

Standard Final Exams

M W F Courses

Tu Th Courses

Courses meeting on TuTh, Tu, or Th:

Class Start Time is Between:	Exam Day	Exam Time
8am - 9:15am	Friday, May 15	1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
9:30am - 10:45am	Tuesday, May 12	10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
11am - 12:15pm	Monday, May 11	10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
12:30pm - 1:45pm	Friday, May 15	4 p.m. - 6 p.m.
2pm - 3:15pm	Thursday, May 14	10:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
3:30pm - 4:45pm	Monday, May 18	1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
5pm - 5:45pm	Friday, May 15	6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Announcement

Final Exam –

Date: May 18, 1:30pm – 3:30pm

Location: Online

Open book: laptop and digital material – Yes; Chat/ChatGPT/LLM based tools – No

Final Milestone Presentation –

Date: May 7 3:30pm - 5:00pm (Be there at least 15 min ahead of time to setup your ‘booth’)

Location: Sandbox


Live Demo! Bring your setup to Sandbox early, and prepare to give a live demonstration, walkthrough key features/iterations you’ve made throughout the semester.

Final Milestone Summary –

Date: May 14 EOD (Thursday)


Format: Online <https://www.hackster.io/smartlab/projects> with Documentation + simple video.

More details on ELMS.



Personal Fabrication

CMSC730 | Huaishu Peng | UMD CS



Formative manufacturing

Subtractive manufacturing

Additive manufacturing



Industrial 3D Printer

The Economist (Cover)



Long-term vision

(1) Everyone can design and customize everyday objects.


The Economist (Cover)



Long-term vision

(1) Everyone can design and customize everyday objects.

(2) A personal fabricator will construct both its appearance and functionality.



Design 3D digital models is difficult



What are the drawbacks of CAD design tools?

Implicit design commands


Complex interface

No fast physical feedback (intimacy between the designer and the raw material)



(a) Target 3D model

Input: 3D digital model



(c) Sculpted physical replica


Output: 3D clay model

Olivia White

Olivia White.

Olivia White.

Olivia White.



4:27

28



(a) Target 3D model



(b) Guidance projected onto material




Figure 1: We assist users in creating physical objects that match digital 3D models. Given a target 3D model (a), we project different forms of guidance onto a work in progress (b) that indicate how it must be deformed to match the target model. As the user follows this guidance, the physical object's shape approaches that of the target (c). With our system, unskilled users are able to produce accurate physical replicas of complex 3D models. Here, we recreate the Stanford bunny model (courtesy of the Stanford Computer Graphics Laboratory) out of polymer clay.

Abstract

We propose a method that allows an unskilled user to create an accurate physical replica of a digital 3D model. We use a projector/camera pair to scan a work in progress, and project multiple forms of guidance onto the object itself that indicate which areas need more material, which need less, and where any ridges, valleys or depth discontinuities are. The user adjusts the model using the guidance and iterates, making the shape of the physical object approach that of the target 3D model over time. We show how this approach can be used to create a duplicate of an existing object, by scanning the object and using that scan as the target shape. The user is free to make the reproduction at a different scale and out of different materials: we turn a toy car into cake. We extend the technique to support replicating a sequence of models to create stop-motion video. We demonstrate an end-to-end system in which real-world performance capture data is retargeted to claymation. Our approach allows users to easily and accurately create complex shapes, and naturally supports a large range of materials and model sizes.

Keywords: personal digital fabrication, spatially augmented reality, sculpting

Links: [DL](#) [PDF](#)

1 Introduction

Most people find it challenging to sculpt, carve or manually form a precise shape. We argue that this is usually not because they lack manual dexterity – the average person is able to perform very precise manipulations – but rather because they lack precise 3D information, and cannot figure out what needs to be done to modify a work in progress in order to reach a goal shape. An analogy can be made to the task of reproducing a 2D painting: when given outlines that need only be filled in, as in a child's coloring book or a paint-by-numbers kit, even an unskilled user can accurately reproduce a complex painting; the challenge lies not in placing paint on the canvas but in knowing where to place it. Motivated by this observation, we present Sculpting by Numbers, a method to provide analogous guidance for the creation of 3D objects, which assists a user in making an object that precisely matches the shape of a target 3D model.

We employ a spatially-augmented reality approach (see e.g. Raskar et al. [1998] or Bimber and Raskar [2005] for an overview of spatially-augmented reality), in which visual feedback illustrates the discrepancy between a work in progress and a target 3D shape. This approach was first proposed by Skeels and Rehg [2007]. In this approach, a projector-camera pair is used to scan the object being created using structured light. The scanned shape is compared


(c) Sculpted physical replica

Rivers et.al. from MIT
2012

Structured light 3D scanning

Compare the scanning result with the 3D digital model

Differences are projected at each step with green/red colors




Limitations of this light guidance idea?

Turn-taking (scan at each of the 'step')

Would be hard to do with other material such as wood/foam (because there is no additive process for such material)

Possible solutions?



FreeD – A Freehand Digital Sculpting Tool

Amit Zoran
 Responsive Environments Group
 MIT Media Lab
 amitz@media.mit.edu

Joseph A. Paradiso
 Responsive Environments Group
 MIT Media Lab
 joep@media.mit.edu

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we present an approach to combining digital fabrication and craft, emphasizing the user experience. While many researchers strive to enable makers to design and produce 3D objects, our research seeks to present a new fabrication approach to make unique, one-of-a-kind artifacts. To that end, we developed the FreeD, a hand-held digital milling device. The system is guided and monitored by a computer while preserving the maker's freedom to sculpt and carve, and to manipulate the work in many creative ways. Relying on a pre-designed 3D model, the computer gets into action only when the milling bit risks the object's integrity, by slowing down the spindle's speed or by drawing back the shaft, while the rest of the time it allows complete gestural freedom. We describe the key concepts of our work and its motivation, present the FreeD's architecture and technology, and discuss two projects made with the tool.

Author Keywords

Computer-Aided Design (CAD); Craft; Digital Fabrication; Carving; Milling.

ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.2 [Information interfaces and presentation]: User Interfaces.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last several years, digital fabrication technologies have altered many disciplines [4]. Today's designers can easily create, download, or modify a Computer-Aided Design (CAD) model of their desired object, and fabricate it directly using a digital process. In developing new manufacturing technologies, engineers seek an optimal solution, reducing the process to as few parameters as possible, and separating design from fabrication. Ease of use, accessibility, proliferation and efficacy grow as technology matures. However, qualities such as creative engagement in the experience itself are lost. The nature of interaction with the fabricated artifact is rarely the focus of new developments.

While the process of engineering minimizes risks, seeks efficiency, and enables automation and repetition, craft is

about involvement and engagement, uniqueness of the final products, and authenticity of the experience [7]. Engaging in an intimate fabrication process and enjoying the experience of shaping raw material are inherent values of traditional craft. As a result of this engagement, handcrafted products are unique and carry personal narratives [10].

Our research interest lies in the cross-section between digital fabrication and the study of the craft experience. We wish to allow designers to engage with the physical material, not only the CAD environment. We hope to encourage the exploration of an intimate digital fabrication approach, introducing craft qualities into the digital domain. Our contribution is a system merging qualities of both traditions: minimizing fabrication risk by using a small degree of digital control and automation while allowing authentic engagement with raw material to achieve unique results.

The *FreeD* is a freehand digitally controlled milling device (Figure 1). With the FreeD we harness CAD abilities in 3D design while keeping the user involved in the milling process. A computer monitors this 3D location-aware tool while preserving the maker's gestural freedom. The computer intervenes only when the milling bit approaches the 3D model. In such a case, it will either slow down the spindle, or draw back the shaft; the rest of the time it allows the user to freely shape the work. Our hope is to substantiate the importance of engaging in a discourse that posits a new hybrid territory for investigation and discovery - a territory of artifacts produced by both machine and man.






Figure 1: (A) The FreeD and (B-C) the process of making a bowl from polyethylene foam.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for

CHI 13 and UIST 13
 Zoran et.al. from MIT







Tracking: 6DOF Magnetic tracking

Control: stop milling at the edge of the digital model

Control can be overridden with manual control

What can this do that the previous project cannot?







(a)



(b)



Manual override



user can manually switch between different reference virtual models during the work



Physical merging

What if we have no digital model at the beginning?

What if we hope to design a 3D model **from scratch**?

What if we can have a system for CAD users
but with timely **physical feedback**?





On-The-Fly Print: Incremental Printing While Modeling

Huaishu Peng, Rundong Wu, Steve Marschner, François Guimbretière
 Computing and Information Science
 Cornell University
 {hp356, rw489}@cornell.edu, {srm, francois}@cs.cornell.edu

ABSTRACT

Current interactive fabrication tools offer tangible feedback by allowing users to work directly on the physical model, but they are slow because users need to participate in the physical instantiation of their designs. In contrast, CAD software offers powerful tools for 3D modeling but delays access to the physical workpiece until the end of the design process.

In this paper we propose *On-the-Fly Print*: a 3D modeling approach that allows the user to design 3D models digitally while having a low-fidelity physical wireframe model printed in parallel. Our software starts printing features as soon as they are created and updates the physical model as needed. Users can quickly check the design in a real usage context by removing the partial physical print from the printer and replacing it afterwards to continue printing. Digital content modification can be updated with quick physical correction using a retractable cutting blade. We present the detailed description of *On-the-Fly Print* and showcase several examples designed and printed with our system.

Author Keywords

3D printing; fabrication; computational craft; CAD; rapid prototyping; interactive devices.


ACM Classification Keywords

H.5.m. Information interfaces and presentation (e.g., HCI): User Interfaces.

INTRODUCTION

Since the notion of interactive fabrication was introduced by Willis et al. [32], several approaches have been proposed for hands-on digital fabrication. For example, Constructable [17] allows the step-by-step fabrication of functional objects using a laser cutter controlled by a laser pointer; D-Coil [19] enables non-experts to design 3D digital models from scratch using a digitally controlled wax extruder; ReForm [31] merges manual shaping with digital milling and extrusion of synthetic clay. On the one hand, these interactive fabrication systems offer immediate, tangible feedback that can benefit

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored.




CHI 16
 Peng et.al.

3D modeling while 3D printing

Connect Manual Initialize Subtract
 PrintNew Pause Cap

Cell Size Printing Base Type
 Cube Base Ball Base
 VisCollision ShowWire
 VisBase ColorCoding

Operation Mode: Auto Machine Mode: Online



Perspective Top Front Right
 End Near Point Mid Cen Int Perp Tan Quad Knot Vertex Project Disable


3D modeling while 3D printing

04:47:12

Design + print from scratch < 10 min

The user can focus on digital design

The user can check physical prints early on




To support design and fab in parallel
our machine should be able to

print fast

print incrementally

make subtractive changes





A pair of mist cooling nozzles

Extended extruder tip




Rotational rail (B axis)



Rotational rod (C axis)







To allow the designer to focus on the design
our software should be able to

print new primitives automatically
solve potential collisions

Software Workflow



Candelabra



Panton chair



Vase



Aircraft



Dinosaur



Teapot





Bird's nest stadium





Lamp












In-situ Design and Fabrication



RoMA: Interactive Fabrication with Augmented Reality and a Robotic 3D Printer

Huaishu Peng¹, Jimmy Briggs^{1*}, Cheng-Yao Wang^{1*}, Kevin Guo¹, Joseph Kider⁴, Stefanie Mueller³, Patrick Baudisch², François Guimbretière¹

Cornell University
Ithaca, NY, USA
{hp356, jeb482, cw776, kg344, fvg3}@cornell.edu

Hasso Plattner Institute
Potsdam, Germany
patrick.baudisch@hpi.de

MIT CSAIL
Cambridge, MA, USA
stefanie.mueller@mit.edu

Univ. of Central Florida
Orlando, FL, USA
jkider@ist.ucf.edu

ABSTRACT

We present the Robotic Modeling Assistant (RoMA), an interactive fabrication system providing a fast, precise, hands-on and *in-situ* modeling experience. As a designer creates a new model using RoMA AR CAD editor, features are constructed concurrently by a 3D printing robotic arm sharing the same design volume. The partially printed physical model then serves as a tangible reference for the designer as she adds new elements to her design. RoMA's proxemics-inspired handshake mechanism between the designer and the 3D printing robotic arm allows the designer to quickly interrupt printing to access a printed area or to indicate that the robot can take full control of the model to finish printing. RoMA lets users integrate real-world constraints into a design rapidly, allowing them to create well-proportioned tangible artifacts or to extend existing objects. We conclude by presenting the strengths and limitations of our current design.

Author Keywords

3D printing; Augmented Reality; Interactive Fabrication; CAD; Rapid Prototyping; Physical Prototyping.

ACM Classification Keywords

H5.2 [Information interfaces and presentation]: User Interfaces.

INTRODUCTION

Interactive fabrication [43] entails a hands-on approach during the 3D modeling process to offer a reflective design experience. This concept has been developed with several approaches [4]. For example, Constructables [24] proposes a step-by-step laser cutting system to design 3D assemblies from 2D physical cutouts. D-Coil [28] allows the user to create a 3D digital model by directly handcrafting its

*The two authors contributed equally to this work.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full





Figure 1: a) RoMA overview. b) Designer view from the AR headset. The designer creates a digital spout while the robot prints the teapot body. Digital model is overlaid onto the physical model.

physical counterpart. On-the-Fly Print [27] combines CAD digital modeling with incremental low-fidelity physical rendering, while ReForm [41] combines hand modeling with digital carving of clay to create a 3D model. Each system has a different set of trade-offs. For example, the D-Coil process mirrors the hands-on approach of clay-coiling, but forces the





AR headset

Robotic 3D printer


AR controller

Rotating platform






Printing using the wireframe structure
Design and fab happen in parallel



Step into the 3D printer



X3

Using the user's body as design reference



X6

Using partially printed model to support next design step



Design and fabrication directly
ON a physical object

Proxemics-based interaction


Designer Zone 3

Designer Zone 2


Designer Zone 1

Robot Prints

Robot Parks



Proxemics-based interaction




User touches and rotates

Robot parks automatically


Proxemics-based
interaction


Robot takes
control of the platform

User leaves the
design scene




Design on an object






Adding and removing material is still very slow


Can we **directly reshape** the material?





Formative manufacturing



Subtractive manufacturing



Additive manufacturing



FormFab: Continuous Interactive Fabrication

Stefanie Mueller^{1,2}, Anna Seufert², Huaishu Peng^{3,4}, Robert Kovacs²,
Kevin Reuss², François Guimbretière³, Patrick Baudisch²

MIT CSAIL¹ Hasso Plattner Institute² Cornell University³ University of Maryland⁴
Cambridge, MA, USA Potsdam, Germany Ithaca, NY, USA College Park, MD, USA
stefanie.mueller@mit.edu patrick.baudisch@hpi.de fvg3@cornell.edu huaishu@cs.umd.edu

ABSTRACT

Several systems have illustrated the concept of interactive fabrication, i.e. rather than working through a digital editor, users make edits directly on the physical workpiece. However, so far the interaction has been limited to *turn-taking*, i.e., users first perform a command and *then* the system responds with physical feedback. In this paper, we present a first step towards interactive fabrication that changes the workpiece continuously *while* the user is manipulating it.

To achieve this, our system FormFab does not add or subtract material but instead reshapes it (*formative* fabrication). A heat gun attached to a robotic arm warms up a thermo-plastic sheet until it becomes compliant; users then control a pneumatic system that applies either pressure or vacuum thereby pushing the material outwards or pulling it inwards.

Since FormFab reshapes the workpiece continuously while users are moving their hands, users can interactively explore different sizes of a shape with a single interaction.

Author Keywords: personal fabrication; interactive fabrication; direct manipulation; 3D modeling tools.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, Willis et al. [28] proposed the concept of *Interactive Fabrication*. The key idea is to bring the principles of *direct manipulation* [20] to the editing of physical objects: Instead of working on a digital 3D model and producing the physical version only at the end, users make edits directly on the physical workpiece and see it change immediately.

Early interactive fabrication systems, such as *Shaper* [28], *CopyCAD* [5], and *constructable* [14], allow for hands-on editing on the physical workpiece. However, their interaction is best described as *turn-taking*: users first provide their






Figure 1: (a) FormFab changes the workpiece continuously *while* the user is interacting with it. First, a heat-gun warms up the workpiece. Once the material has become compliant, (b) the user's hand gesture interactively controls a pneumatic system that applies pressure or vacuum, pushing the material outwards or pulling it inwards.

input to the system and *then* the system responds with physical feedback. Since there are two *discrete* steps, users can only explore one option per turn [2].

Selectively heat the material



Directly manipulating the area with gestures



Limitations


Slow heating process
Limited expressiveness




How to further improve the system?

What if we can generate physical models **in seconds**?

What if we can generate physical models **in seconds**?



Fast shape changing speed
But only 2.5D
And it's not detachable



Dynablock: Dynamic 3D Printing for Instant and Reconstructable Shape Formation

Ryo Suzuki¹, Junichi Yamaoka², Daniel Leithinger¹, Tom Yeh¹,
Mark D. Gross¹, Yoshihiro Kawahara², Yasuaki Kakehi²
¹University of Colorado Boulder, ²The University of Tokyo
{ryo.suzuki, daniel.leithinger, tom.yeh, mdgross}@colorado.edu
{yamajun, kakehi}@iii.u-tokyo.ac.jp, kawahara@akg.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp




Figure 1. Dynablock is a rapid and reconstructable shape formation system, comprised of a large number of small physical elements. A) Dynablock's shape consists of 9 mm blocks which can be connected with omni-directional magnets. B-D) Dynablock leverages the 24 x 16 pin-based shape display as a parallel assembler of blocks. Dynablock is able to construct three-dimensional shapes in seconds. E) The example shows the output of a miniature model of table and a chair. The constructed shape is graspable and reconstructable.


ABSTRACT
This paper introduces Dynamic 3D Printing, a fast and reconstructable shape formation system. Dynamic 3D Printing assembles an arbitrary three-dimensional shape from a large number of small physical elements. It can also disassemble the shape back to elements and reconstruct a new shape. Dynamic 3D Printing combines the capabilities of 3D printers and shape displays: Like conventional 3D printing, it can generate arbitrary and graspable three-dimensional shapes, while allowing shapes to be rapidly formed and reformed as in a shape display. To demonstrate the idea, we describe the design and implementation of Dynablock, a working prototype of a dynamic 3D printer. Dynablock can form a three-dimensional shape in seconds by assembling 3,000 9 mm blocks, leveraging a 24 x 16 pin-based shape display as a parallel assembler. Dynamic 3D printing is a step toward achieving our long term vision in which 3D printing becomes an interactive medium, rather than the means for fabrication that it is today. In this paper we explore possibilities for this vision by illustrating application scenarios that are difficult to achieve with conventional 3D printing or shape display systems.

CCS Concepts

INTRODUCTION
What if 3D printers could form a physical object in seconds? What if the object, once it is no longer needed, could quickly and easily be disassembled and reconstructed as a new object? Today's 3D printers take hours to print objects, and output a single static object. However, we envision a future in which 3D printing could instantly create objects from reusable and reconstructable materials.
With these capabilities, a 3D printer would become an interactive medium, rather than merely a fabrication device. For example, such a 3D printer could be used in a Virtual Reality or Augmented Reality application to dynamically form a tangible object or controller to provide haptic feedback and engage users physically. For children, it could dynamically form a physical educational manipulative, such as a molecular or architectural model, to learn and explore topics, for example in a science museum. Designers could use it to render a physical product to present to clients and interactively change the product's design through direct manipulation. In this vision, Dynamic 3D printing is an environment in which the user thinks, designs, explores, and communicates through dynamic and interactive physical representation.

UIST 18
Suzuki et.al.

For an already printed 3D artifact, can we still “edit” it?



Patching Physical Objects

Alexander Teibrich, Stefanie Mueller, François Guimbretière, Robert Kovacs, Stefan Neubert, Patrick Baudisch

Patching Physical Objects

Alexander Teibrich¹, Stefanie Mueller¹, François Guimbretière^{1,2}, Robert Kovacs¹, Stefan Neubert¹, Patrick Baudisch¹

¹Hasso Plattner Institute
Potsdam, Germany
{firstname.lastname}@hpi.uni-potsdam.de

²Cornell University, Information Science
Ithaca, NY 14850, USA
francois@cs.cornell.edu

ABSTRACT

Personal fabrication is currently a one-way process: once an object has been fabricated with a 3D printer, it cannot be changed anymore. Any change requires printing a new version from scratch. The problem is that this approach ignores the nature of design iteration, i.e. that in subsequent iterations large parts of an object stay the same and only small parts change. This makes fabricating from scratch feel unnecessary and wasteful.

In this paper, we propose a different approach: instead of re-printing the entire object from scratch, we suggest patching the existing object to reflect the next design iteration. We built a system on top of a 3D printer that accomplishes this: Users mount the existing object into the 3D printer, then load both the original and the modified 3D model into our software, which in turn calculates how to patch the object. After identifying which parts to remove and what to add, our system locates the existing object in the printer using the system's built-in 3D scanner. After calibrating the orientation, a mill first removes the outdated geometry, then a print head prints the new geometry in place.

Since only a fraction of the entire object is refabricated, our approach reduces material consumption and plastic waste (for our example objects by 82% and 93% respectively).

Author Keywords: rapid prototyping; 3D printing; sustainability.

ACM Classification Keywords: H.5.2 [Information interfaces and presentation]: User Interfaces.

General Terms: Design; Human Factors.

INTRODUCTION

Personal fabrication machines, such as 3D printers, are on the verge of becoming a mass market [10]. With more people owning a 3D printer, more and more objects will be printed in the future. Many researchers envision a future in which even inexperienced users will create their own designs using software that enables them to create objects through a design-fabricate-test-redesign cycle [4].

Permissions to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from Permissions@acm.org. *UIST '15*, November 08-11, 2015, Charlotte, NC, USA. © 2015 ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-3779-3/15/11...\$15.00 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2807442.2807467>








Figure 1: To minimize material consumption and to reduce waste during design iteration, we propose patching the existing object rather than reprinting it from scratch. (a) First, our software calculates which part changed, then (b) a mill removes outdated geometry, followed by a print head that prints the new geometry.

While we share the excitement about this future evolution, we are worried about potential implications on sustainability: unlike the more "traditional" software-based design process, creating and iterating on physical designs requires actual physical material and creates actual physical waste.

Existing angles on sustainability focus on either reducing print material (e.g. infill material [27], support material [24]) or they try to recycle the already printed material. While a few filament types, such as PLA, are biodegradable, many other materials are not. Filament extruders, such





Besides physical "editing," what are its other potential uses?

Reducing material (plastic) waste;)

Sustainable making has rapidly emerged as a significant research interest among technical HCI researchers, particularly with the growing democratization and accessibility of digital fabrication tools.

But what's the flip side? As we democratize making, we are also inadvertently democratizing the creation of waste.

Some of the current explorations to mitigate this issue

Scrappy: Using Scrap Material as Infill to Make Fabrication More Sustainable

Ludwig Wilhelm Wall
lwall@uwaterloo.ca
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada

Daniel Vogel
dvoegl@uwaterloo.ca
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada

Alec Jacobson
jacobson@cs.toronto.utoronto.ca
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

Oliver Schneider
oliver.schneider@uwaterloo.ca
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada




Figure 1: Scrappy is a system that lets users use scrap objects as infill to reduce time, cost, and material: (a) a library tracks scrap objects, like an old print, as well as other common objects; (b) an add-in for Fusion 360 suggests scraps from the library that can fit into a model, sorted by saved printing time; (c) an algorithm finds the best scrap placement and generates a modified model; (d) a custom slicer optimizes infill and adds machine commands to pause the printer with instructions how to insert the scrap into the object; (e) the final printed object has the scrap inside, reducing the material, time, and energy needed to print.

ABSTRACT

We present a software system for fused deposition modelling 3D printing that replaces infill material with scrap to reduce material and energy consumption. Example scrap objects include unused 3D prints from prototyping and calibration, household waste like coffee cups, and off-cuts from other fabrication projects. To achieve this, our system integrates into an existing CAD workflow and manages a database of common items, previous prints, and manually entered objects. While modelling in a standard CAD application, the system suggests objects to insert, ranked by how much infill material they could replace. This computation extends an existing nesting algorithm to determine which objects fit, optimize their alignment, and adjust the enclosing mesh geometry. While printing, the system uses custom tool-paths and animated instructions to enable anyone nearby to manually insert the scrap material.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

CHI '21, May 8–13, 2021, Yokohama, Japan.
© 2021 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-6096-6/21/05...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445187>

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → Interaction tech.

KEYWORDS

fabrication, geometry processing, sustainability

ACM Reference Format:

Ludwig Wilhelm Wall, Alec Jacobson, Daniel Vogel, and Oliver Schneider. 2021. Scrappy: Using Scrap Material as Infill to Make Fabrication More Sustainable. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI'21)*, May 8–13, 2021, Yokohama, Japan. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445187>

1 INTRODUCTION

Personal fabrication methods naturally generate scrap. Our formative study showed that failed prints, tests, and offcuts occur naturally in the iterative, creative practice of designing and testing physical objects. While experts might strive to use material efficiently, there will still be waste; with novices, there will be even more. These scrap objects are often thrown out, but some end up cluttering work spaces with the hope they can be used in the future. In some fabrication environments, bags of waste objects are stored for years with the hope of finding an eventual use. The process of re-melting waste filament to create new spools is commonly known, but almost never implemented, since it requires specialized machines and reduces filament quality.


CHI 21
Wall et.al.

The main idea of this work is to reduce the infill by using scrap materials lying around us


(a) Old print in new print



(b) Waste in mechanism part



(c) Discarded hardware in tool



(d) Recurring calibration prints





Figure 4: Examples showing scrap, computed mesh, and printed model: (a) an outdated print inside a new one; (b) household waste inside a mechanical part; (c) the broken handle of a hand tool inside another tool, (d) and a recurring print used to calibrate printers inside a bigger version of the same model.



The main idea of this work is to reduce the infill by using scrap materials lying around us




Figure 2: Fusion 360 integration: (a) our add-in panel displays a list of compatible scrap with previews; (b) detail of previews showing compatible scraps that would fit into a large model, such as a plastic salt shaker, a beer can, a soda can, or a cardboard packaging box.

Model	Scrap	Print time without scrap	Scrappy print time savings	Material weight without scrap	Scrappy material weight savings
Tardis	Salt dispenser	1730 min		285 g	
Gear	Jar lid	150 min		25 g	
Fossil token	Rock	55 min		10 g	
Large XYZ-cube	XYZ-cube	33 min		7 g	
Baby Yoda	Pikachu	472 min		52 g	
Phone stand	I-Pod	272 min		58 g	
Scraping tool	Broken handle	160 min		33 g	

Substiports: User-Inserted Ad Hoc Objects as Reusable Structural Support for Unmodified FDM 3D Printers

Ludwig Wilhelm Wall
lwall@uwaterloo.ca
School of Computer Science,
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada

Oliver Schneider
oliver.schneider@uwaterloo.ca
School of Computer Science,
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada

Daniel Vogel
dvogel@uwaterloo.ca
School of Computer Science,
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Canada




Figure 1: Our approach uses a modified slicer to select reusable objects to use as ad hoc structural support. Object “holders” and instructions are printed, then the user inserts objects during one or more pauses during the print. In this example, our approach reduced print time by 1 hour and saved 87% of support (2.0g out of 2.3g); even a small savings in support material can result in pronounced time savings due to reduced printer movements.

ABSTRACT

We contribute a technical solution to reduce print time and material with unmodified fused deposition modelling printers. The approach uses ad hoc objects inserted by a user during printing as a replacement for printed support of overhanging structures. Examples of objects include household items like books, toy bricks, and custom mechanisms like a screw jack. A software-only system is integrated into existing slicing software to analyze generated support print paths, search a library of objects to find suitable replacements, optimize combinations of replacement objects, and make necessary adjustments to impacted printing layers and paths. During printing, the user is prompted to insert objects with the help of lightweight printed holders to guide placement and prevent movement. Instructions printed on the build-plate help identify and position objects. A technical evaluation measures performance and benefits with different sets of ad hoc objects and different levels of user involvement.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → Interaction tech.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606718).
UIST '23, October 29–November 01, 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA.
© 2023 Copyright held by the owner(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-60558-183-3/23/10...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606718>

KEYWORDS

fabrication, interactive 3D printing, sustainability

ACM Reference Format:

Ludwig Wilhelm Wall, Oliver Schneider, and Daniel Vogel. 2023. Substiports: User-Inserted Ad Hoc Objects as Reusable Structural Support for Unmodified FDM 3D Printers. In *The 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST '23)*, October 29–November 01, 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606718>

1 INTRODUCTION



3D printers that employ fused deposition modelling (FDM) use printable support structures to reliably manufacture models with overhangs, bridges, and other geometry extending more than 45° from the Z-axis (we collectively refer to all of these as “overhangs”). Disposable support structures are pure waste, costing additional material and time, so it is desirable to minimize them.

One strategy is to optimize the support structure itself, for example, using lightweight structures that branch out from lower parts of the model to support overhangs [10]. However, this introduces additional connections between support material and the model, marring the surface finish. In general, optimizing support geometry increases the chance of failure: thin tall structures are more severely affected by thermal deformation and their low stiffness can result in accidental displacement. For these and similar reasons, support structures typically generated by slicers are sturdy with a substantial connection to the build plate and filling much of the volume beneath overhangs [1].



Another approach is to replace support structures with something else. For example, Hongyao et al. [12], Xu et al. [20] replaced a printer build plate with a mechanically actuated grid of supporting surfaces and Yigit et al. [40] propose using a robot arm to place a set

UIST 23
Wall et.al.

The main idea of this work is to reduce the supporting structure by using existing objs around us



The main idea of this work is to reduce the supporting structure by using existing objs around us



Some of the current explorations to mitigate this issue

- Reduce the material usage
- New material

Designing a Sustainable Material for 3D Printing with Spent Coffee Grounds

Michael L. Rivera
mrivera@colorado.edu
ATLAS Institute and Department of
Computer Science, University of
Colorado Boulder
Boulder, CO, USA

S. Sandra Bae
sandra.bae@colorado.edu
ATLAS Institute, University of
Colorado Boulder
Boulder, CO, USA

Scott E. Hudson
scott.hudson@cs.cmu.edu
Human-Computer Interaction
Institute, Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, USA




Figure 1: Design Process Overview. We investigated spent coffee grounds—a commonly wasted natural material—as a sustainable material for 3D printing (A). We experimented with different food-based binders and adjusted material composition to make the material self-supporting with hand-extrusion (B). We tuned 3D printing parameters for quality and reliability (C). We then explored how our material could enable sustainable prototyping workflows and creating objects like biodegradable espresso cups and planter pots (D).

ABSTRACT

The widespread adoption of 3D printers exacerbates existing environmental challenges as these machines increase energy consumption, waste output, and the use of plastics. Material choice for 3D printing is tightly connected to these challenges, and as such researchers and designers are exploring sustainable alternatives. Building on these efforts, this work explores using spent coffee grounds as a sustainable material for prototyping with 3D printing. This material, in addition to being compostable and recyclable, can be easily made and printed at home. We describe the material in detail, including the process of making it from readily available ingredients, its material characteristics and its printing parameters. We then explore how it can support sustainable prototyping practices as well as HCI applications. In reflecting on our design process, we discuss challenges and opportunities for the HCI community to support sustainable prototyping and personal fabrication. We conclude with a set of design considerations for others to weigh when exploring sustainable materials for 3D printing and prototyping.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Human-centered computing → Human computer interaction (HCI).



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike International 4.0 License.

DIS '23, July 10–14, 2023, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
© 2023 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9893-0/23/07.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3595983>

KEYWORDS

3D printing, personal fabrication, environmental sustainability, zero-waste prototyping, bio-based materials

ACM Reference Format:

Michael L. Rivera, S. Sandra Bae, and Scott E. Hudson. 2023. Designing a Sustainable Material for 3D Printing with Spent Coffee Grounds. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '23)*, July 10–14, 2023, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 18 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563657.3595983>

1 INTRODUCTION

Environmental challenges including climate change, pollution, and waste production have reached global concern. Within the Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) community, there is a growing interest in addressing these sustainability issues that are associated with the materials and the energy we use for digital technologies [12, 28, 62, 74, 77, 98]. Researchers are examining the effects of digital technology use on energy consumption [36, 130] as well as introducing strategies to mitigate energy over-use [87, 131]. Others have investigated reducing waste output by reusing objects—such as electronics [47, 55] and textiles [135]—and designing them for decomposition [45, 66, 68, 111].

The sustainability of personal fabrication technologies, particularly 3D printing, is a pressing issue [10, 31, 57, 124]. As of 2019, over 2 million 3D printers have been integrated into the homes of consumers and small businesses [103]. This widespread adoption has been enabled by open-source movements (e.g., Fab@Home [23] and RepRap [52]) and cheap kits, costing less than \$160 USD¹. Consequently, the adoption of these machines exacerbates three

¹Best Cheap/Budget 3D Printers <https://all3dp.com/1/best-cheap-budget-3d-printer-affordable-under-100-1000/>







Figure 1: Design Process Overview. We investigated spent coffee grounds—a commonly wasted natural material—as a sustainable material for 3D printing (A). We experimented with different food-based binders and adjusted material composition to make the material self-supporting with hand-extrusion (B). We tuned 3D printing parameters for quality and reliability (C). We then explored how our material could enable sustainable prototyping workflows and creating objects like biodegradable espresso cups and planter pots (D).



The image features a complex, stylized pattern of green and yellow lines on a dark green background, resembling a printed circuit board (PCB) layout. The lines form various shapes, including straight paths, curves, and clusters of small circles, some of which are highlighted with yellow outlines. In the center, there is a large black rectangle with a white dot in its top-left corner. Inside this rectangle, the text "Redo Electronics?" is written in a white, sans-serif font. The overall aesthetic is technical and digital.

Redo
Electronics?




SolderlessPCB

Can we get rid of soldering->completely?

a “solderless” PCB assembly method
using custom 3D printed housing
make SMD components easily detachable for reuse





one scenario: harvest component from old prototypes



kitchen timer


score board





PCB 3D model with cavity model

housing 3D model




git repo

Can we get rid of soldering->completely?

SOLDERLESSPCB = easy reuse of electronic components across projects


 CHI 2024 | Special Recognition for Sustainable Practices


Can we use the same substrate->again and again?



CHI 2025 | | Zeyu Yan, Advait Vartak, Jiasheng Li, Zining Zhang, Huaishu Peng

to “erase” old circuit traces
using conductive filler
to renew and modify outdated PCB for new circuit design











before RENEWAL

renewing

after RENEWAL

click to check time





Can we get rid of soldering->completely?

SOLDERLESSPCB = easy reuse of electronic components across projects

 CHI 2024 | Special Recognition for Sustainable Practices


PCB RENEWAL = same substrates for different devices

Can we use the same substrate->again and again?

 CHI 2025 | Best Paper Honorable Mention Award

Can we reuse electronic components + substrates -> completely and all together?

enable fabrication of fully recyclable PCBs
with easily separable and recoverable material: PVA and EGaln
using 3D printing and accessible tools



ready to print


printing

prototype

re-extrusion

recovered elements

deoxidize EGaIn



recycled PVA filament

reclaimed components

recovered EGaIn


retrieve components

dissolving





ESP32 breakout board
USB jack
4 SMD ICs
31 SMD two-terminal components





Some of the current explorations to mitigate this issue

- Reduce the material usage
- New material

Zoom out:

Throughout your own making and prototyping practices in this semester,

- > Where do you see waste happens?
- > What are things we can do?
- > At what cost?