



CAN UNCLASSIFIED



DRDC | RDDC
technologysciencetechnologie

Understanding the trade-offs between protection, performance and integrated survivability

Linda L.M. Bossi
DRDC – Toronto Research Centre

Andrew Morton
Human Systems Incorporated

Adrienne Sy
Allan Keefe
Thomas Karakolis
DRDC – Toronto Research Centre

Monica Jones
University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute

Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport (JSAMS)
Volume 20, Supplement 2, November 2017
Page S139

Date of Publication from Ext Publisher: November 2017

Defence Research and Development Canada
External Literature (P)
DRDC-RDDC-2018-P063
April 2018

CAN UNCLASSIFIED

CAN UNCLASSIFIED

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVE STATEMENTS

This document was reviewed for Controlled Goods by Defence Research and Development Canada (DRDC) using the Schedule to the *Defence Production Act*.

Disclaimer: This document is not published by the Editorial Office of Defence Research and Development Canada, an agency of the Department of National Defence of Canada but is to be catalogued in the Canadian Defence Information System (CANDIS), the national repository for Defence S&T documents. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Department of National Defence) makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, of any kind whatsoever, and assumes no liability for the accuracy, reliability, completeness, currency or usefulness of any information, product, process or material included in this document. Nothing in this document should be interpreted as an endorsement for the specific use of any tool, technique or process examined in it. Any reliance on, or use of, any information, product, process or material included in this document is at the sole risk of the person so using it or relying on it. Canada does not assume any liability in respect of any damages or losses arising out of or in connection with the use of, or reliance on, any information, product, process or material included in this document.

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Department of National Defence), 2017

© Sa Majesté la Reine en droit du Canada (Ministère de la Défense nationale), 2017

CAN UNCLASSIFIED

237

Understanding the trade-offs between protection, performance and integrated survivability



Linda L.M. Bossi^{1,*}, Andrew Morton², Adrienne Sy¹, Allan Keefe¹, Thomas Karakolis¹, Monica Jones³

¹ Defence Research and Development Canada, Department of National Defence, Canada

² Human Systems Incorporated, Canada

³ University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute, USA

Introduction: Heavy load weights cost in terms of soldier performance. Few studies, however, have specifically examined the contribution of other Clothing and Individual Equipment (CIE) mass properties (e.g., bulk, stiffness). Canada is employing the standardized LEAP combat mobility course to understand the contributions of these CIE mass properties to soldier mobility decrements. Follow-on simulator studies that replicate soldier movement speeds and movement patterns under the same loads have enabled us to gather empirical data of soldier vulnerability to enemy fire under select scenarios. Results will inform the trade-space of protection versus performance and integrated survivability.

Methods: Twenty-four combat arms soldiers completed the LEAP course in three CIE configurations. LEAP completion time, load weight, clothed anthropometry (bulk) and range of motion (stiffness) data were gathered. Multivariate analyses evaluated the quantitative interaction between LEAP performance and mass properties, soldier characteristics and perception. A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to reduce the number of dependent variables used for a subsequent regression analysis. In the follow-on simulator study, 31 soldiers engaged human targets moving across gaps between points of cover at speeds representative of LEAP sprint speeds under various loads. Shooting performance and the relationships with target conditions were examined by collecting hit probabilities, distance and time to hit, radial error, shot location and number.

Results: From the LEAP study analysis, eight factors with an eigenvalue > 1 accounted for 86% of the total variance. Regression analyses showed that LEAP performance could be accounted for by the eight components. Load weight and torso bulk measures were both found to be strongly associated with relative LEAP performance. Stiffness measures were inversely associated with LEAP performance. Decrements in mobility translated to increased vulnerability in the simulator study, with the speed of target movement a significant main effect across all hit probabilities examined. Accuracy results show strong effects of both range and speed, as well as gap width. The effect of a speed-accuracy trade-off showed that faster moving targets are not only less likely to be hit but, when hit, they are hit less accurately.

Conclusions: Objective measures of mass properties (load weight, bulk volume, and stiffness) showed association with LEAP task performance. Knowledge about the interdependence between mass properties, soldier characteristics, combat mobility task performance and soldier susceptibility to enemy fire will influence the design of future modular scalable body armour, as well as decision

aids for their effective employment to improve integrated soldier survivability.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2017.09.509>

238

Agile usability product design assessment of warfighter worn robotics



K. Blake Mitchell

Natick Soldier Research, Development & Engineering Center (NSRDEC), United States

Introduction: While biomechanical assessments gather extensive objective data regarding the performance and design characteristics of wearable robotics, they can be timely, intensive, and costly. By modeling assessments after agile usability testing, design teams receive extensive system specific feedback in real time at relatively low costs. This methodology has been used for a variety of soft and rigid exoskeletons, load distribution devices, and energy harvesters. Additionally, it has been used for cooling garments, chemical biological ensembles, duty uniforms, and packs.

Methods: Agile assessments can be executed early in the design process, requiring only a single prototype. Typically 3–5 participants are assessed individually, performing a variety of basic mobility and mission tasks. Donning, doffing, adjustability, compatibility, ease of use, impact on mission performance, mobility, acceptability and fit are key metrics. Specific activities are customized to focus on the individual test item. For example, in the case of a knee energy harvester, activities focus on tasks related to knee mobility (high steps, stair climbing, taking a knee, squatting, sitting on the ground, aiming a weapon in the kneeling posture, etc.). The majority of the findings are focused on observations from the test team and discussions with participants. A less rigid assessment structure allows for flexibility in test activities and lines of investigation not previously identified. Findings lead to identifying necessary critical design changes early in the development and acquisition process, without incurring significant costs or resources.

Results: Written summaries of the activities and findings are provided to the product team and provide project and design documentation. However, by integrating the team into the assessment, project officers, designers and engineers are able to see and hear warfighter feedback firsthand, thereby allowing the team to leave at the end of the day with an understanding of issues with the current prototype and ideas for how to fix them. This allows for more agility in the design process, where issues can be identified early and design changes can be quickly implemented. This method allows multiple assessments and design iterations of a test item to be placed on warfighters within a shorter amount of time, reducing the number and severity of potential issues warfighters experience in larger, more costly field evaluations and when eventually fielded.

Conclusions: In summary, this method has proven beneficial in identifying gross form, fit and function issues related to warfighter worn robotics while providing immediate feedback for the team to continue their iterative design process.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2017.09.510>

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

*Security markings for the title, authors, abstract and keywords must be entered when the document is sensitive

1. ORIGINATOR (Name and address of the organization preparing the document. A DRDC Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, is entered in Section 8.) Elsevier B.V. Registered Office Radarweg 29, 1043 NX Amsterdam The Netherlands		2a. SECURITY MARKING (Overall security marking of the document including special supplemental markings if applicable.) CAN UNCLASSIFIED	
		2b. CONTROLLED GOODS NON-CONTROLLED GOODS DMC A	
3. TITLE (The document title and sub-title as indicated on the title page.) Understanding the trade-offs between protection, performance and integrated survivability			
4. AUTHORS (last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc., not to be used) Bossi, L.L.M.; Morton, A.; Sy, A.; Keefe, A.; Karakolis, T.; Jones, M.			
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) November 2017	6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total pages, including Annexes, excluding DCD, covering and verso pages.) 1	6b. NO. OF REFS (Total references cited.) 0	
7. DOCUMENT CATEGORY (e.g., Scientific Report, Contract Report, Scientific Letter.) External Literature (P)			
8. SPONSORING CENTRE (The name and address of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development.) DRDC – Toronto Research Centre Defence Research and Development Canada 1133 Sheppard Avenue West P.O. Box 2000 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9 Canada			
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.)		9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.)	
10a. DRDC PUBLICATION NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) DRDC-RDDC-2018-P063		10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.)	
11a. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION WITHIN CANADA (Approval for further dissemination of the document. Security classification must also be considered.) Public release			
11b. FUTURE DISTRIBUTION OUTSIDE CANADA (Approval for further dissemination of the document. Security classification must also be considered.)			

12. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (Use semi-colon as a delimiter.)

Dismounted soldier; protection; soldier equipment; mobility; vulnerability; integrated survivability

13. ABSTRACT/RESUME (When available in the document, the French version of the abstract must be included here.)

Heavy load weights cost in terms of soldier performance. Few studies, however, have specifically examined the contribution of other Clothing and Individual Equipment (CIE) mass properties (e.g., bulk, stiffness). Canada is employing the standardized LEAP combat mobility course to understand the contributions of these CIE mass properties to soldier mobility decrements. Follow-on simulator studies that replicate soldier movement speeds and movement patterns under the same loads have enabled us to gather empirical data of soldier vulnerability to enemy fire under select scenarios. Results will inform the trade-space of protection versus performance and integrated survivability.