Deliverable 5 Review: Final Concept and Model

Team GM2





Agenda

□ Mission statement review

Customer needs

- Market focus
- Customer needs
- Design tradeoffs

Concept sketch

□ Prototype

□Q&A

Mission Statement Review

Primary Market	 Current and future Cadillac SRX customers with rear- seat passengers
	 Customers with children
	 Business customers (e.g. corporate-owned vehicles)
Secondary Market	 Future customers of other Cadillac vehicles
	 Deville, Escalade, and others
Assumptions & Constraints	 The tray table will be installed by the dealer
	The tray table will be <u>safe</u>
	 The design will maintain or enhance <u>Cadillac styling</u>

Stakeholders (Cadillac brand, dealers, etc.) and business goals (differentiate from competition, serve market size of 200,00 units) have not changed.

Market Focus and Customer Needs



Several concepts were generated to balance customer needs AND constraints.

Safety		
Comfortable and easy to operate	AND	Protects passengers from injury during collision or hard braking
Installation		
Enhances interior of car	AND	Can be installed at the dealer without major modifications
Cost		
Meets high Cadillac standards	AND	Can be purchased and installed for ~\$400.00
Personalized fit		
Adjustable to fit a small child	AND	The occasional business traveler

Design tradeoffs focused efforts on three concepts*.



*Other concepts considered are shown in the Appendix.

Further input from customers and GM led us to a single concept.



The table mount folds into the rear arm rest.



Although we follow a structured process, we are still receiving data and feedback that may cause iteration.



Next steps and challenges are focused on detailed design and development of an alpha prototype.

Complete Assembly Drawings

Complete Materials & Component Selection

Build Alpha Prototype and Test

Complete Financial Model

Present & Demonstrate Final Product

Questions?



"GM's future success will depend on our ability to develop and rev up new engines for growth. That means ... delighting our customers with innovations the competition doesn't have."

G. Richard Wagoner, Jr.

Process Comments

Process Reflection

 The major reasoning was the lack of knowledge of the team regarding the structure of the rear-seat passenger surroundings. Since we didn't have access to detailed drawings of the seats and passenger areas, as well as the physical seats, the design which allows the least interference with the existing structures was most appealing.

We were advised by the Cadillac dealers and Lear engineers that the rear-armrest would be easy to remove and replace. Considering all these factors, the team decided to pursue the rear-armrest idea.

 We came up with 2 rather promising final concepts. One would be categorized as more technologically innovative and a more integral design. The other would be categorized as more technologically conservative – yet more robust in its implementation. Ideally, we would have created mock-ups and even prototypes for both. This experimentation would've helped us get a better "feel" for the potential product, and enabled us to collect user opinions. However, due to the time restrictions we are under, we decided to go with the "safer" design – that is – the one we were more confident we could implement in practice.

Group Meeting – 3/8/2004

- The team reviewed the results of concept selection matrix, from which 2 general design ideas stood out. The first was the rear-armrest location and the second was the back of the front seats.
- A decision was made to pursue the rear-armrest location (see process comments above).

Group Meeting - 3/11/2004

• Team members brought to the table more concept ideas they had generated for the rear-armrest. These were discussed, and it was decided that an additional meeting was needed to finalize a concept decision. For this meeting some promising designs would be drawn and described in higher detail.

Group Meeting – 3/13/2004 – Final Concept Generation

• Two final concepts were analyzed in greater detail, and the merits of each were discussed at length. The team converged and agreed on a single final concept. Drawings and descriptions were to be generated.

Advisor Meeting – 3/16/2004

 On March 15th Amber and Lane met with Professor Whitney to discuss the status of our current concept. He was impressed with the engineering nature of or design, but was curious on how we plan to make it ascetically pleasing. He also had some concern on the safety aspect of keeping tray tables in front seat map pocket. These concerns were passed on to members of the team. MIT OpenCourseWare https://ocw.mit.edu

15.783J / 2.739J Product Design and Development Spring 2006

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: https://ocw.mit.edu/terms.