V

3693.

BA1.



Project Report ETS-70

More Optimal Searches

L.G. Taff P.M.S. Randali

17 November 1983

Lincoln Laboratory

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

LEXINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS

OTIC FILE COPY

T

l

Prepared for the Department of the Air Force under Electronic Systems Division Contract F19628-80-C-0002.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

JAN 1 8 1984

84 01 18 006

The work reported in this document was performed at Linesin Laboratory, a conter for research operated by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, with the approximation the Department of the Air Force under Contrast F19638-08-C902.

This report may be reproduced to estisfy needs of U.S. Government agencies.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are these of the contractor and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the efficiel policies, either expressed or implied, of the United States Government.

> The Public Affairs Office has reviewed this report, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information forvice, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

FOR THE COMMANDER

Thomas J. Alpert, Major, USAF Chief, ESD Lincoln Laboratory Project Office

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY LINCOLN LABORATORY

MORE OPTIMAL SEARCHES

L.G. TAFF P.M.S. RANDALL Group 94

PROJECT REPORT ETS-70

17 NOVEMBER 1983

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

•.•

12

an e e se e e



LEXINGTON

MASSACHUSETTS

Abstract

This Report expands upon our previous work in this area. Specific application is made to searches for near-stationary artificial satellites and to the classical along orbit search. These two reflect different limiting cases for the a priori target distribution (uniform for the near-stationary case) and the conditional detection probability (uniform for the along orbit case). Our treatment of the near-stationary case is as realistic as is currently possible. Atmospheric extinction, eclipses, and phase effects are all included. Similarly we have explored a variety of scenarios for the along orbit search. We conclude with explicit search plan construction and illustrative examples. Finally we mention other work in this area currently underway.

CONTENTS

	Abstract	ii i
Ι.	REVIEW	1
	A. Formulation	1
	B. Optimal Searches	4
	C. The Search Plan	6
II.	NEAR-STATIONARY SATELLITE SEARCHES	9
ш.	ALONG ORBIT SEARCHES	22
IV.	ADVANCES	28
	References	29



I. REVIEW

In reference 1 one of us (LGT) introduced the concepts of optimal search theory to the artificial satellite search problem. The best summary of the literature (reference 2) is herein extended in detail to two classical search problems for deep space artificial satellites--near-stationary satellites and along orbit searches. Clearly the latter type is frequently utilized in the low altitude regime and by radars as well as by passive optical sensors. Hence the formalism that allows one to solve such problems should be of interest to a wide audience.

المحيد المعاجبة والمعاصة والمعاجبة والمعاجبة المتاجية

A. Formulation

One looks for artificial satellites on the celestial sphere. In the largest sense this forms the two dimensional <u>search space</u> of the problem. In practice we delineate a limited area of the celestial sphere (say above altitude 30°) that we shall actually search in. Denote this search space by J.

One searches using a telescope with a finite field of view. In practice we always examine an entire field, never a fraction of a field nor more than one field at a time. Hence the search space J consists of a discrete set of fields of view. Number these by the index j = 1, 2, ... In particular, since the celestial sphere encompasses 4π steradians, max $(j) < \infty$.

Before the satellite is found one assigns an a priori <u>target distri-</u> <u>bution</u> on the search space J, p: $J \rightarrow [0,1]$ (the notation means that p is a function defined over the set J which maps elements of J into the domain zero to unity inclusive). The target distribution is the a priori probability of finding an artificial satellite in field of view j ε J before one starts the search. For near-stationary satellites a reasonable model for p

is p is uniform over all geocentric right ascensions and over the geocentric declination range $< 10^{\circ}$ (or 5° or 20°). For other satellites, both because of parallax effects and the inherent spread over orbital element space (particularly in inclination), a reasonable model for p is that p is uniform over the topocentric celestial sphere. In any case

When one examines a field of view for an artificial satellite one expends a certain amount of effort trying to detect the satellite. One may look at the same field of view several times. The cost of performing k inspections in the j'th field of view is measured by a <u>cost function</u> c(j,k): J x {0,1,2,...} + [0, ∞]. Clearly $c(j,0) = 0 \vee j \in J$ (no effort implies no cost). One could measure cost by the time spent examining a field of view plus the time spent in moving to the next field of view (this makes c nonlocal and is not desirable). Operationally we always spend the same time in each field of view (more or less). Also, because [area (J)]^{1/2}/slew speed << time spent examining a field of view, the non-local element of c is both unimportant and varies little. Thus we shall measure cost by time and specialize to the case when the incremental cost of the k'th examination in field of view number j, viz.

 $\gamma(j,k) = c(j,k) - c(j,k-1)$

is a constant independent of both j (i.e., the telescope is fast and all fields of view are treated equally) and k (e.g., the same field of view is equally well inspected each time).

When one does examine a field of view of the search space looking for an artificial satellite then there is a conditional probability of detecting it on or before the k'th inspection of that field of view (given that it is there). This function, for field of view number j and examination k, is denoted by b(j,k): J x {0,1,2,...} + [0,1]. Naturally $b(j,0) = 0 \forall j \in J$ (you can't find it if you don't look for it). From the <u>detection function</u> b one can construct the probability of failing to detect the satellite on the first k-1 scrutinizations of field of view number j and then succeeding on the k'th one (given that the satellite is in field of view number j); viz.

 $\beta(j,k) = b(j,k) - b(j,k-1)$

There is a lot of physics and mathematics subsumed in the detection function. Clearly it depends on the satellite's apparent magnitude, the background star density, the night sky background brightness, the resolution element size of the detector(s), the false alarm probability one is willing to accept, how tired one is, etc. Since the celestial sphere is unchanging, atmospheric extinction can be computed, the Moon's position is known, etc. this is a computable function. Operationally, for a fixed set of external parameters, our detection probability has the shape shown in Fig. 1 where m_L is our quoted limiting magnitude (e.g., where the probability of detection is 50%). The form shown in the diagram will be used to compute the optimal search plans given below.

Finally we need to define a <u>search plan</u>. A discrete plan is a sequence $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, ...)$ which tells the searcher to first look in cell ξ_1 ; if the satellite is found there then terminate the search but if it isn't found then

look next in field of view ξ_2 , etc. A global way to describe this is by a function which specifies the <u>allocation</u> of effort devoted to each field of view j. To this end define f: $J + [0,\infty)$; f(j) is the number of examinations in field of view number j.

Above we referred to searches for a fixed target. Clearly the satellites we are trying to find are moving. We've made the assumption that these objects are fixed when compared to our search rate. The mathematical formulation of this approximation is [area (J)/search rate]·satellite angular speed << field of view.

B. Optimal Searches

Given the cost of searching field of view number j a total of k times, c(j,k), the total cost of performing the search plan ξ with allocation f is

$$C[f] = \sum_{j \in J} c(j, f(j))$$

The total number of examinations over all fields of view is $\sum_{j \in J} f(j)$. Similarly the total probability of satellite detection with this allocation of effort is P[f],

$$P[f] = \sum_{j \in J} p(j)b(j,f(j))$$

where b(j,k) is the conditional probability of finding the satellite in field of view number j after k examinations of that field of view given that it's in that field of view. There are four types of searches one might define as optimal. One might be interested in maximizing the total probability of detection when constrained to a given number of inspections (say K). If the incremental cost function $\gamma(j,k) = c(j,k) - c(j,k-1)$ is a constant, then (after a suitable renormalization) one is demanding that P[f] be a maximum for C[f] $\leq K$. Such a search is termed <u>totally optimal</u>. If one demanded optimality for all K = 1, 2, 3, . . . then the search is called <u>uniformly optimal</u>. A third type of search plan that one might consider is the search plan that maximizes the probability of detection with respect to the incremental cost and does so at every step of the search. Mathematically one finds the value of j which maximizes $p(j)\beta(j,k)/\gamma(j,k)$ at each k. These searches are called <u>locally optimal</u>. Lastly one might entertain a search plan that minimized the total expected cost (i.e., was the fastest) to find the target.

SALAN

「「「「いいい」」というでは、「いくないでは、「「いい」」というです。「「いい」」というです。「「いい」」という」という」「いったい」」である。「「いい」」という」という」では、「「」」という」という

The essential assumptions necessary to cast the artificial satellite search into the simplest form of the mathematical superstructure that Stone² outlines are

- That the satellite is fixed (i.e., search rate high compared to the satellite's angular speed),
- (2) That the search space is discrete (i.e., a fixed field of view),
- (3) That the allocation of effort is discrete (i.e., no favored fields of view), and
- (4) That γ is bounded away from zero and $p(j)b(j,k)/\gamma(j,k)$ is a decreasing function of j (i.e., no free examinations of a field of view and the larger the search space the more difficult to detect.)

I do not believe that the physics or astronomy is strained by these strictures. In fact (5) γ = constant is not unreasonable (i.e., the telescope moves smartly). The important point is that under these five limitations the totally optimal search plan, the uniformly optimal search plan, the locally optimal search plan, and the fastest searches are all <u>identical</u>. Not only that, it can be explicitly exhibited. See Stone's text for the rigorous mathematical statements of the relevant theorems and their proofs.

C. The Search Plan

We need just a bit more mathematics before we can exhibit the solution to the optimal search problem. The search plan $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3, ...)$ is a sequence of values $\xi_i \in J$ for i = 1, 2, 3, ... These specify that the i'th examination be in field of view ξ_i if the previous i-l inspections failed to detect the satellite in fields of view $\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_{i-1}$. Let the set of all such search plans be denoted by Ξ . Introduce the probability P[n, ξ] (and the cost C[n, ξ]) of detecting the satellite on or before the n'th examination while performing search plan $\xi \in \Xi$ (of the first n inspections). Finally, let r(j,n, ξ) be the number of scrutinizations out of the first n that are placed in j'th field of view while following search plan ξ . A uniformly optimal search plan [for $\gamma(j,k) = 1$; this is an unimportant normalization] $\xi^* \in \Xi$ is one such that

 $P[n,\xi^*] = \max \{P[n,\xi] : \xi \in E\}, n = 1, 2, ..., K$

A locally optimal search plan ξ^* is one such that ξ_1 is determined by $[\gamma \neq 0 \text{ necessarily}]$

$$\frac{p(\xi_1)\beta(\xi_1,1)}{\gamma(\xi_1,1)} = \max_{j \in J} \frac{p(j)\beta(j,1)}{\gamma(j,1)}$$

and having determined the field of view for the first n-l examinations $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ the field of view for the n'th one is determined from

$$\frac{p(i)\beta(i,r(i,n-1,\xi) + 1)}{\gamma(i,r(i,n-1,\xi) + 1)} = \max_{j \in J} \frac{p(j)\beta(j,r(j,n-1,\xi) + 1)}{\gamma(j,r(j,n-1,\xi) + 1)}$$

with $\xi_n^* = i$. Now define $k_n = r(\xi_n, n, \xi)$. The notation means that the n'th examination of the search plan ξ is placed in field of view ξ_n and that it is the k_n 'th time that this field of view has been searched. The average cost to find the satellite can be expressed in a variety of ways if the limit as $n \to \infty$ of P[n, ξ] is unity;

$$\mu(\xi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C[n,\xi] (P[n,\xi] - P[n-1,\xi])$$
$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \gamma(\xi_m,k_n) p(\xi_n) \beta(\xi_n,k_n)$$
$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \gamma(\xi_m,k_n) p(\xi_n)\beta(\xi_n,k_n)$$
$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \gamma(\xi_m,k_m) (1-P[m-1,\xi])$$

since $P[0,\xi] = 0$. If $\gamma(j,k) = 1$ then this reduces to

$$\mu(\xi) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1-P[n,\xi])$$

Now we can exhibit the solution explicitly. Under the assumptions outlined above if q_j is the probability of detecting the satellite after a single examination of field of view number j (given that it is in field of view number j) then, as each inspection is an independent event, the incremental conditional probability of detection $\beta(j,k) = b(j,k) - b(j,k-1)$ is given by

$$\beta(j,k) = q_j (1-q_j)^{k-1}$$
 for $j \in J$, $k = 1, 2, ...$

Normalize such that $\gamma(j,k) \approx 1 \forall j \in J, k = 1, 2, ...$ and suppose that an allocation f(j) has total cost (i.e., number of inspections) K,

$$\sum_{j \in J} f(j) = K$$

The total probability of detection for this allocation of effort will be

$$P[f] = \sum_{j \in J} p(j)b(j,f(j)) = \sum_{j \in J} p(j)[1-(1-q_j)^{f(j)}]$$

Consider the search plan defined by: one makes the n'th inspection in field of view number i ε J such that

$$p(i)q_i(1-q_i) = \max_{\substack{j \in J \\ j \in J}} p(j)q_j(1-q_j) r(j, n-1, \xi)$$

Then $\xi = \xi^*$ and is optimal (in all senses). This result is due to Chew³. Since J is finite the existence of an i satisfying the above is guaranteed. If one exploits the uniformity of the target distribution p over the search space J, then the result is even simpler,

$$q_{i}(1 - q_{i}) = \max_{j \in J} q_{j}(1 - q_{j})^{r(j, n-1, \xi)}$$
(1)

II. NEAR-STATIONARY SATELLITE SEARCHES

・本語をななないたな。

We have already argued that the a priori target distribution p(j) can be approximated by a defective uniform distribution over the search space. We have also argued that the incremental cost function is homogeneous over J and independent of the number of looks, $\gamma(j,k) = 1$ (in appropriate units). The probability of detection of the satellite in field of view number J (given that it's there) is q_j . This depends principally on the apparent magnitude of the satellite and the night sky background. Three effects tend to make satellites fainter; atmospheric extinction, loss of brightness due to increasing phase angle, and increasing distance (heliocentric or geocentric).

The extinction is modeled as usual,

E * E secz

where z is the topocentric zenith distance and c_z is the extinction per unit air mass. We've used a value of 0.13 mag/air mass for ϵ_z . For the phase function in magnitudes I've used the results in reference 4

$$B(1,0) = B(1,0) + 0.538 - 0.134 |0|^{0.714} - 72$$
 for $|0| < 7^{\circ}$

$$B(1,0) = B(1,\theta) - \theta l$$
 for $|\theta| > 7^{\circ}$

where B(1,0) is the absolute B magnitude and $B(1,\theta)$ is the apparent magnitude corrected for phase angle θ . The parameter of the linear part of the phase function in magnitudes $\ell = 0.039$ mag/deg. Eclipses can play an important role in searches for near-stationary satellites. Obviously it makes no sense to search that part of the sky currently undergoing eclipse (in the visible wavelength bands). Moreover, it would be a mistake to preferentially find an artificial satellite just prior to its eclipse (eg. westward of the shadow cone). Hence not looking within the penumbra represents one level of search planning refinement and only looking eastward of the penumbra represents yet another step up in sophistication.

3

The geometrical discussion of artificial satellite eclipses is more complicated than that for the Moon because the satellites are much closer. The results were worked out by one of us (LGT) in 1981. For a near-stationary satellite the half-angle of the umbral cone is 8^2427 while that of the penumbral cone is 8^2960 . Since it only takes ~ 2 minutes to traverse this $\sim 0^25$ and the brightness variation during the transition through penumbral eclipse is exceedingly difficult to model, we've chosen to ignore the distinction. The half-angle of the penumbral eclipse cone was then increased by 2%to allow for refraction effects in the Earth's atmosphere. Ellipticity of the Earth, its atmosphere, and its heliocentric orbit have either been ignored (the first two) or averaged over (the latter).

Since the eclipse is centered at the solar opposition point we merely test for the angular distance from the center of a field of view to the opposition point. If this distance is less than 1.02 times the half-angle of the penumbral shadow cone then the apparent magnitude is set equal to ∞ which results in a probability of detection of zero (cf. Fig. 1). Otherwise the apparent magnitude is calculated as indicated above. For the trailing shadow cone searches, the right ascension of the center of the field of view is less than (mod 24)



Fig. 1. Probability of detection (P_D) as a function of magnitude difference from the limiting magnitude (m_L) .

that of the opposition point, then the probability of detection = 0. Otherwise it is computed as just described. Sample search plans are shown in Figs. 2-8.

All of the search plans have been terminated under the same (artificial) criteria: Either each field of view of the search space $(30^{\circ} \times 3^{n})$ in declination x right ascension) is examined once or a field of view of the search space is about to be examined for the seventh time (a combination storage/ reasonableness criteria of futility). The fields of view are each 2° x 2° (uncorrected for the coso foreshortening). Furthermore all of the sample search plans are illustrated in the same format: Declination increasing up (North) and right ascension to the right (East). The numbers in the individual fields of view are the examination number, following the optimal search plan, of that field of view. No entry means that the field of view wasn't examined before termination. Thus, if you look at Fig. 2, the most northeasteriy field of view was never examined while the field of view just to its west was inspected twice--on the 1276 look of the optimal search plan and on the 1372 look. Similarly the highest probability field of view was searched on the first examination of the optimal search plan and on the 562 look. The effort is distributed in elliptical waves, about the opposition point, in Fig. 2. The major axis of the ellipse is vertical--joining the opposition point and the zenith. Actually the "ellipses" are not North-South symmetrical, they bulge more in the North (eg. note the number of empty fields of view in the southwestern and southeastern corners as opposed to the corresponding northern ones). The reason for this is that the satellites are brighter nearer the zenith (because of reduced atmospheric extinction) than

DECLINATION

in:

1 TR 10

																			1	3087	5-N	1
N O			1433		ž ž ž ž z	ĔġÊţġ	ži zi z	÷ 2 4 2 6 E	ĒĒĀĒŸĒ	751 330 312 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 300 30	1:8:2 <u>F</u>	<u> </u>	É2882	281852	é: 25 t 2	ittit	5553X	iitet:	55853	: Fif:	1276 1377	
R T H				3835 X	222323	: 11:55	*==?*?	128882	iliti	233255	181 141 481 488	ÊSFEE	ŝłte	î leti	EEEEEE	řtesta		22 4 2 7 8 2 7	333253		807 1147 1180 1347 1403	
		ÉÉ	18828 19228	386333	7 381 81	231222	i r f g g g	: 1 5 5 5 3	:::::::	7 2 3 2 5	28283	ättar	i i f i s	ž3žez	÷363÷	ĒSBE	*****	222 2 8 2	198885	043 613 786 681 1168 1280	780 077 1030 1141 1313 1697	ĔĨĖ
				ž ž 1115	82822 P	3000 310 670 910 1271	125323	82223	****	323 1	40 197 473 1401	i j î t	2232	1;};		1912 <u>8</u>	52 11]		R. 1 1 1 1 2 1	47 47 827 107 11	417 777 673 1663 1186 3163	i i i i
		1001 110 <i>1</i> 1110 1110	718 827 916 1986 1936	žiete	201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201 201	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1258 2	žBžčz	17 18 481 1885	1 2 2 K	27 18 48	li.	33 182 700	30 176 60)	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	10 10 10 10 10 10	44 207 384 241 1355	111 250 616 644 1025	231 220 401 411 914 1200			12:38
		1011 1120 1200 1273	::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	82 32 52 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32		130 272 431 429 1482	a R a R s	315 215	M 133 434 134	2 ; ji	*** ****	170	, nj	17 188 1915	28 141 401	<u> </u>	71 M PR	97 3 M 973 473 1000	201 201 470 680 646 1117	318 441 571 756 002 1186	631 666 779 663 1687 1380	i i i s
5		1000 1100 1204 1210	610 773 676 1027 1140 1209	376 673 611 610 1010 1216	141 117 148 159 178	112 961 618 640 1423	• * * * *	2862	N 111 679	êt :	. .		•";	14 744)) ()) ())	78 178 118	64 176 367 970	* 5 2 2 2		3 7 3 7 4 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	iin:	ĒĒĒIS
			jë i e s t	613 638 630 621 1000 1277	214 3.34 615 786 877 1238	118 207 427 421 1877 1421	2 R R C	lter	24 177 667	18 198 1838			:	·17 241	žêr	63 133 491 130	88 176 201 827 1636	17 270 317 300 1100	1 80 200 474 443 1321		ii ka k	85838 85838
ner		1 190 1 386 1 386	73852	*****	111223	35622	81 210 272 710 1141	2885	36 135 667 1175	78 166 751	, 14 , 109 , 1233		, ;;	** 18 867)1 136 680	52 147 640 696	**************************************	107 344 407 644 1040	225 216 661 677 919 1234	111111	506 716 630 907 1133 1330	911 1667 1168 1394 1394 1413
		1301 1410	063 001 1112 1221 1221	121228	179 64 9 67 17 6 4 9 67 17	19939 19939 19939	ž f a č i	58883	87 194 829 883	37 134 816 1370	, a :	31 189 7:4	70 100 733	335 1 500 6 7 7	44 170 444 1980	43 173 260 632	81 210 213 700 1127	144 700 444 979 979 1179	379 344 434 774 876	440 402 470 444 1833 1941		1000 1100 1310 1000
-			1444	6:3:5:1 1 1 1 1 1 1	463 666 603 7070 1211	794 848 844 731 838 1997	ittt:		77 185 394 767 1377	8 î î e		41 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	., 140 447 1803	64 161 930 937	67 171 300 614 1629	40 510 303 773 1167	114 263 021 036 1010 1020	333 Mi 403 914 1147	330 370 700 700 111	*****	46.7 973 1140 1300 1301	1997
			1336 1419	876 1821 170 170 1706 1700	6407 733 643 903 1136 1235	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	274 340 636 130 677 1221	*****	1.8 8 C 1		78 186 181 781 1921	73 187 756 766 766	74 180 971 1919	84 344 353 779 1797	64 978 984 749 1151	118 370 620 807 1002 1460	131 314 409 437 127 1279	311 643 674 676 663 1143	641 549 745 755 195	748 848 974 889 1291 1491	1168 1176 1337 1116	
				11.99 1.317 1.399	834 919 1873 1188 1386		376 624 615 620 1011 1011	788 388 785 8 1 1 1	730 315 685 671 936 199	167 J93 680 630 975 1366	118 294 422 426 1617 1426		110 266 410 647 1827	13) 275 436 436 436 436 400	197 797 460 861 1976		323 467 661 775 9723 1164	400 663 736 667 1664 1744	40) 800 1070 1070	1000 1117 1217 1304	1107	
8 0 U					1 1 44 1 2 8 3 1 3 8 8	446 967 1608 1177 1164	400 744 964 1000 1143 1344	417 673 735 660 1006 1267	3 M 667 793 667 1197	296 206 647 743 646 1200	200 343 636 717 617 1330	364 329 611 697 693 1369	254 235 616 701 600 1240	279 347 637 729 629 1313	313 643 676 763 966 1102	200 527 610 625 1676 1210	130 130 70 130 130 130 130	732 636 946 1166 1256 1256	* 500 + 1 11.0 * 700 2 * 304 * * 4 19	197. 1897		
т Н ↓						1748 1387 1476	543 1667 1164 1114 1114	733 681 981 1177 1177 1101	540 776 647 991 1.125	614 607 764 079 1064 1201	11111	41)7 547 444 641 1235	447 646 647 644 1010 1247	481 679 736 664 1061 1782		643 797 979 1961 1172 1969	848 877 1979 1979	1002 1102 1210 1210 1400	1442			
,	WES	T				•	•	•	•		-	<u> </u>	•		•				•	•	.	EASI

RIGHT ASCENSION

Fig. 2. Optimal search plan for a near-stationary artificial satellite on midnight local time of a winter solstice night. Each rectangular field of view is 2° X 2°. See the text for a fuller description. they are closer to the nadir. The cumulative probability of detection at the termination of the search was 60.7% assuming that the artificial satellite was in the search space initially. After examining J fields of view the optimal plan was 23% more efficient than the uniform (eg. existing) search plan. This increase in efficiency had dropped to 4.2% after 4J cells had been examined (that is the cumulative probability of detection of the optimal search plan after the firt 4J examinations was 4.2% larger than the cumulative probability of detection of 4 repetitions of the plan that searches each of the J fields of view of the search space once [= the uniform plan]). This loss of effectiveness is easy to understand by actually looking at Fig. 2. As the search wears on the allocation of effort approaches uniformity, hence the relative advantage should approach unity.

1

The next figure (Fig. 3) shows the same scenario but at 3 A.M. local time instead of at midnight. There is an obvious northeasterly shift of effort (because of extinction). There are further small scale differences but more importantly after J field of view examinations the optimal search is 34.4% more efficient than a uniform one would be (with the same total cost of course). Figure 4 is identical to Fig. 2 but for a satellite a half magnitude brighter. Now each cell of the search is examined because it makes sense to do so. The final cumulative probability of detection is 83.1%.

Figure 5 repeats the scenario of Fig. 2 but now eclipses are included. The hole in the center represents the penumbral shadow cone and this search plan is markedly different from the one in Fig. 2. This time the optimal search plan is 65.7% more efficient than the uniform one after J looks, 42.7% after 2J looks and 32.0% after 3 looks. The cumulative probability of detection at termination is 35.9%.

RIGHT ASCENSION

Fig. 3. Same as Fig. 2 but for 3 A.M. local time.

でものでものではないでのではないでいた。そこそので、そこそので、そこそ、そこそ、そこそ、そこそ、そうそ、そうたいで、これできたが、そうたいで、たいで、たいで、たいで、たいで、これでも、これで、 第二章

												_						_	13	087	3-N]_
† N O	ш ст	313 400	38	7% 339	23	330 493	100 437	35	1i	111 887	143 414) H (1	1 E	łí	124 479	12 14 1	318 422	ĘŻ	žž	22	H
R T H		=		21. 10 10	5		172 401	:#	117	,,,	124	140	162	180	122	136 621	194	3.	311 436	841 381	21	201 371
	311 438	=	28a 239	234) 3000	#		127		**	81	n	-	-	7	•,	102	120	114	197 641	211	847 367	18 11
	=		=		#	1 ad 6 1 1	117	-	-	-	-	-	••	•	•1	•	101	131		197	133 362	2000 3.300
	=	372 131	343 347		167 	120	-	74	•,	•	,,		"	-	41	••	-		:,,	12	829 418	=
	.			19	#	130	-	•		*	13	,	•	"	39	-	,,	-	1 M 633	179 477	433	=
Z		;;	51	1		117	81	13	u د	18	•	,	,	•;	21	-	-		111		111	
DECLINATION	Ξ		11	1	:::	110	80	-	*	14	•	3	•	17	4		*		134	129 474	110 117	
DEC	117 110	=	3E	9877 439		194	P1	43	ac.	Ph		•	"	10	21	N	70	107		100	136 407	#1
	7.7 49	Ξ	11	221 414	:	139 819	, 48	70	87	"	*	31	30	33	•	43	92	122	162 443	100	138 303	5
		3877 381	53	334 384		, <u>,</u>	im	-	**	-	8	•	47	*	•7	-		147 610	162) 467	8123 413	M7 M3	201
	103 479	710 610	E	11	377	188 47	::	138	148	-	7	73	74	**	•		7.03 816	17	210 6.21	344 173	177 187	
		***	6 F	585 349		894 411		ŝŝ	141 818	126	118	160	118	·ø1	133 646	16.5 662	1 Mg 972		; <u>;</u>	**	793 378	314 412
8 0 U	473	338 681	ž	***	179	=	230 401	13	t t	170 683	138 47	161 804	184 801	183 500	17	193 443	217 410	243 379	247 334	740 270	12	×.
т н 1	47	35	44		38	14 77	ÎÈ	244 373	370	112 427	ŝž	ţi	23	700 2,4	ž :	in See	360 367	374 233	201 374	200 431	130 641	177 847
V	WE8	T			L				نےا ء		T 49						L		Ļi		Ē	EAST

· · ·

RIGHT ASCENSION

Fig. 4. Same as Fig. 2 but for a satellite of $p^{m}_{...5}$ brighter.

A-NORTH

ما و على ما وحير ما يو ال و من المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد

RIGHT ASCENSION

Flg. 5. Same as Fig. 2 but including eclipses.

In Fig. 6 we've changed from the winter solstice to the vernal equinox. Otherwise it's a repetition of the Fig. 3 scenario but at 9 P.M. local time. The North-South asymmetry is especially evident because opposition is lower in the sky ($\delta = 0^{\circ}$) than it was at the winter solstice ($\delta = \epsilon$ = obliquity of the ecliptic = 23°5). After an expenditure of effort of J scrutinizations the optimal search plan is 60.3% more efficient than is the uniform one. Figure 7 is also on march 21 but at midnight; compare with Fig. 5. Finally, Fig. 8 shows vernal equinox, midnight, trailing edge shadow cone search plan. The first field of view is displaced northeast (extinction) and there's a marked tendency to look in the middle declination fields of view (phase loss).

Hopefully these examples will convince you that optimal search planning is non-trivial, non-intuitive, and important.

-

and the second second

130877-N



Fig. 6. Same as Fig. 2 but at 9 P.M. local time on the vernal equinox.

19

ومددر وجرمر م

٨

warmented that he water at the open that to be to

												_					-		3087	78-N	
				111	35825	22228	1 40 2 30 3 2 3 4 1 3 6 40 7 75	98 161 361 307 618 671	63 116 212 333 678	28228	: f f í s a	33 88 187 443 715	88 188 188 210 487 487	111553	11111	186283	380 407 616 417 736 604	505 627 730 634	674 		
a r H			*.M		115111	1 2 1 R 5 P	N 219 23 28	17 44 173 441 77	·		- 23 1 2	- 12535	12 64 140 230 611 032	153283	122261	599555	111137	376 4.83 664 638 773 673	43% 730 617		
			618 782 813		177 364 340 436 680 731	70 135 337 400 801	77 78 143 787 477 747	0 43 199 274 633 863						2 29 126 209 873	14 80 143 277 605 786	85:38r	192858	238 337 387 621 626 783	44 33 13 78 3 1 78 3 2	837	
			19365	243 234 497 639 783 783	147 176 380 81 672 681	33 80 176 365 443 714	8 46 129 277 647 647								- 2 2 2 8	282382	40 127 214 338 463 679	170 233 234 421 670 770	1518:8	HE I	
		47 47	41443		74 133 229 346 403 688	18 55 148 782 485 784										- 7 5 5 8 8	34 91 181 209 484 7.0		788 177 438 477 447 447	441 440 774 461	
		763 427		188 231 332 417 978 728	86 189 380 336 477 84	11 - 23 24 - 24 25 - 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2											34 75 186 .97 1	100 100 244 371 610 674		647 614 711 618	
		743 877		187 220 221 411 647 723	81 18 29 29 48 88	8 47 131 275 623 614											23 73 166 2162 477 763	264Kic	240 330 330 634 178 780	10.00	
		***	1451F	174 236 241 435 660 733	54 112 330 576 676												25 80 185 298 480 744	182 171 246 379 816 677	# # 2 2 2 8 8	6.74 638 748 839	
		•	19313	215 387 382 475 687 778		i i i i e :												130 207 221 304 800 791	314 303 400 117 400	439 736 614	
			112	37.5 37.5 47.4 41.5 41.5 41.5 41.5 41.5 41.5 41.5 41	::::	i i i i a										19 67 361 266 771	73 133 310 344 483 483	197 293 293 439 639 646 752	482 482 883 878 809	#00 #1	
			E	404 878 647 646 911	822352	66 147 212 300 609 609	N 43 197 288 441 797								13 88 142 273 601 603	108 108 207 210 470 470	138 210 294 385 665 703	300 300 64.2 679 679 673 824	***		
		-		818 720 817		16,3 26,3 43,3 640 736	03 146 330 367 605 602	31 37 38 4 71 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7						21 71 164 270 470 763	67 110 208 128 474 482	121 199 247 391 644 697	246 330 405 634 670 753	647 664 834 760 680	931		
					401 943 799 444	261 418 632 617 767 601	213 200 370 441 441 797	114 190 200 407 637 637	R 1311 311 321 321 321 321 321 321 321 321	80 104 195 317 446 692	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	41 100 313 442 700	61 112 200 231 679 679	20 3 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3	100 331 322 612 640 126	967 286 423 647 647 647	437 666 421 741 642	278			
s D						44) 786 630	426 020 010 717 025	393 244 444 444 477	217 293 384 484 411 775	175 386 342 429 403 334	162 224 316 610 606 721	142 229 326 416 471 726	194 261 386 639 644 780	240 337 606 635 635 637 754	100 430 646 627 768 686	640 616 713 616	814 875				
							•••	431 752 618	614 500 516 791 677	430 639 406 707 433	776 487 686 684 796	600 200 603 617 605	6433 6433 6324 761 846	877 841 786 829	742 621						
WE	ST		<u></u>		L	L	Ļ	L	4	L	L	L	L	┟ ┈╶━━━	L	·	L	<u> </u>	<u></u>	н	L E A

RIGHT ASCENSION

Fig. 7. Same as Fig. 5 but on the vernal equinox.



RIGHT ASCENSION

Fig. 8. Midnight local time, vernal equinox optimal search plan including eclipses but only trailing shadow cone edge.

and the second second

<u>. N. .</u>

and state in

III. ALONG ORBIT SEARCHES

One usually initiates an along orbit search when an examination of the nominal position for the artificial satellite doesn't yield the object of interest. In addition one has assumed no change in the satellite's orbital plane, merely that the satellite is slightly late or slightly early. Hence an along orbit search is one wherein a series of fields of view (or beam widths), along the topocentric path of the assumed orbital plane and travelling with the satellite's presumed mean motion, are examined under the hypothesis that the mean anomaly at epoch is slightly larger or smaller than its nominal value. Such a procedure renders the moving target fixed in the moving coordinate system of the search space. As the usual reason for the nonappearance of a satellite is a perturbation in the mean motion (atmospheric drag) or a poor element set (due to a mean motion/eccentricity swap), the search space is not strictly comoving with the satellite. Therefore to remain within the fixed target scenario, the strong inequality

> area search space << field of view search rate << relative angular speed

must hold (relative angular speed = |true mean motion-nominal mean motion|).
I shall assume this to be the case.

With this point in mind the search snace J for the along orbit search is a linear series of field of view (see Fig. 9). I shall label them by j = -N, -N + 1, ..., 0, ..., N. The a priori target distribution p will be assumed to be symmetrical $[p(n) = p(-n) \ n = 0, 1, 2, ..., N]$ and unimodal $[1 \ge p(0) \ge p(1) \ge$ $... \ge p(N)]$. We intend to acquire data this Fall at the ETS to provide an empirical estimate for p as a function of orbital type and age. For the



1.7

7

CPCA-WA-WA-WA-WA

Fig. 9. Comoving and actual fields of view for an along orbit search.

explicit numerical computations listed below we shall further assume that the probability of being in either of the next outer fields of view is equal to that of being in the adjacent inner one, viz.

$$p(n + 1) + p(-n - 1) = p(n) = p(-n)$$

and since p is symmetrical this implies that

$$p(n + 1) = p(n)/2$$
 $n = 1, 2, ..., N$

The cost function is most realistically defined in terms of time--the time spent examining a field of view plus the time required to move to the next one. In the case of the GEODSS network, the telescopes accelerate and decelerate so fast that the non-local nature of the cost function for the small areal extent $\{\leq(2N + 1)\theta$ where θ is the field of view [N.B. This is not strictly true because J is comoving with the satellite. The real maximum angular extent is a complicated function of N, θ , the satellite's mean motion, and the time spent inspecting each field of view]} involved here shall be neglected. Since the time spent examining each field of view is a constant,

 $c(j,k) = k(t_{look} + t_{move}), v j \in J, k = 1,2,...$

where t_{look} is the time spent looking in a field of view for the artificial satellite and t_{move} is an average duration of a movement from one field of view to another. In the appropriate set of units the incremental cost function b(j,k) = c(j,k) - c(j,k-1) = 1.

The last quantity needed to specify the problem is the conditional detection probability b(j,k). As the portion of the celestial sphere covered

by J is small, the natural background and foreground sources of noise vary smoothly, and the time to complete an along orbit search is short, the differential extinction, phase angle, night sky background, etc., effects are all small. Therefore, the essential approximation for the along orbit search is that b(j,k) is homogeneous,

$$b(i,k) = b(j,k)$$
 vi, jcJ; k = 1,2,...

If b is the single glimpse probability (i.e., the conditional probability of detection in any field of view given that the satellite is in that field of view) then the incremental probability of detection on the k'th examination is

$$\beta(j,k) = b(1 - b)^{K-1}$$
 $k = 1,2,...$

Note that $\partial b/\partial j = 0$ and $\partial \beta/\partial j = 0$ because of the assumed homogeneity of b(j,k). The algorithm for planning the search is, cf. Eq. (1),

$$p(i)b(1-b)^{r(i,n,\xi)} = \max_{j \in J} p(j)b(1-b)^{r(j,n-1,\xi)}$$

and if the n'th inspection is in field of view $\xi_n = i$ then search plan $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$ is optimal.

Let's consider the first few inspections of three different along orbit searches. In each case we'll take J=5 (N=2) and p(-2) + p(-1) + p(0) + p(1)+ p(2) = 0.8 so p(-2) = p(2) = 0.08, p(-1) = p(1) = 0.16, and p(0) = 0.32. First let the single glimpse probability of detection be high, b = 95%. Then the optimal search plan for the first 20 examinations is the sequence

$\xi^* = (0,1,-1,2,-2,0,1,-1,2,-2,0,1,-1,2,-2)$

The probabilities of detection with this allocation of effort are 76%, 79.80%, and 79.99% after the first 5, 10, and 15 looks. Note that $P[f] \le 0.8$ in this case. Since the first five looks of the optimal search plan are in each field of view of the search space, the existing search plans yield the same probability of detection after completion as does the optimal one. This should not be at all surprising since it's been assumed that you'll find the satellite if you look at it (i.e., b = 0.95). The difference between the usual search plan and an optimal one becomes more apparent as the probability of detection decreases or the maximum amount of effort (K) increases.

To see this more clearly let us reduce b to 55%. The optimal search plan for the first 21 examinations is (both this plan and the one above appear to be periodic)

 $\xi^* = (0,1,-1,0,2,-2,1,-1,0,2,-2,1,-1,0,2,-2,1,-1,0,2,-2)$ The cumulative probabilities of detection following the optimal plan's alloca-

tion of effort are 47.52%, 65.38%, 73.42%, and 77.44% after 5, 10, 15, and 20 looks. If we just look in each cell of the search space the corresponding cumulative probabilities of detection would be (for the same <u>total</u> effort) 44%, 63.8%, 72.71%, and 76.72% respectively. Once again, not much difference between the optimal plan and the usual ones. Of course it's been assumed that we have a pretty good chance of detection.

To tip the balance towards the optimal plan consider the case of a faint object, say b = 0.15. The first twenty-two stages in the optimal plan are

 $\xi^* = (0,0,0,0,0,0,1,-1,0,1,-1,0,1,-1,0,1,-1,0,1,-1,2,-2)$

Note the heavy concentration on that field of view of the search space where the a priori target distribution is highest. The optimal search plan is telling us that when our chance of detection is minimal (b = 15%) then we'd best not look where it's not likely to be. The cumulative probabilities of detection following the allocation of effort of the optimal plan are 17.80%, 28.58%, 36.94%, and 43.50% after 5, 10, 15, and 20 looks. The once in each field of view search plan has only a 12% cumulative probability of detection upon completion. Thus the optimal plan is 48% more efficient than the usual one after the customary expenditure of effort. Repeating the usual plan once or twice yields cumulative probabilities of detection upon completion of 22.2% and 30.87%. The optimal plans with equal expenditure of effort are 29% and 20% more effective in these cases.

IV. ADVANCES

There are two areas of especial interest that we have not dwelled upon. One concerns optimal searches for moving targets. The rigorous theory that supports optimal searches for fixed targets has not been developed for this case. Hence, while an experienced optimal searcher may pursue his (or her) intuition in such matters, certainty is lacking. The second domain concerns optimal searches for targets by multiple searchers--either moving or fixed targets and colocated or separated searchers. Space based surveillance systems will yield yet another order of complexity when non-colocated and moving searchers look for moving targets in an asynchronous fashion. Progress on these topics is being made by others and in particular, the optimal multiple search for constant brightness, near-stationary artificial satellites has been solved (reference 5, see reference 6 too).

References

- L. G. Taff, "Optimal Search Theory and Optical Artificial Satellite Searches," Project Report ETS-64, Lincoln Laboratory, M.I.T. (5 May 1982), DTIC AD-All5617/3.
- 2. L. D. Stone, Theory of Optimal Search (Academic Press, N.Y., 1975).
- 3. M. C. Chew, Ann. Math. Stat. 38, 494, 1967.
- 4. T. Gehrels and F. F. Tedesco, Astr. J. 84, 1079, 1979.
- 5. W. Stronquist, private communication, 1983.
- 6. S. S. Brown, Oper. Res. 28, 1275, 1980.

	UNCLASSIFIED			
SECURITY CLASS	HFICATION OF THIS PAGE (PA	n Data Entered)		
	REPORT DOCUME	NTATION PAGE	1	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
I. REPORT NUMBER	N	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.		A RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
ESD-TR-83-	-070	AD. A1369	34	
. TITLE (and Subt	title)			. TYPE OF REPORT & PENIOD COVERED
				Project Report
More Optin	nal Searches			roject nepot
·				. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
				Project Report ETS-70
T. AUTHOR(a)			1	. CONTRACT ON WHART NORDER(s)
Laurence G	. Taff and Patrice M.S.	Randall		F19628-80-C-0002
PERFORMING ON	GANIZATION MAME AND ADORES	<u> </u>		IS. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
Lincoln Lat	boratory, M.I.T.			AREA & WORK UNIT HUMBERS Program Element Nos. 63428F
P.O. Box 73				and 12424F
Lexington,	MA 02173-0073			Project Nos. 2698 and 2295
1. CONTROLLING O	OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		[1	12. REPORT DATE
Air Force C	Command, USAF			17 November 1983
Andrews Al			H	1. RUMBER OF PAGES
Washingto	on, DC 20331			38
4. MONITONIEG AG	GENCY NAME & ADORESS (If diff	erent from Controlling Of	(fire)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
Electronic S	Systems Division			Unclassified
	FB, MA 01731		H	IS. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDUL
	STATEMENT (of this Report) or public release; distri	bution unlimited.	1	
Approved f			ani from Report)	
Approved fo	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end		ant from Report)	
Approved for D. DISTRIBUTION S D. SUPPLEMENTAR None	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end	iered in Block 30, if differ		
Approved for by distribution a be supplementan None be key word# (Co	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end NY NOTES	iered in Block 30, if differ	:k aumber)	rget distribution
Approved for the distribution of the supplementant Norie the key words (Co	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end NY NOTES	ered in Block 30, if differ	sk number) a priori ta	rget distribution al detection probability
Approved f), distribution a 12. supplementan None 13. key wond; (Co	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end NY NOTES ontinue on reverse side if nece optimal searches near-stationary artificia	ared in Block 20, if differ mary and identify by bloc il satellites	a priori ta conditiona	•
Approved for 1). DISTRIBUTION S 13. SUPPLEMENTAN None 13. KEY WORD% (Con 14. ABSTRACT (Con This Reponet Cases for the optimation of	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end NY NOTES ontinue on reverse side if nece optimal searches near-stationary artificia along orbit search winne on reverse side if neces ort expands upon our pr ry artificial satellites an a priori target distribut uniform for the along o suble. Atmospheric exti	ared in Block 20, if differ many and identify by block is satellites many and identify by block revious work in this is ind to the classical alo ion (uniform for the rbit case). Our treate nction, eclipses, and a along orbit search.	a priori ta conditiona number) area. Specific a ng orbit search near-stationar ment of the nea phase effects a . We conclude	al detection probability pplication is made to searches for n. These two reflect different limiti- ry case) and the conditional detection ar-stationary case is as realistic as is are all included. Similarly we have with explicit search plan construction
Approved for i). DISTRIBUTION S 13. SUPPLEMENTAR None 13. KEY WORDS: (Con This Reponet a solution of the	or public release; distri STATEMENT (of the abstract end W NOTES ontinue on reverse side if nece optimal searches near-stationary artificia along orbit search winne on reverse side if neces ort expands upon our pr ry artificial satellites an a priori target distribut uniform for the along o sible. Atmospheric exti riety of scenarios for th	ered in Block 20, if differ manary and identify by block is satellites very and identify by block revious work in this is id to the classical alo ion (uniform for the rbit case). Our treats nction, eclipses, and is along orbit search. mention other work	a priori ta conditiona number) area. Specific a ng orbit search near-stationar ment of the nea phase effects a . We conclude	al detection probability pplication is made to searches for n. These two reflect different limiti- ry case) and the conditional detection ar-stationary case is as realistic as is are all included. Similarly we have with explicit search plan construction

.

•

.

3-0

<mark>a ten ander ander a ten ander a ten ander a ten ander ander ander ander a ten ander a</mark>