2 | Numerical methods for set-based design | 18 |
| 2.2.1 | Box-shaped Solution Spaces | 18 |
| 2.2.2 | Further interval approaches | 19 |
| 2.3 | Chassis design with box-shaped Solution Spaces | 21 |
| 2.4 | Research questions | 23 |
| 3 | Solution Spaces | 25 |
| 3.1 | Low-dimensional representation of high-dimensional Solution Spaces | 26 |
| 3.2 | Definitions | 27 |
| 3.2.1 | The (complete) Solution Space | 27 |
| 3.2.2 | Parametric vs. oracle functions and surrogates | 28 |
| 3.2.3 | The hull of a Solution Space | 29 |
| 3.2.4 | Size measure of a Solution Space | 29 |
| 3.2.5 | Loss of Solution Space | 30 |
| 3.2.6 | Linearity, monotonicity, convexity | 31 |
| 3.3 | Deriving Solution Space constraints from performance functions | 33 |
| 3.4 | Assessing sets regarding Solution Space constraints | 34 |
| 3.5 | Analytic test problems | 34 |
| 4 | Box-shaped Solution Spaces | 39 |
| 4.1 | Intervals as representation of high-dimensional Solution Spaces | 40 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 4.2 | General problem statement | 40 |
| 4.2.1 | Concept of inner and outer box | 41 |
| 4.2.2 | Assessing box-shaped sets regarding Solution Space constraints . . . | 41 |
| 4.3 | Loss of Solution Space | 47 |
| 4.4 | Review: Stochastic algorithm | 48 |
| 4.4.1 | Problem statement | 48 |
| 4.4.2 | Algorithm | 49 |
| 4.4.3 | Properties of the algorithm | 49 |
| 4.5 | Tracking the vertexes of a box: Linearly constrained Solution Spaces . . . | 52 |
| 4.5.1 | Problem statement | 52 |
| 4.5.2 | Implementation | 56 |
| 4.5.3 | Numerical results | 57 |
| 4.6 | Tracking the vertexes of a box: Nonlinearly constrained Solution Spaces . . | 59 |
| 4.6.1 | Problem statement | 59 |
| 4.6.2 | Implementation | 61 |
| 4.6.3 | Numerical results | 62 |
| 4.7 | Modifications of the optimization problem | 65 |
| 4.7.1 | Implementation | 65 |
| 4.7.2 | Numerical results | 66 |
| 5 | Two-dimensional decomposition of Solution Spaces | 69 |
| 5.1 | 2d-spaces as representation of high-dimensional Solution Spaces | 70 |
| 5.2 | General problem statement | 70 |
| 5.3 | Underlying idea | 72 |
| 5.4 | Tracking the vertexes of a polytope | 75 |
| 5.4.1 | Assessing polytope-shaped sets regarding Solution Space constraints | 75 |
| 5.4.2 | Problem statement | 77 |
| 5.4.3 | Implementation | 81 |
| 5.4.4 | Numerical results | 82 |
| 5.5 | Decomposing Solution Space constraints | 85 |
| 5.5.1 | Problem statement | 85 |
| 5.5.2 | Implementation | 89 |
| 5.5.3 | Numerical results | 92 |
| 6 | Comparison of the approaches | 95 |
| 6.1 | Properties of the underlying optimization problems | 96 |
| 6.2 | Numerical effort | 98 |
| 6.2.1 | Box-shaped Solution Spaces: Tracking vertexes of a box vs. the stochastic Solution Space algorithm | 99 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 6.2.2 | 2d-spaces: Tracking vertexes of a polytope vs. decomposing Solution Space constraints | 103 |
| 6.2.3 | Box-shaped Solution Spaces vs. 2d-spaces | 104 |
| 6.3 | Gain of Solution Space | 104 |
| 7 | Application | 107 |
| 7.1 | Chassis design in an early design stage | 108 |
| 7.1.1 | Design variables and vehicle parameters | 108 |
| 7.1.2 | Performance measures | 109 |
| 7.1.3 | Physical relations between design variables and performance measures | 111 |
| 7.1.4 | Physical simulation model and mathematical surrogates | 112 |
| 7.1.5 | Technical questions | 115 |
| 7.2 | Numerical results of Example One (single vehicles) | 118 |
| 7.3 | Numerical results of Example Two (set of vehicles) | 123 |
| 8 | Critical reflection | 131 |
| 9 | Conclusion | 135 |
| A | Optimization | 141 |
| A.1 | Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions for constrained optimization problems . . . | 141 |
| A.2 | Fundamentals of interior-point algorithms and pattern search | 143 |
| A.2.1 | Interior-point | 143 |
| A.2.2 | Pattern search | 144 |
| A.3 | Number of optimization parameters, optimization constraints and derivatives | 147 |
| B | Numerical results | 151 |
| B.1 | Classification measures | 151 |
| B.2 | Parametric surrogate models | 152 |
| B.3 | Monotonicity | 153 |
| B.4 | Numerical details of the stochastic Solution Space algorithm | 158 |
| B.5 | Computer specifications | 160 |
| | Glossary | 169 |