

Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning

Guiding question

Concrete → interfaces → measurement → calculation → failure → recovery.

Course map

The real phenomenon → Vocabulary and problem boundary → Course-specific system view → Mathematical relationship and reading the symbols → Worked calculations and interpretation

1 — The real phenomenon

Expansion adds volume, crew, power, heat, water, data, mobility and maintenance. Each new capability must be integrated in stages: prepared interfaces, unloaded tests, energization, verification, progressive loading and acceptance criteria. Modularity reduces change cost only if interface standards are actually maintained.

The guiding question is: How do we add a new district without destabilizing what already works? Reasoning starts with the physical or operational function before introducing the mathematical relationship. The goal is not to accumulate terminology, but to know which quantity changes, why it changes and what becomes hazardous when it leaves its domain. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the first task here is therefore to identify the mechanism specific to this subject before searching for an equation or reference value.

2 — Vocabulary and problem boundary

In “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, distinguish the phenomenon, available measurement, any command, the margin and the success criterion. The calculation boundary states what is included and excluded; without that boundary, a percentage, mass or time may be mathematically correct but wrong as an engineering conclusion. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the chosen boundary also states what would otherwise be double-counted or omitted from a mission budget.

distance, network flow, power, pressurized volume, travel time, interface state and backup capacity
broken line, blocked logistics route, isolated zone, incompatible interface or backup capacity concentrated in the same location

layout mockups, segmented-network testing, rover campaigns and reconfiguration exercises

Equation - evidence - decision

Marge = capacité – besoin

Failure to test: The reference failure is not a vague “broken component.” For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, test in particular broken line, blocked logistics route, isolated zone, incompatible interface or backup capacity concentrated in the same location. Diagnosis asks which symptoms appear first, which are only consequences and which action preserves the most options.

Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning

3 — Course-specific system view

This lesson does not reuse one generic picture for every subject. The system view follows cause → measured quantity → decision or physical response → limit for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”. The English text remains fully equivalent while large translated illustrations are intentionally deferred until their dedicated artwork is supplied. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the system view must expose inputs, outputs, measured quantity and the consequence of drift without relying on a generic module diagram.

4 — Mathematical relationship and reading the symbols

Read aloud : margin equals available capacity minus required demand.

Before substituting numbers, write the unit of every term, state whether the relationship is a physical law, approximation or project indicator, and check dimensional consistency. This is especially important here because “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning” combines quantities that do not all have the same evidence status. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, this relationship is chosen because of the phenomenon under study; a different dominant quantity would require a different equation or model.

5 — Worked calculations and interpretation

180 kW – 145 kW = 35 kW margin

900 L/day – 760 L/day = 140 L/day margin

8 people → 12 people = +50% crew size

1. 1. Power 180 kW – 145 kW = 35 kW margin Interpretation: this result is used only after comparison with units, margin and the scenario boundary for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”.
2. 2. Water 900 L/day – 760 L/day = 140 L/day margin Interpretation: this result is used only after comparison with units, margin and the scenario boundary for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”.
3. 3. Growth 8 people → 12 people = +50% crew size Interpretation: this result is used only after comparison with units, margin and the scenario boundary for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”.

6 — What the formula does not contain

Operational table

Phenomena / sections:	3 — Course-specific system view ; 4 — Mathematical relationship and reading the symbols ; 5 — Worked calculations and interpretation
Relationship to revisit:	Marge = capacité – besoin
Expected decision:	measure → compare with margin → choose nominal, degraded or stop

Check before continuing

Explain without rereading: 3 — Course-specific system view ; 4 — Mathematical relationship and reading the symbols ; 5 — Worked calculations and interpretation. State one measured quantity, one margin and one possible decision.

Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning

The relationship “Marge = capacité – besoin” does not by itself contain all of “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”. It does not automatically tell us whether a sensor is valid, a structure is aging, a resource is accessible, a command arrives in time or a secondary failure removes margin. The example 180 kW – 145 kW = 35 kW margin therefore remains a local calculation rather than a complete architecture.

To make the model useful, explicitly add the quantities that dominate this subject: distance, network flow, power, pressurized volume, travel time, interface state and backup capacity. We can then ask which variation truly changes the result, which is negligible and which forces an architectural change. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, this model limitation states exactly what a correct calculation still cannot establish about the real system.

7 — Instrumentation, observability and data quality

For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, observability relies on distance, network flow, power, pressurized volume, travel time, interface state and backup capacity. Each datum has a unit, acquisition rate, uncertainty, timestamp and validity domain. A value arriving without context can be more dangerous than no measurement because it creates unjustified confidence.

Consistency is checked with at least one independent piece of information when the function is critical. A trend, physical balance or second measurement principle helps distinguish a real system change from a drifting sensor. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the selected instrumentation must distinguish a real physical change from sensor drift or a bad state estimate.

8 — Phenomenon-specific failures and recovery

The reference failure is not a vague “broken component.” For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, test in particular broken line, blocked logistics route, isolated zone, incompatible interface or backup capacity concentrated in the same location. Diagnosis asks which symptoms appear first, which are only consequences and which action preserves the most options.

The degraded mode must be defined before failure: minimum function, allowable duration, consumed stock, crew action, abort condition and return-to-nominal criterion. That sequence is topic-specific and cannot be replaced by one universal paragraph about redundancy. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the degraded mode is defined around the minimum function specific to this subject, with an abort threshold and a return-to-nominal condition.

Operational table

Phenomena / sections:	7 — Instrumentation, observability and data quality ; 8 — Phenomenon-specific failures and recovery
Relationship to revisit:	Marge = capacité – besoin
Expected decision:	measure → compare with margin → choose nominal, degraded or stop

Check before continuing

Explain without rereading: 7 — Instrumentation, observability and data quality ; 8 — Phenomenon-specific failures and recovery. State one measured quantity, one margin and one possible decision.

Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning

9 — NASA / reference case

The operational case is treated as a production or service chain: input resource, machine, intermediate storage, quality control, maintenance and final user. NASA ISRU, autonomy and manufacturing work helps separate a technology demonstration from a truly available Mars industrial capability.

The case is used only within what it actually demonstrates. Flight measurement, human-system standard, component test and architecture study are different kinds of evidence; the text therefore states what is observed, calculated, simulated or still prospective. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the cited NASA case is used as targeted evidence for this phenomenon and is never turned into one universal Mars architecture.

10 — Architecture trade

A good solution for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning” does not maximize one metric. Compare nominal performance, mass, energy, simplicity, maintenance, crew time, common dependencies and recoverability. An option that improves 900 L/day – 760 L/day = 140 L/day margin can still be rejected if it makes failure detection or repair much harder.

The trade is recorded together with its assumptions. If environment data, mass or mission cadence changes, we know which conclusions must be recomputed instead of silently preserving an obsolete choice. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the trade is evaluated against the interfaces actually touched by this subject rather than a generic list of desirable qualities.

11 — Demonstration, testing and success criteria

The evidence strategy for “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning” combines layout mockups, segmented-network testing, rover campaigns and reconfiguration exercises. Every test records exact hardware, software, configuration, environment, tolerances and success criterion. A successful demonstration outside the mission domain does not replace qualification inside it.

Evidence grows by levels: analytical relationship, simulation, component, subsystem, integrated system, duration and failure. This hierarchy prevents one spectacular test from being presented as validation of the whole mission. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, demonstration must reproduce the constraints that make this phenomenon difficult; a spectacular test outside the mission domain is insufficient.

Operational table

Phenomena / sections:	9 — NASA / reference case ; 10 — Architecture trade ; 11 — Demonstration, testing and success criteria
Relationship to revisit:	Marge = capacité – besoin
Expected decision:	measure → compare with margin → choose nominal, degraded or stop

Check before continuing

Explain without rereading: 9 — NASA / reference case ; 10 — Architecture trade ; 11 — Demonstration, testing and success criteria. State one measured quantity, one margin and one possible decision.

Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning

12 — Decision exercise

Situation: revisit “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning” with a 20% increase in the most penalizing quantity from the first worked example while one measurement or backup path is unavailable.

Situation: revisit “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning” with a 20% increase in the most penalizing quantity from the first worked example while one measurement or backup path is unavailable. Expected answer: recompute the relationship, identify remaining margin, check whether observability is still adequate, and decide whether degraded operation remains acceptable. Multiplying by 1.2 is not enough if the variation also changes interfaces or limits.

13 — What to retain without over-generalizing

14 — Topic-specific primary sources

These references directly document the phenomenon, technology or human constraint addressed in this lesson. They do not by themselves define an official Mars architecture. For “Growing the base: modularity, interfaces and commissioning”, the bibliography is deliberately targeted to this page so that readers can trace each claim back to the relevant primary document.

Topic-specific primary sources

NASA — Systems Engineering Handbook - <https://www.nasa.gov/reference/systems-engineering-handbook/>
NASA TechPort — NASA Platform for Autonomous Systems - <https://techport.nasa.gov/projects/94884>
NASA-STD-8729.1A — Reliability and Maintainability Standard - <https://standards.nasa.gov/standard/NASA/NASA-STD-87291>

Operational table

Phenomena / sections:	12 — Decision exercise ; 13 — What to retain without over-generalizing ; 14 — Topic-specific primary sources
Relationship to revisit:	Marge = capacité – besoin
Expected decision:	measure → compare with margin → choose nominal, degraded or stop

Check before continuing

Explain without rereading: 12 — Decision exercise ; 13 — What to retain without over-generalizing ; 14 — Topic-specific primary sources. State one measured quantity, one margin and one possible decision.