

# Additive Versus Traditional Manufacturing: A Techno-Economic Analysis of Printed Circuit Boards and Pistons

A Major Qualifying Project  
submitted to the faculty of  
WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Science.

By  
Matthew Adams  
Cheyenne Day



Faculty Advisor: Adam Powell  
Assistant Advisor: Sneha Narra  
Submitted: 4/28/22

*This report represents the work of WPI undergraduate students submitted to the faculty as evidence of completion of a degree requirement. WPI routinely publishes these reports on its website without editorial or peer review. For more information about the projects program at WPI, please see <http://www.wpi.edu/academics/ugradstudies/project-learning.html>*

## Table of Authorship

<b>Section Title</b>	<b>Primary Author</b>	<b>Page</b>
Abstract	Cheyenne	7
1.0 Introduction	Cheyenne	7
2.0 Background	Cheyenne	9
2.1 Traditional Manufacturing	Cheyenne	9
2.2 Additive Manufacturing	Matt	11
2.3 Electronic Industry	Cheyenne	12
2.4 Automotive Industry	Matt	15
3.0 Methodology	Cheyenne	17
3.1 Case Study 1 Approach: PCBs	Cheyenne	17
3.1.1 PCB Cost Model	Cheyenne	20
3.1.2 PCB Life Cycle Analysis	Cheyenne	22
3.2 Case Study 2 Approach: Piston	Cheyenne	25
3.2.1 Piston Cost Model	Matt	25
3.2.2 Piston Life Cycle Analysis	Matt	25
4.0 Results and Analyses	Cheyenne	26
4.1 Resulting PCB Cost Models	Cheyenne	26
4.1.1 Traditional PCB Cost Model	Cheyenne	26
4.1.2 Additive PCB Cost Model	Cheyenne	29
4.1.3 PCB Cost Model Comparison	Cheyenne	32
4.2 Resulting PCB Life Cycle Analyses	Cheyenne	33
4.3 Resulting Piston Cost Model	Matt	39
4.4 Resulting Piston Life Cycle Analysis	Matt	39
5.0 Impacts	Cheyenne	39

5.1 Engineering Ethics	Cheyenne	40
5.2 Societal and Global Impact	Cheyenne	40
5.3 Environmental Impact	Cheyenne	41
5.4 Codes and Standards	Cheyenne	41
5.5 Economic Factors	Cheyenne	42
6.0 Conclusion	Cheyenne	42
6.1 Concluding Remarks: PCB Case Study	Cheyenne	43
6.2 Concluding Remarks: Piston Case Study	Matt	45
References	Cheyenne & Matt	46

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	7
<b>2.0 Background</b>	9
2.1 Traditional Manufacturing	9
2.2 Additive Manufacturing	11
2.3 Electronic Industry	12
2.4 Automotive Industry	15
<b>3.0 Methodology</b>	17
3.1 Case Study 1 Approach: PCBs	17
3.1.1 PCB Cost Model	20
3.1.2 PCB Life Cycle Analysis	22
3.2 Case Study 2 Approach: Piston	25
3.2.1 Piston Cost Model	25
3.2.2 Piston Life Cycle Analysis	25
<b>4.0 Results and Analyses</b>	26
4.1 Resulting PCB Cost Models	26
4.1.1 Traditional PCB Cost Model	26
4.1.2 Additive PCB Cost Model	29
4.1.3 PCB Cost Model Comparison	32
4.2 Resulting PCB Life Cycle Analyses	33
4.3 Resulting Piston Cost Model	39
4.4 Resulting Piston Life Cycle Analysis	39
<b>5.0 Impacts</b>	39
5.1 Engineering Ethics	40
5.2 Societal and Global Impact	40
5.3 Environmental Impact	41

	4
5.4 Codes and Standards	41
5.5 Economic Factors	42
<b>6.0 Conclusion</b>	42
6.1 Concluding Remarks: PCB Case Study	43
6.2 Concluding Remarks: Piston Case Study	45
<b>References</b>	46

**List of Figures**

<b>Figure 1:</b> <i>Traditional vs Additive Manufacturing Methods: PCB</i>	14
<b>Figure 2:</b> <i>Excess Aluminum Powder in Piston Fabrication</i>	15
<b>Figure 3:</b> <i>Chosen PCB Model Rendition</i>	19
<b>Figure 4:</b> <i>Nano Dimension's PCB Specifics for their Life Cycle Analysis</i>	24
<b>Figure 5:</b> <i>Life Cycle Analysis conducted by Nano Dimension</i>	36
<b>Figure 6:</b> <i>Potential Savings by using Additive Manufacturing</i>	37
<b>Figure 7:</b> <i>Our PCB design manufactured by JLCPCB</i>	38
<b>Figure 8:</b> <i>Our PCB design manufactured by Nano Dimension</i>	38

**List of Tables**

<b>Table 1:</b> <i>Chosen PCB Drilling Information</i>	19
<b>Table 2:</b> <i>Chosen PCB Specifications</i>	19
<b>Table 3:</b> <i>PCB Cost Centers</i>	21
<b>Table 4:</b> <i>JLCPCB Quote</i>	27
<b>Table 5:</b> <i>ALLPCB Quote</i>	27
<b>Table 6:</b> <i>PE Electronics Quote</i>	28
<b>Table 7:</b> <i>Cost of Electricity Through Traditional Means</i>	29
<b>Table 8:</b> <i>Nano Dimension Quote</i>	30
<b>Table 9:</b> <i>Cost of Electricity Through Additive Means</i>	31
<b>Table 10:</b> <i>Cost Comparison Between JLC PCB and Nano Dimension</i>	32
<b>Table 11:</b> <i>PCB Traditional Manufacturing Inputs and Outputs</i>	33

## **Abstract**

Our project aims to compare the practicality and efficiency of additive manufacturing versus traditional manufacturing in select industries. Our report mainly focuses on the electronic and automotive manufacturing industries and includes a techno-economic assessment for each. These analyses are separated into two case studies. Our first case study is of printed circuit boards and our second is Porsche pistons. Each study focuses on a chosen part in one of the two industries, and includes life cycle analyses and cost analyses for both manufacturing methods during their typical operation. Our project aims to provide insight to both manufacturers and consumers by assessing and comparing both types of manufacturing.

## **1.0 Introduction**

Manufacturing industries are the backbone of our economy. They take raw resources and process, prepare, and fabricate the different materials until the desired product is achieved. Manufacturing industries are divided among sectors, some of which include food, electronics, transportation, metals, plastics, and textiles. Oftentimes industries are interconnected and supply their finished products as intermediate products in other industries. Products can be made by either traditional or additive manufacturing. Traditional manufacturing, also sometimes called subtractive manufacturing, can take the form of a block of material fixed at a particular point, where small chips of the material are then removed over time to make the desired product. It can also take the form of a melted material that is then processed and cooled to retain a new shape. These processes differ from additive manufacturing, in which material is added over time to make the desired product.



Everything has an associated cost, which is an important factor to consider in manufacturing. To determine the most cost effective design and manufacturing method, it can be beneficial to utilize cost models. These models use formulas, equations or functions to measure and estimate the amount of time, effort, raw materials, and money used to create a product or deliver a service. Cost models can provide useful insight when it is not possible for detailed and exact costs to be outlined.

Every product or service also affects the environment in some way. A life cycle analysis is a method of measuring that impact over the course of a product's entire life cycle, starting with the resources used to manufacture each part up until the product's end of life. It takes into account environmental impacts such as energy, fuel, emissions, and waste products, and allows others to compare end products, production methods, and the materials used to create them. This information allows manufacturers to choose a design and manufacturing process most beneficial to them and the environment. The life cycle analysis is a crucial part of determining a product's overall carbon footprint. The software OpenLCA utilizes numerous databases to numerous categories of information on materials. It claims to be the world's leading software for life cycle assessment, and is free to use. We were able to use this program to find information regarding the environmental factors for different materials. This data was then used for our life cycle analyses in each case study.

Our project aims to compare the practicality and efficiency of additive manufacturing versus traditional manufacturing in select industries. Our proposal will focus mainly on the electronic and automotive manufacturing industries and will include a techno-economic assessment for each. These analyses will take the form of a case study focused on life cycle

analyses and cost analyses for a chosen part in those industries. Our aim is to provide insight by assessing and comparing both types of manufacturing during typical operation.

## **2.0 Background**

Although essential, manufacturing has some disadvantages. High energy consumption, emissions from transportation and production, hazardous waste products, and a large carbon footprint are a few of the negative effects manufacturing has on the environment. The type of manufacturing method used and whether it was by traditional or additive means, influences the quality of product production and its resulting carbon footprint.

### **2.1 Traditional Manufacturing**

The first manufacturing method we will discuss is the most common, traditional manufacturing. There are several standard processes that include: CNC machining, casting, forging, plastic forming, plastic joining, and injection molding. Typically, portions from a raw block of material are removed to create the end product or a cast is used to mold a molten material. Surface finishes can also be applied after the part is produced to add, alter, remove, or reshape the material. This can be very beneficial, as it can improve material strength and alter other properties, or be utilized to simply change the products aesthetic appearance.

In CNC machining, a material is secured to the machine while a numerically controlled tool travels along a computer generated path to remove material and create the part. This can be done by drilling, turning, or milling, and almost any material can be placed into the machine. CNC machining has a high tolerance to make very accurate parts, but it cannot create internal features or undercuts. Due to this fact, it is typically used for prototyping and for making engine and machine components.

Casting is a method of forming a part that involves pouring molten metal into a mold. For die casting or permanent mold casting, the mold is an inversion of the end product that is normally machined out of a block of steel. Other forms of casting, such as sand casting and investment casting, use an expendable, non reusable mold that is then destroyed after the part is made. Casting allows for finer internal structures when compared to machining, as the molten metal forms to the shape of the container it is in.

Forging involves taking a block of raw material and heating it below its melting point. The material becomes soft, and it is repetitively impacted with a large force until it forms the desired shape. Forging has the benefit of increased strength compared to machined and cast parts.

Plastic forming encompasses all methods of forming plastics such as thermoforming, pressure forming, and vacuum forming. In each, a sheet of plastic is heated and placed over a mold, where pressure or a vacuum force is applied to form the sheet into the desired shape. Only one side of the plastic can be fitted to the mold, as forming is a one sided process.

Plastic joining is between two semi-finished parts by welding, bonding, using adhesive, or fastening them together. The process used is dependent on the semi-finished part's shape and how they were made. Plastic joining is a very time consuming process that can also be very costly in labor.

Injection molding involves softening a plastic material and injecting it into a mold. Once the plastic cools and solidifies, the piece is then ejected from the mold as a finished part. This process is typically used for plastic materials, but it can be used for others as well to create a high quality surface. Injection molding is primarily for manufacturing a large number of parts in a series, as the startup cost for injection molding is very high.

## 2.2 Additive Manufacturing

The other type of manufacturing process is additive manufacturing. It is a much more recently developed form of manufacturing, and is still evolving. Instead of using tools to remove material from stock, additive manufacturing essentially starts from nothing and builds the part by adding small amounts of material in layers. Additive manufacturing can take form in a few different methods depending on the materials being used and the desired structure of the part.

The most common form of additive manufacturing is material extrusion of plastics such as PLA, ABS, Nylon, and PETG. This method is extremely prevalent in the recreational and small business section of the market due to the ease of use of the machines and low entry cost. These machines start off very basic and can scale greatly to include larger print sizes, increased speed, increased precision, and multiple different filaments for different colored parts as well as dissolvable supports.

Other methods of additive manufacturing include powder-bed fusion, direct energy deposition, sheet lamination, binder jetting, material jetting and vat photopolymerization. These methods can roughly be separated into four different types. Sheet lamination involves cutting individual layers and laying them on top of each other. This differs from direct energy deposition, material jetting, and material extrusion where the material that the part is made of is deposited onto the build tray. The final grouping includes powder-bed fusion, binder jetting, and vat polymerization, where the material is in a pool or tray in the form of a powder or liquid, and the material is selectively solidified using different methods such as binders and lasers (*The 7 Categories of Additive Manufacturing*).

Additive manufacturing is on the rise, and it has already found a foothold in certain elements of production such as rapid prototyping. Different fields are currently experimenting

with AM technologies, some of which include 3D printed houses, organ creation, as well as electronics.

### **2.3 Electronic Industry**

Our first industry of interest is the electronic industry, which one could argue is one of the most valuable industries to our modern society. Most products have an electronic component to them and as time goes on, devices and machines have gotten more complicated as technology has evolved. The electronic industry is constantly in high demand and rapidly changing. When the manufacturing of electronic components is interrupted, it can cause a domino effect of shortages of items and machines dependent on those components. This can vastly inflate prices and extend delivery times for all kinds of products. So how can one guarantee the smooth operation of the electronic industry to ensure the timely manufacturing of items in today's day and age?


For one, the additive manufacturing of electronic components is generally faster, more precise and more lightweight compared to traditional methods. It utilizes multi-material 3D printing to create products, typically with an electrically conductive material and isolating material. This simultaneous printing of both materials is the key to printing a functional electronic component. Additive manufacturing can also create complex geometries that were previously unattainable with traditional manufacturing and shorten the product's developmental life cycle. However, the additive manufacturing of electronic components is costly and still a new technology. This factor can drive many companies away, preferring to stick to traditional manufacturing methods instead and make a greater profit (*xponentialworks.com*).

Our first case study will analyze the manufacturing of a printed circuit board (PCB). These important little boards provide the mechanical support for a circuit as well as the electrical

connections. PCBs are fabricated through batch processes and are custom made to order. We chose this part due to its importance in the electronic industry as the base for most electronic components, and because of the abundance of information online regarding its manufacturing process. Many articles speculate the best way to create them, whether by additive or traditional methods, however none provide case studies with tables or data to compare their performance. In our paper, we focused on exactly that.

Starting with the traditional manufacturing process of a printed circuit board, a dielectric substrate, typically glass reinforced epoxy, is laminated and both sides are bound by copper foil through a machining and lamination process. Resists are placed in a specific pattern to protect the material under it, where lithography then uses multiple chemicals to create the desired circuit patterns on the copper foil. Chemical etching then removes some of the copper to form circuit traces (*Dong, Y., Bao, C., & Kim, W. S., (2018)*). This process uses a large amount of energy and is very chemically intensive, using wet chemicals that can be harmful to the environment.

**Figure 1:** *Traditional vs Additive Manufacturing Methods: PCB*



*Note.* From left to right respectively, this image shows a simplified version of the traditional and additive manufacturing methods of a printed circuit board. Each manufacturing process can be broken down into three main steps (*Dong, Y., (2018)*).

The additive manufacturing process begins with a 3D model containing information about the object's surfaces. This information then undergoes a digital slicing procedure to create a successive sequence of 2D cross-sectional layers of the object. This code can be recognized and followed by a 3D printing platform to create the desired 3D object. For a printed circuit board, the dielectric substrate serves as a base, where circuit traces are then deposited as a reconstructed 2D layer (*Dong, Y., (2018)*). Nano Dimension, an additive manufacturing company focused on electronic components, recently utilized multi-layer PCB circuit manufacturing in order to reduce the time from creating a PCB design to creating a prototype. They were also able

to create an additively manufactured integrated circuit with four layers in just 25 hours, and 16 of these boards in 100 hours (*Capabilities & Use Cases. Nano Dimension*).

## 2.4 Automotive Industry

Our second industry of interest is automotive. Transportation is an essential aspect of modern life, needed to get to work, school, stores, or to see family and friends. The automotive industry has been growing and evolving rapidly since its inception around 120 years ago. One of the most important aspects of designing and manufacturing automobiles is the tight margins and focus on reducing costs at every opportunity. Additive manufacturing is being touted as an integral part of current and future aspects of the automotive industry. With its current abilities and attributes however, additive manufacturing is not being used for large scale production of parts or for the assembly of mass produced consumer products (*M, A., (2020)*).

**Figure 2:** *Excess Aluminum Powder in Piston Fabrication*



*Note.* The above image shows excess aluminum powder being removed from the finished parts by a vacuum. It is then filtered and cleaned so the aluminum powder can be reused (*M, A.,*



(2020)). The energy used by the vacuum is something that should be considered for the piston's life cycle analysis.

Many companies are experimenting with the world of additive manufacturing. One of those companies is Volkswagen with its many subsidiary brands such as Audi and Porsche. Porsche has begun 3D printing things such as seat pads in different comfort levels for select models, as well as high performance pistons for the highest trim of their famous 911 sports car. These pistons have been designed to include geometries that are far too complex for traditional manufacturing. The weight of the pistons can be reduced by up to 20% and allow for the introduction of complex internal structures such as a cooling duct to reduce operating temperatures, therefore increasing its efficiency (*Page, I., (2020)*). These gains might be fairly small, but every gram counts when working with high performance automobiles such as the Porsche 911 GT2 RS.

The traditional methods of manufacturing pistons included casting and forging. Pistons made by casting are typically cheaper and used for producing large quantities for less powerful commuter cars. Forged pistons are typically much stronger and typically used in performance vehicles such as the Porsche 911 GT2 RS as they can withstand the higher forces that are present in engines using forced induction to create more power (*Cars Direct (2012)*).

The newer method of producing the pistons with additive manufacturing begins with a 3D modeled part. This model is created using a method called topological optimization that automatically determines where unnecessary material can be removed based on the stresses that the part will undergo. This often results in a design that looks unnatural in the eyes of traditional manufacturing, but it can often look like something produced in nature. After the model is

created, it is sent to a 3D printer that will then use lasers in a method called powder bed fusion to weld the aluminum powder together layer by layer. Porsche even uses a proprietary aluminum alloy for these pistons called M174+. The new production process, including the special aluminum alloy, creates a part that is 10% lighter and allows Porsche to squeeze 30 more horsepower from their engine (*Donut Media, (2021)*).

### **3.0 Methodology**


Our project has two main objectives: to create cost models and life cycle analyses for both the additive and traditional manufacturing of our two case studies. By comparing the cost models and life cycle analyses between the different manufacturing methods, we hope to gain a better understanding of which is the most efficient, cost effective, and ecological for the selected part.

#### **3.1 Case Study 1 Approach: PCBs**

For the traditional manufacturing of a printed circuit board, we contacted ten different companies. Some of these included Millennium Circuits Limited, PS Electronics, Hopewell Companies, and Gorilla Circuits. Millennium circuits extensively described the manufacturing process on their website and stated that they can supply both small and large batches of printed circuit boards. Upon multiple tries to contact the ten traditional manufacturing companies, they either did not express interest in working with us on this project or did not have the information we desired. Due to this, our information relies heavily on the data provided publicly on their company websites along with stated assumptions. We used three different websites to obtain our traditional manufacturing quotes: JLCPCB, ALLPCB, and PS Electronics.

For additive manufacturing, we were only able to identify and contact two companies, Nano Dimension and Optomec. The company Nano Dimension is the leading manufacturer of industrial 3D printers for additively manufactured electronics (AMEs), whereas Optomec is solely a company that sells AME printers. Upon contacting Optomec, they stated that they could not provide data for the information that we sought, as they only sold AME printers and did not manufacture PCBs on site. After contacting the AME company Nano Dimension, they expressed interest in working with us and creating more ties with universities. We were able to correspond through emails and conduct a few online meetings to exchange information.

To begin collecting information, we then had to select a PCB design. Luckily, a colleague at WPI was working on a project that required creating a PCB model. After reaching out to him and explaining our project, he emailed files for us to use. It should be noted that this design was a draft and not a final version, as it was the only available design to us at the time we reached out. We used the website PCBway to view the gerber files and get the rendition. Figure 3 depicts the PCB board we will be using, and Table 1 displays its corresponding drilling information. Our model has the dimensions 38.1mm by 50.29mm by 1.6mm, and has two layers. The dimensions and other specifications associated with the PCB are listed in Table 2, which includes board type, the number of layers, the layer thickness, PCB size, base material, solder mask, silkscreen, and conductive material.

**Figure 3:** *Chosen PCB Model Rendition*

*Note.* This figure shows the layered image of our circuit board the website PCBway created using our gerber files.

**Table 1:** *Chosen PCB Drilling Information*

Symbol	Size	Quantity	Plated	Slot Length
	35.0000	11	PTH	0 (Round)
	35.4331	10	PTH	0 (Round)
	39.1700	1	PTH	0 (Round)
+	125.0000	4	PTH	0 (Round)

*Note.* This table shows the drilling information for our PCB, also from the website PCBway.

**Table 2:** *Chosen PCB Specifications*

<b>Board Type</b>		Single board, Rigid
<b>Number of Layers</b>		2
<b>Layer Thickness</b>	<b>mm</b>	1.6
<b>PCB Size</b>	<b>mm</b>	38.1 x 50.29

<b>Base Material</b>		FR4
<b>Solder Mask</b>	<b>oz</b>	Green, 1 oz
<b>Silkscreen</b>		White
<b>Conductive material</b>		LF-HASL
<b>Outer copper weight</b>	<b>oz</b>	1

*Note.* This table includes the specifications associated with our chosen PCB model, which was then sent to companies for quotes.

### 3.1.1 PCB Cost Model

To gather data for our cost model, we took an activity based costing approach to create a direct link between design parameters and their impact on cost. The total cost of a traditionally manufactured PCB job order consists of the following cost elements: material costs, production costs, non-recurring tooling and programming costs, as well as yield costs. Material costs are driven by the amount of material added to or consumed by the product, and include chemicals used for stripping and etching, added materials such as copper plating, laminates and prepregs. The acquisition, storage and disposal costs associated with the materials are also considered. Production costs are driven by the time spent in each cost center and encompasses all labor, overhead, and machining for each cost center. Non-recurring costs reflect the number and complexity of the tools required. It consists of one time costs such as creating the PCB design, programming the CNC machine, and programming the testing apparatus. The yield-loss costs consist of scrapping PCBs that fail inspection or tests, as well as ones that are shipped to the customer with defects (*Giachetti, R. E, & Arango, J., (2003)*). Table 1 below summarizes the factors for each process.

**Table 3: PCB Cost Centers**

<b>Fabrication Cost Centers</b>	<b>Major Cost Elements</b>	<b>Cost Drivers</b>
Inner layer processing	Material cost  Production costs	Number of inner layers Number of panels Copper weight Number of inner layers Copper weight Number of panels
AOI Inner layer laminating  Drilling	Yield-loss costs Material costs Production costs Production costs  Yield-loss costs	Inner line circuit length Number of layers Number of panels Number of holes Board thickness Number of panels Number of holes Hole diameter
Outer layer processing	Material costs  Production costs	Board areas Copper weight Number of panels Copper weight Number of panels
Soldermask	Material costs	Soldermask type Number of sides to mask
HASL	Production costs	HASL required?
Electrical Test (flying probe only) Electrical test (bed of nails only)  Electrical test	Production costs  Non-recurring tooling costs Production costs  Yield-loss costs  Programming costs	Number of networks Single/double sided? Number of test points Number of SMT test points Single or double sided? Outer line width Outer line circuit length Soldermask tolerance Annular ring size Number of test points

*Note.* This table shows cost centers, their cost elements, and the associated cost drivers for a traditionally manufactured printed circuit board. The table was modeled after an article that described an activity based approach to cost modeling for PCB fabrication (*Giachetti, R. E, & Arango, J., (2003)*).

We utilized the websites JLCPCB, ALLPCB, and PS Electronics to give us quotes regarding the different quantities of printed circuit boards. We sent the previously described information, the PCB gerber files and the model specifications in Table 2, to the different websites along with the chosen quantities of 10, 50, 100, and 1,000 PCBs. We received four quotes from each source in return. This allowed us to obtain a broader scope of the total manufacturing cost while also being able to determine which is the most accurate source. By choosing a range of quantities, this allowed us to estimate an ethical quantity of PCBs.

The next cost center involves the cost of electricity. We were able to estimate the cost of electricity for the different quantities by using the National Grid energy rates in Massachusetts for early 2022. By multiplying the rates by the kilo-Watt-hours it took to manufacture the different quantities for both manufacturing methods, we were able to estimate their total electricity costs. A table was then created to display the electrical data.

Next, we created a section for the cost model comparison. It includes the total costs for a traditional manufacturing company and an additive company, and details the quantity, manufacturing time, total manufacturing cost, and estimated electricity costs. By using this table, we were able to make observations regarding the costs for the two manufacturing styles and their ramifications.

### **3.1.2 PCB Life Cycle Analysis**

To reiterate, a product's life cycle analysis begins at the resources used to manufacture each part and stretches to the product's end of life. It measures factors such as the amount of product produced, the energy consumed, chemical used, waste products, and emissions. Different factors can affect the lifespan of a part or product, such as PCB's being influenced by their type, size, number of layers, temperature, and environmental factors.

The lack of specific information for the traditional manufacturing of our PCB model extends to our life cycle analysis as well. We were unable to receive life cycle amounts on our PCB design through traditional means, as we used online websites that do not provide this feature. Without knowing the amounts of materials going into the manufacturing process and the amount contained in the product, it is impossible to compute the amounts of material recycled, material wasted, any contamination, or emissions. With numbers, we would have utilized OpenLCA and its numerous databases to find information on the materials regarding their environmental factors. Our colleagues in the Energy Metals Research Group at WPI created a spreadsheet of calculations for their research on iron powder flow electrolysis (Wang, Y., (n.d.)). This spreadsheet would have been utilized to calculate total emissions, energy balance, manufacturing flow of materials, and an uncertainty analysis for our two case studies. Our aim would have been to assess the PCBs cradle to gate life cycle, from the moment the resources are extracted to when it gets to the factory gate, or its cradle to grave cycle, from the moment the resources are extracted to when the product is disposed of.

Although we were unable to receive life cycle data for traditional manufacturing, we were able to find a previous paper regarding the life cycle of a PCB that included an inputs and outputs table. Since we were unable to communicate with local companies, we will be using this table based on a PCB plant in Turkey for our life cycle analysis. We do so with the knowledge that the PCB they used may very likely have been a different size, affecting the values in their chart and subsequently our comparisons and conclusions.

For our additive life cycle, we were unable to receive specific input and output numbers for our chosen PCB model. Instead, we received a PDF file from Nano Dimension employees containing a life cycle analysis of their DragonFly IV printer compared to conventional



manufacturing methods. If we had received specific values for our model, there would have been an error of analysis due to the input and output values for traditional being for a different PCB design in a different country four years prior. The data from the analysis Nano Dimension conducted would be more reputable since their comparisons were conducted in the same year and with the same criteria. It should also be noted that the PDF file seems to detail the PCBs gate to gate life cycle, which is the timeframe of when the product enters the factory to when it exits the factory. Figure 4 below shows the PCB data they used to calculate their life cycle analysis.

**Figure 4:** Nano Dimension's PCB Specifics for their Life Cycle Analysis

Powered by HSSMI

**NANODIMENSION**

**COMPONENT INPUTS**

Length (H) (mm)	100	Part Quantity	Single Unit	Production Location	North America
Width (W) (mm)	100	No. of Parts	1	End User Location	North America
Thickness (Z) (mm)	1.60	No. of Batches	1	Evaluation time (days)	8
No. of Layers	10	No. of Design Iterations	4	New Launches per Year	1

**FACTORS**

- Non-planar Structure
- Printed Connections
- Printed Coils / Capacitors
- Embedded Components
- Unconventional 3D Printed RF
- Avoid Back Drilling (RF cases)
- Blind / Buried Vias

*Note.* This figure outlines the PCB specifics Nano Dimension used to calculate their life cycle analysis. Nano Dimension employees shared this figure with us through a PDF file detailing the ecological impact of the DragonFly IV printer.

Nano Dimension partnered with Fuss & O'Neill and HSSMI with the aim to confirm ecological data. Fuss & O'Neill were able to conduct an industry wide analysis of electronics

manufacturing for comparable manufacturing data. HSSMI is a global sustainable manufacturing consultancy and they are experts in the circular economy. They consolidated Fuss & O’Neill’s data while also conducting an extensive industry analysis. HSSMI created a tool to generate accurate ecological outputs between alternate manufacturers and the DragonFly IV printer. They used the above specifications in Figure 4 and created bar graphs with the generated data to compare manufacturing technologies. These graphs can be found in our resulting PCB life cycle analysis.

### **3.2 Case Study 2 Approach: Piston**

For the manufacturing of a Porsche piston, we contacted companies that create pistons in the traditional methods of casting and forging. These companies include Porsche and another Volkswagen brand, as well as aftermarket piston producers like Summit Racing and JE Pistons. We also contacted the company Mahle, since they work closely with Porsche to additively manufacture the pistons. Mahle is a German company that focuses on providing engineering and production expertise to the automotive industry with focuses in internal combustion engine and electric motor drivetrains as well as general electronics and air conditioning (*We Shape Future Mobility!*).

#### **3.2.1 Piston Cost Model**

This section has been intentionally left blank, as it has not yet been completed.

#### **3.2.2 Piston Life Cycle Analysis**

This section has been intentionally left blank, as it has not yet been completed.

## **4.0 Results and Analyses**

This section presents data acquired primarily from company websites and previous papers, as well as from companies directly when applicable. Missing information was estimated through our own calculations and compiled into excel spreadsheets for better comprehension and clarity. We then created cost analyses and life cycle analyses and organized the information into tables. These analyses resulted in findings that will hopefully inform and aid others in choosing the best manufacturing process for PCB or engine piston fabrication.

### **4.1 Resulting PCB Cost Models**

For our PCB case study, the information we gathered was split into a traditional manufacturing cost model, an additive manufacturing model, and a comparison section to analyze the two cost models side by side. We believed this would be the most effective way to display and compare the collected data due to its extensive size. The following sections display the steps we took to create these analyses in full detail along with their results.

#### **4.1.1 Traditional PCB Cost Model**

By utilizing the websites JLCPCB, ALLPCB, and PS Electronics, we submitted our PCB gerber files from our methodology section (shown previously in Figure 3) and model information (listed previously in Table 1 and Table 2), along with our four chosen quantities of PCBs. We received four quotes from each source, with some websites giving a more in-depth cost breakdown than others. Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6 below display the received quotes from JLCPCB, ALLPCB, and PS Electronics respectively.

**Table 4: JLCPCB Quote**

<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	10	50	100	1,000
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	2-3 days	5-6 days	5-6 days	5-6 days
<b>Shipping time</b>	<b>days</b>	2-5 business days	2-5 business days	2-5 business days	2-5 business days
<b>Weight</b>	<b>kg</b>	0.006	0.32	0.64	6.63
<b>Board Price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$0.00	\$5.90	\$11.80	\$117.70
<b>Film Price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$0.00	\$0.60	\$0.60	\$0.60
<b>Engineering fee</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$5.00	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00
<b>Surface finish</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$1.20	\$5.20	\$5.20	\$5.20
<b>Shipping price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$19.11	\$22.16	\$25	\$131.83
<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$25.31	\$42.86	\$51.81	\$264.33

*Note.* This table displays the information received from the website JLCPCB regarding the PCB files and specifications we sent them (*PCB Prototype & PCB Fabrication Manufacturer—JLCPCB*).

**Table 5: ALLPCB Quote**

<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	10	50	100	1,000
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	2 day lead time	2 day lead time	2 day lead time	2 day lead time
<b>Quote Price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$31	\$17	\$24	\$152

*Note.* This table displays the information received from the website ALLPCB regarding the PCB files and specifications we sent them (*Instant PCB Quote Online—PCB Cost Calculator*).

**Table 6: PS Electronics Quote**

<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	10	50	100	1,000
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	9 day lead time	9 day lead time	9 day lead time	9 day lead time
<b>Unit Price</b>	<b>\$/PCB</b>	\$2.000	\$0.400	\$0.205	\$0.205
<b>Set up and Electronic Test</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$120.000	\$120.000	\$120.432	\$304.318

*Note.* This table displays the information received from the website PS Electronics regarding the PCB files and specifications we sent them (*PS Electronics*).

By comparing data received from the three sources, it is apparent that JLCPCB has a more in-depth cost breakdown whereas ALLPCB is lacking in this regard. PS Electronics is in between the two, being only slightly more detailed than ALLPCB, and yet still not as detailed as JLCPCB. When it comes to manufacturing and shipping times, JLCPCB seems to be the most reliable source, as the times grow slightly larger as the quantities increase. For these reasons listed, the data from JLCPCB will be used in our PCB cost model comparison.

A previous paper regarding a PCB traditional manufacturing plant estimated that in order to fabricate one PCB, 7.135kW of energy is required (*Giachetti, R. E, & Arango, J., (2003)*). If the manufacturing was conducted in Massachusetts, where the average commercial electricity rate was 17.6¢ per kW in early 2022, we can estimate the cost of energy for the different quantities of printed circuit boards (*Energy Bot, (2022)*). Table 7 below shows the calculated energy costs for traditional manufacturing for different quantities of PCB's.

**Table 7: Cost of Electricity Through Traditional Means**

# of PCBs	1	10	50	100	1,000
<b>Energy used in kWh</b>	7.135	71.350	356.750	713.500	7135.000
<b>Estimated electricity cost</b>	\$1.256	\$12.558	\$62.788	\$125.576	\$1,255.760

*Note.* This table shows the estimated price of electricity in Massachusetts for the different quantities of traditionally manufactured printed circuit boards.

#### **4.1.2 Additive PCB Cost Model**

As we were only able to successfully contact one additive manufacturing company, Nano Dimension, the information we have may not be representative of the AME industry as a whole. Information was gathered from public information on their companies website as well as through communication with Nano Dimension employees.

Nano Dimension offers three different services on their website for PCB fabrication. The first is called an “AME Test Ride,” and allows you to get your design 3D printed and shipped worldwide. With this service you are able to speak with an expert, upload your gerber files, do a design check, and then print and ship your design. The cost for this service is listed as US \$1,000. The second service is called “AME Co-Design,” and allows you to work with their team to realize your 3D electronic design idea together. With this service you are able to do the same as the previous service with the added benefits of discussing your idea with an application engineer, working with their design experts to create a 3D AME design, component assembly, and testing. The cost for this service is US \$3,000-5,000. The third service is called “Advanced AME Project,” and allows you to co-develop a special AME application with a short run production using their engineers. With this service you are able to speak with an expert, discuss your challenges and ideas with their application engineers, define your project scope and

interaction, receive design concepts, print samples, component assembly, testing, and shipping. The cost for this service is US \$5,000-10,000 (*NaNoS Shop. (n.d.)*). No other information was given regarding a production or shipping time frame without first purchasing the service.

After having an online meeting with representatives from Nano Dimension, they were able to give us a quote using our PCB files. With our PCB's size, they informed us that they would be able to fabricate 8 in a batch in their DragonFly IV printer. This brought the cost for printer set-up to \$800 and the creation of a batch to \$1,400. This information can be seen below in Table 8, with the associated cost per board. Since it was the easiest to group the boards in batches of 8, we received quotes in multiples of 8 that were as close to our chosen quantities as possible. The total manufacture time was calculated with the knowledge that set-up would take an hour and our batches of 8 would take 6 hours each. The total time was then converted from hours to days.

**Table 8:** *Nano Dimension Quote*

<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1000</b>
<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of batches of 8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	0.29 days	1.54 days	3.04 days	31.29 days
<b>Shipping time</b>	<b>days</b>	Can be in-person	Can be in-person	Can be in-person	Can be in-person
<b>Associated cost per board</b>	<b>\$/board</b>	\$275.00	\$191.67	\$183.33	\$175.80
<b>Shipping price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75
<b>Total cost</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$2,275.00	\$9,275.16	\$17,674.68	\$175,875.00

*Note.* This table displays the information received from the AME company Nano Dimension regarding the PCB files and specifications we sent them. The quantities are different from our traditional manufacturing quotes, since they'd be printing in batches of 8.

The brochure for the 3D electronic DragonFly IV printer at Nano Dimension mentions that it requires 20 amps through an uninterrupted power supply, which corresponds to about 2kW. With our previously calculated manufacturing times and the same 17.6¢/kW rate used previously for electricity in Massachusetts, it is possible to estimate the cost of electricity for the different quantities. Table 9 below calculates the price of electricity for the additive manufacturing of different quantities of PCB's.

**Table 9:** *Cost of Electricity Through Additive Means*

<b># of PCBs</b>	8	48	96	1,000
<b>Approximate Hours</b>	7	37	73	751
<b>Energy used in kWh</b>	14	74	146	1502
<b>Estimated electricity cost</b>	\$2.521	\$13.327	\$26.295	\$270.510

*Note.* This table calculates the estimated price of electricity in Massachusetts for the additive manufacturing of printed circuit boards.



### 4.1.3 PCB Cost Model Comparison

To best compare the cost information between the two manufacturing styles, relevant data was compiled into Table 10 below. There we can see the quantities, manufacturing times, total manufacturing cost, and the estimated electricity cost for JLCPCB and Nano Dimension.

**Table 10: Cost Comparison Between JLC PCB and Nano Dimension**

<b>Traditional Manufacturing: JLC PCB</b>					
<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	10	50	100	1,000
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	2-3 days	5-6 days	5-6 days	5-6 days
<b>Total manufacturing cost</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$25.31	\$42.86	\$51.81	\$264.33
<b>Estimated electricity cost</b>	<b>\$/kWh</b>	\$12.558	\$62.788	\$125.576	\$1,255.760
<b>Additive Manufacturing: Nano Dimension</b>					
<b>Quantity</b>	<b># of PCB's</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1000</b>
<b>Manufacture time</b>	<b>days</b>	0.29 days	1.54 days	3.04 days	31.29 days
<b>Total manufacturing price</b>	<b>\$</b>	\$2,200.00	\$9,200.16	\$17,599.68	\$175,800.00
<b>Estimated electricity cost</b>	<b>\$/kWh</b>	\$2.521	\$13.327	\$26.295	\$270.510

*Note.* This table was created using the traditional company JLCPCB's quote and electricity estimation as well as the additive company Nano Dimension's quote and electricity estimation for easier comparison.

After looking at the table, it is abundantly clear that for a single layer, simple design PCB, traditional manufacturing is more cost effective. The additive manufacturing of PCBs uses less energy and therefore pays less in electricity usage, however their manufacturing price is so

much higher that there is almost no competition when it comes to cost. The traditional manufacturing of PCBs is cheaper, even when electricity and other factors are added to the total cost.

#### 4.2 Resulting PCB Life Cycle Analyses

For traditional manufacturing methods, Table 11 below depicts traditional PCB manufacturing inputs and outputs during its life cycle. This information was based on a previous research paper about the life cycle assessment of a PCB manufacturing plant in Turkey (*Ozkan, E., Elginöz, N., & Germirli Babuna, F., (2017)*). We were unable to replicate this table with information regarding a printed circuit board manufacturing plant in the United States, and were also unable to find a similar article with more recent data. Due to this, we will use their values for the inputs and outputs when manufacturing a single printed circuit board, with the knowledge that these values have most likely changed over time and will be slightly different.

**Table 11:** *PCB Traditional Manufacturing Inputs and Outputs*

Inputs			Outputs		
Materials	Amount	Unit	Materials	Amount	Unit
<b>Fabrication of Board</b>			<b>Product</b>		
Glass fiber woven	1.596	kg	PCB	1	m <sup>2</sup>
Copper	0.615	kg	<b>Product</b>		
Epoxy resin	0.31	kg	Textile waste (contaminated)	0.019	kg
Water (fabrication)	0.407	m <sup>3</sup>	Plastic waste (contaminated)	0.004	kg
<b>Manufacturing of PCB</b>			Metal waste (contaminated)	0.009	kg

Water (fabrication)	0.058	m <sup>3</sup>	Board waste (hazardous and non-hazardous)	0.094	kg
Solvents	0.069	kg	Wastewater	0.465	m <sup>3</sup>
Etching agent	1.89	kg	Copper	0.27	kg
Etching resist ink	0.011	kg	Copper (recovery in the factory)	0.091	kg
NaOH	0.008	kg	Solder slag	0.003	kg
Solder mask	0.051	kg	<b>Emissions</b>		
Solder bar	0.004	kg	TOC (propane)	2.83x10 <sup>-3</sup>	kg
Flux	0.014	L	Dust	4.9x10 <sup>-5</sup>	kg
Energy	7.135	kWh	Ag	5.47x10 <sup>-6</sup>	kg
			Cu	5.47x10 <sup>-6</sup>	kg


*Note.* This table shows the input and output data of traditional PCB manufacturing found from an article on the life cycle assessment of a PCB plant in Turkey (Ozkan, E., Elginöz, N., & Germirli Babuna, F., (2017)).

It is worth noting the amounts of solvents and etching agents put into the manufacturing process as well as the amounts of harmful byproducts, waste, and emissions created as a result of manufacturing only one PCB. Although relatively small with emission values ranging from milligrams to grams, when you multiply these values to account for the quantity of PCB's in an order and then by hundreds of orders a company produces, they become very prominent.

For additive manufacturing methods, no water or acids are used and no etching or lithography is performed. “The DragonFly IV Combines over 70 steps into one complete process, optimizes material use, drastically cuts environmental impacts, and requires minimal relative energy use,” (Nano Dimension, 2022) They do use solvents and have to clean the printheads to ensure they are at peak performance, but it contains 82% less chemicals than its

traditional counterpart, and resulting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are 94% less. The exact chemicals present in the solvents were not mentioned. The DragonFly IV printer has two printheads that deposit ink. One uses dielectric ink, specifically polymer based ink for insulation and structure, and the other uses silver nanoparticle ink to print conductive features. This allows them to use 98% less raw materials than conventional methods of manufacturing and produce 99% less waste. Energy use in additive manufacturing is also reduced, using 57% less than traditional manufacturing. When it comes to taking up space, additive takes up about 9 m<sup>2</sup> while conventional methods take up 8,253 m<sup>2</sup>. It is also worth noting that there is an average annual injury rate of 7.9 in traditional manufacturing compared to 0 injuries due to additive manufacturing. Nano Dimension's DragonFly IV printer has an interlocking mechanism that prevents anyone from opening the door when a print job is underway. These numbers can be seen below in Figure 4, which was created by Nano Dimension to assess their environmental impact. It should be noted that their life cycle analysis seems to be for the gate to gate life cycle of a printed circuit board, and only assesses the data of the board's time in the factory. Their data does not seem to include upstream processes in a cradle to gate life cycle analysis, such as the materials and other inputs used to create both of their inks, or post processes in a cradle to grave life cycle, such as transportation, use, and end of life.


**Figure 5:** Life Cycle Analysis conducted by Nano Dimension



*Note.* This figure came from the PDF file sent by Nano Dimension employees. It is the result of their impact analysis of the DragonFly IV printer compared to traditional manufacturing methods. It seems to detail the gate to gate life cycle for PCB manufacturing.

When analyzing Figure 5 above, it is clear that the additive manufacturing of PCBs is more environmentally friendly. With every statistics over 50% better than conventional manufacturing methods and most above 80%, there is no disputing that fact. Nano Dimention's analysis also extends to potential savings over the period of a year, which you can see in Figure 6 below.


**Figure 6: Potential Savings by using Additive Manufacturing**



*Note.* This figure was included in the PDF file Nano Dimension employees shared with us. By using the previous Figure 5 data, they estimated potential savings by using additive manufacturing to fabricate PCB's instead of conventional methods.


We were able to purchase circuit boards from both our traditional manufacturing company of interest, JLCPCB, and our additive one, Nano Dimension. We sent the same files and PCB information detailed in our report to both companies. The figures below show the two resulting circuit boards.

**Figure 7:** *Our PCB design manufactured by JLCPCB*



*Note.* This figure depicts the circuit board that was manufactured by the company JLCPCB. The left image is of the top of the PCB while the right image is of the bottom.

**Figure 8:** *Our PCB design manufactured by Nano Dimension*



*Note.* The above figure depicts our circuit board design as manufactured and shipped by the company Nano Dimension. The left image is of the top of the PCB while the right image is of the bottom.

After receiving the two PCB's, their differences were very apparent. The additive board did not include any of the board identifiers seen in our model rendition in Figure 3, such as the

labeling for resistors and capacitors. The traditional PCB was also much thicker and heavier, where the additive one was two and a half times smaller in thickness and only a fraction of its weight. The traditional PCB has a glossy, smooth texture on both sides, whereas only the bottom of the additive board is smooth and glossy. The front of that board has a similar texture to smooth plastic. The edges of the traditional board are very slightly rounded, and the edges of the additive one have a much sharper edge. The traces on the boards are almost identical, except for the traditional board tracing being slightly raised. The PCB model we sent was an unfinished one, so we unfortunately have no way of testing that both circuit boards work.

The capability of the additively manufactured boards to be much thinner and lighter can be beneficial to many products. Companies have recently been switching to more eco-friendly product production or plan to in the near future. That being said, it is highly likely that there will be a switch, even if it is a partial one, to additive manufacturing for the fabrication of printed circuit boards and possibly other electronics.

#### **4.3 Resulting Piston Cost Model**

This section has been intentionally left blank, as it has not yet been completed.

#### **4.4 Resulting Piston Life Cycle Analysis**

This section has been intentionally left blank, as it has not yet been completed.

### **5.0 Impacts**

With every project, the impacts should be considered and written into the report. For our impacts, they can be broken down into engineering ethics, societal and global impact,



environmental impact, codes and standards, and economic factors. The following sections will discuss these topics in depth and mention how they correlate to our project.

### **5.1 Engineering Ethics**

The Mechanical Engineering Code of Ethics states that engineers should uphold and advance the integrity, honor, and dignity of the engineering profession. This is done by 1. using their knowledge and skill for the enhancement of human welfare, 2. being honest and impartial, and serving with fidelity their clients (including their employers) and the public; and 3. striving to increase the competence and prestige of the engineering profession (Khan, A., 2022). In our report, we ensured transparency in our data by clearly stating how we received it, how we came up with it, and if there were any uncertainties when reporting our findings.

### **5.2 Societal and Global Impact**

In regards to our first case study, printed circuit boards, we hope to positively impact consumers who purchase PCBs as well as the health and welfare of everyone. We intended to inform others about both manufacturing processes, traditional and additive, and provide a PCB case study that detailed cost analyses and life cycle analyses for both processes. We broke the information into two parts to shine a light on the benefits and fallings short for both processes, as well as to discuss them in depth. At the time of conducting our MQP, papers that discuss additive versus traditional manufacturing for PCB's exist, but none of the reports include a case study with numbers to back up their claims. Unintended consequences for our project may include promoting or demoting certain companies by their inclusion in our project. In our procedure we named the companies we contacted for research purposes, and stated that a lot of them did not get back to us. We meant no harm to those companies, however the simple statement of fact is

that it may paint those companies in an uncomfortable light and paint those that responded in a better one.

### **5.3 Environmental Impact**

Our project revolves around assessing the environmental impact of manufacturing processes. By creating life cycle analyses, we hope it will positively impact the environment by helping companies make informed decisions when it comes to the manufacturing or purchase of printed circuit boards and pistons. We aim to inform people in the short term in the hopes that our report may lead to long term sustainability in manufacturing.

### **5.4 Codes and Standards**

For our first case study, IPC standards govern the work related to PCB manufacturing. It was named after the association that produces PCB-related standards, the Institute for Printed Circuits. The association is now called the Association Connecting Electronics Industries but they decided to continue calling them IPC standards. The best description of these standards comes from the website All About Circuits, “IPC standards are the electronics-industry-adopted standards for design, PCB manufacturing, and electronic assembly. There's an IPC standard associated with just about every step of PCB design, production, and assembly,” (*The History and Basics of IPC Standards*, 2017). Four leading benefits of the standards are; improved product quality and reliability, improved communication, reduced costs, and improved reputation and new opportunities (*IPC Standards for Printed Circuit Boards*, 2019).

ISO standards 14040 and 14044 apply to our project, as they define a complete life cycle analysis when following a product from cradle to grave. “ISO 14040 describes the ‘principles and framework for LCA’, while the ISO 14044 ‘specifies requirements and provides guidelines’

for LCA,” (*Life Cycle-Based Sustainability Standards and Guidelines*, 2021). ISO standard 14067 may also apply. It is consistent with the other two ISO standards and also includes requirements on issues related to carbon footprints and a product's impact on climate change. Although our project did study PCBs environmental impacts, we were unable to create a complete life cycle analysis study as defined by the ISO standards. The life cycle we use for the PCB case study is for a gate to gate analysis and not a cradle to grave, as we did not have sufficient data or external review.

## **5.5 Economic Factors**

Our project is also centered around economic factors. The cost of manufacturing, set-up, shipping, and electricity were all considered in our project's cost analyses. We realize that there are many factors that can influence cost when making a part, such as size or how many holes need to be drilled when referring to PCB's. We include all of these factors in our cost models in order to provide a better cost breakdown to both consumers and companies. Our aim is to help anyone make informed choices in both an environmental and economic sense when manufacturing either additively or traditionally for printed circuit boards and engine pistons.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

It is recommended that another MQP picks up where we left off and continues our research with other types of PCBs. Two designs we believe would be the most beneficial to use are one that is multilayer and has a complex design, and another that is multilayer with a complex design and complex geometry. For a timeframe, we believe it should be picked up in a few years, where at that point we hope it will be easier to conduct the research and analyses. There will also hopefully be more than one AME company that manufactures printed circuit

boards at that time, where data can then be compared and averaged between companies for less biased analyses.

### **6.1 Concluding Remarks: PCB Case Study**

Based on the information we did have, it is abundantly clear that traditional manufacturing is the most cost effective when it comes to fabricating the boards, while additive manufacturing has a more eco-friendly life cycle. With that being said, we can only conclude this based on a single layer, simple geometry and simple design board with a gate to gate life cycle analysis. If this project were to be expanded on, we would recommend that the life cycle analyses are completed from cradle to grave or at least from cradle to gate. It is also recommended that the procedure is done again with a multilayer, complex design board, and once more with a multilayer, complex geometry, complex design board. In the first instance, it is hypothesized that the costs wouldn't have as big of a gap as it did with the simple board, and additive may win out for both cost effectiveness and environmental friendliness. In the second instance, there may be no contest in the regard that traditional manufacturing simply cannot create highly complex geometries and cannot compete. The additive manufacturing of electronics has the ability to stack integrated circuits and their traces on an irregular surface or a structural substrate through 3D integration. This allows for a greater flexibility of mechanical drawings and new possibilities for PCB designs.

When comparing their environmental impact and life cycle analyses, additive takes a substantial lead, saving over 80% in almost every area. By using additive manufacturing to make printed circuit boards, the potential of harming the environment with wet chemicals during manufacturing is greatly reduced, and their use of conductive ink in the place of copper also creates virtually zero waste generation. Aside from a higher initial cost, the additive

manufacturing of electronics is generally more eco-friendly, has a faster production, and is more precise than traditional manufacturing.

The resulting analyses for our PCB case study are slightly dissatisfying due to a lack of data and available resources. The traditional cost analysis and life cycle analysis are a little dated, as companies were not able to get back to us regarding the specific manufacturing questions we had. We subsequently had to use information from a research paper dated from 2018, containing values that have most likely changed over the course of four years. The numbers also did not reflect the PCB we used, which was discouraging. The life cycle analysis we did receive seemed to be for a gate to gate analysis and not a cradle to grave one, and also used a different PCB model than the one we chose. Most companies were also unable to give us machine costs, costs associated with each manufacturing step, the amount of input and output materials, the energy consumed for each process, and the number of scrapped PCBs. It is possible that companies did not want to make this information public, so as to not create more competition for themselves.

To get around these obstacles, we had to predominantly use public manufacturing capability information on the different company websites, along with a few online PCB websites to give us quotes for the PCB design we selected. The technology for the additive manufacturing of printed circuit boards is not as prominent as it needs to be to create accurate cost models and life cycle analyses. We were only able to find two companies that additively manufactured PCBs, Nano Dimension and Optomec. Optomec was not able to give us manufacturing information or provide us with quotes, as they only manufacture the machines, so our data is entirely from Nano Dimension. After contacting Nano Dimension and working with them, they suggested checking out TTM Technologies, and described that they can manufacture PCBs using both manufacturing

methods. Since we were unable to compare a few different AME companies and find average values or costs, this can cause a slight bias in our data. At the time of our research, Nano Dimension is a new and upcoming company, and they are still expanding, recruiting more staff, and solidifying their rates. Although promising, AME technology is still new and has a higher cost, so a major switch to additive manufacturing in the industry will happen, but maybe not for at least a few years.

## **6.2 Concluding Remarks: Piston Case Study**

This section has been intentionally left blank, as it has not yet been completed.

## References

- 3D printing and traditional manufacturing processes.* (n.d.). *3D Printing Blog: Tutorials, News, Trends and Resources | Sculpteo.*  
<https://www.sculpteo.com/blog/2019/07/16/comparison-between-3d-printing-and-traditional-manufacturing-processes-for-plastics-3/>
- About MAHLE - MAHLE Group.* (n.d.). <https://www.mahle.com/en/about-mahle/>
- Additive manufacturing, explained.* (n.d.). MIT Sloan.  
<https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/additive-manufacturing-explained>
- Adekanye, S. A., Mahamood, R. M., Akinlabi, E. T., & Owolabi, M. G. (2017). Additive manufacturing: The future of manufacturing. Materiali in Tehnologije, 51(5), 709–715.*  
<https://doi.org/10.17222/mit.2016.261>
- Compare Massachusetts Electricity Rates—EnergyBot.* (n.d.).  
<https://www.energybot.com/electricity-rates/massachusetts/>
- Dong, Y., Bao, C., & Kim, W. S. (2018). Sustainable Additive Manufacturing of Printed Circuit Boards. Joule, 2(4), 579–582.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2018.03.015>
- Donut Media. (2021, February 16). 3D Printed Pistons Are Changing the Game.*  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y\\_W8clK4mb8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y_W8clK4mb8)
- Giachetti, R. E., & Arango, J. (2003). A Design-Centric Activity-Based Cost Estimation Model for PCB Fabrication. Concurrent Engineering, 11(2), 139–149.*  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1063293X03035372>

*Instant PCB Quote Online—PCB Cost Calculator—JustFit.com. (n.d.).*

[https://www.allpcb.com/online\\_pcb\\_quote\\_new.html](https://www.allpcb.com/online_pcb_quote_new.html)

*IPC Standards for Printed Circuit Boards | PCB Design. (2019, April 1). Mcl.*

<https://www.mclpcb.com/blog/ipc-standards-for-pcbs/>

*Khan, A. (2022, February 21). ASME Code of Ethics for Mechanical Engineers.*

*Engineering Passion.*

<https://www.engineeringpassion.com/asme-code-ethics-mechanical-engineers/>

*Life cycle-based sustainability standards and guidelines. (2021, May 11.). PRé*

*Sustainability. <https://pre-sustainability.com/articles/lca-standards-and-guidelines/>*

*Ltd, N. D. (n.d.). Capabilities & Use Cases | Nano Dimension.*

<https://www.nano-di.com/capabilities-and-use-cases>

*MAHLE produces high-performance aluminum pistons using 3D printing for the first time—MAHLE Group. (n.d.).*

<https://www.mahle.com/en/news-and-press/press-releases/mahle-produces-high-performance-aluminum-pistons-using-3d-printing-for-the-first-time-76416>

*NaNoS Shop. (n.d.). <https://www.nano-di.com/nanos-shop>*

*Ozkan, E., Elginöz, N., & Germirli Babuna, F. (2018). Life cycle assessment of a printed circuit board manufacturing plant in Turkey. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(27), 26801–26808. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-0280-z>*



Page, I. (n.d.). *Porsche GT2 RS: From Casted to 3D-Printed Aluminum Pistons.*

<https://www.spotlightmetal.com/porsche-gt2-rs-from-casted-to-3d-printed-aluminum-pistons-a-949139/>

*PCB Prototype & PCB Fabrication Manufacturer—JLCPCB.* (n.d.).

[https://jlcpcb.com/?\\_ga=2.149786934.1616357991.1639450113-1496757089.1639450113](https://jlcpcb.com/?_ga=2.149786934.1616357991.1639450113-1496757089.1639450113)

Pereira, T., Kennedy, J. V., & Potgieter, J. (2019). *A comparison of traditional manufacturing vs additive manufacturing, the best method for the job.* *Procedia Manufacturing*, 30, 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.003>

*Porsche on the use of additive manufacturing.* (2020, August 3). *3Dnatives.*

<https://www.3dnatives.com/en/porsche-additive-manufacturing-interview-030820205/>

*Reliance Foundry Co. Ltd.* (2018, June 18). *Investment Casting | Metal Casting Resources.*

<https://www.reliance-foundry.com/blog/investment-casting>

*The Benefits of Forged Pistons—CarsDirect.* (n.d.).

<https://www.carsdirect.com/aftermarket-parts/why-install-forged-pistons>

*The History and Basics of IPC Standards: The Official Standards for PCBs - News.* (2017, October 20).

<https://www.allaboutcircuits.com/news/ipc-standards-the-official-standards-for-pcb/>

Wang, Y. (n.d.). *Zero-Emissions Iron Powder Production.* *WPI Energy Metals Research*

*Group - Research.* [https://sites.google.com/view/wpi-emrg/Research#h.p\\_42sJJdDfLr2L](https://sites.google.com/view/wpi-emrg/Research#h.p_42sJJdDfLr2L)

*What's Next for 3D Printed Electronics? (2019, December 30). XponentialWorks.*

<https://xponentialworks.com/whats-next-for-3d-printed-electronics/>