

# InSight

A Brief History of the  
Development and Acceptance of  
a “Build-to-Print” Parachute




Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
California Institute of Technology



Devin Kipp<sup>‡</sup> and Dave Buecher<sup>†</sup>

<sup>‡</sup> Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology  
<sup>†</sup> Lockheed Martin Space Systems


Acknowledgements: Al Witkowski, Jerry Rowan, Pioneer Aerospace Corp.



*“the parachute is identical [to PHX]” – InSight Step 2 Proposal*




# Parachute Plan



Initial plan:

- “*identical*” = *design, materials, construction, test program, etc...*
- Include healthy schedule margin to accommodate any setbacks during development and test

# Parachute Plan, Revision 2 (Requirements Creep)





Design load increase has minor impacts to parachute design:

- Strengthen suspension lines: Kevlar → Technora w/hybrid joints
- No changes to other materials → slight reduction in structural margins


Test venue change enables test campaign improvements:

- Better control/repeatability of test conditions
- Better instrumentation and video of deployment/inflation






# Parachute Plan, Revision 3 (SFDT #1 Response)




## Incorporated multiple lessons learned:

- Sensitivity to dimensional variation
  - Augmented inspection, some re-work
  - Augmented LS-DYNA analysis
- Supersonic inflation stress > subsonic inflation stress
  - Augmented NFAC testing to include higher loads



# Parachute Plan, Revision 4 (Parachute Twist)




Discovered previously unobserved twisting phenomenon in NFAC:

- Confirmed that twisting is linked to parachute packing method
- Developed alternate packing method which eliminated twist
- Performed 'fly-off' of parachutes packed using both methods





# Parachute Plan, Revision 5 (SFDT #2 Response)




## Closely followed post-flight investigation:

- InSight parachute already built and qualified, so limited ability to react
- All findings and recommendations could be reasonably addressed by InSight with no additional activities

# Parachute Plan, Revision 6 (Launch Slip)




Feed-Through Encapsulation



Location of 3<sup>rd</sup> Leak




# Parachute Plan, Revision 7 (Broadcloth Heritage)



Discovered that InSight broadcloth nylon is not the same as heritage material:

- Identified different material response after exposure to high temperature / high duration DHMR
- Different vendor, different additives, different response to DHMR environment (PIA-7020 is a spec, not a recipe)
- Performed enhanced material testing to range of flight-like environments where we had leveraged heritage
- Demonstrated InSight environments do not result in reduced performance

# Parachute Plan, Revision 8 (ASPIRE SR1 and SR2)



Watched ASPIRE flights anxiously:

- Opportunity for new learning (e.g. risk discovery), but very limited time to react
- Some advance planning to prepare contingency options
- Two successful tests!



- Another case study exposing the fallacy of “build to print:”
  - Flight chute nearly identical in design and construction but..
    - Requirements creep impacted design, manufacturing, and test
    - Internal and external activities exposed multiple unknown unknowns
    - Heritage broadcloth material no longer available
- More time spent on unplanned activities than planned ones:
  - Why? Not many flights of supersonic parachutes (N≈20)
    - every new flight can expose unknown unknowns
    - any chute failure induces lots of questions
  - Initial schedule well margined to accommodate unplanned effort
- High confidence in InSight parachute:
  - Parachute broadcloth tested more extensively than any mission since Viking
  - Flight lot chute tested subsonically to >2x the flight limit load
  - Retain very strong heritage basis for successful supersonic deployment on Mars

