



AUTONOMOUS NAVIGATION OF A SATELLITE CLUTTER

THESIS

Stephen C. Johnston, Captain, USAF

AFIT/GA/ENY/90D-9

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AIR UNIVERSITY

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohid

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

AN 0 3 1991

Datribution Unlimited

AFIT/GA/ENY/90D-9

AUTONOMOUS NAVIGATION OF A SATELLITE CLUSTER

THESIS

Stephen C. Johnston, Captain, USAF

AFIT/GA/ENY/90D-9

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

AFIT/GA/ENY/90D-9

	Accession For
TONOMOUS NAVIGATION OF A	NTIS GRA&I DTIC TAB Unannounced Justification
SATELLITE CLUSTER	By
	Availability Codes
	Dist Special
THESIS	A-1

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering of the Air Force Institute of Technology Air University In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

AUTONOMOUS

Master of Science in Astronautical Engineering

Stephen C. Johnston, B.S. Captain, USAF

December, 1990

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited



<u>Preface</u>

This study investigated the state observability problems associated with a previously developed on-board recursive filter that estimates the relative position of each satellite within a satellite cluster. A non-linear least squares filter was used to find and remove the unobservable components of the state. The on-board filter's performance was reinvestigated with the updated state equations.

My heartfelt appreciation and thanks go to Dr. William Wiesel and Dr. Rodney Bain for providing my greatest enjoyment at AFIT, their astrodynamics classes. Additional thanks go to Dr. Wiesel, my thesis advisor, for his support and guidance in completing this thesis. My deepest love and thanks go to my wife Christy who followed me to Dayton, Ohio and endured, once again, the life of a student. I give my greatest love and thanks to the greatest joy in my life, my sons Greg and Andrew. My special thanks and love go to my parents, Hugh and Shirley Johnston for their many years of love, guidance, and support.

Stephen C. Johnston

ii

Table of Contents

Pa	ge
Preface	ii
List of Figures	iv
Abstract	vi
I. Introduction	1
II. Background	4
2.1 Truth Model	4
2.2 Kalman Filter	11
2.2.1 Dynamics	14
2.2.2 U-D Covariance Factorization Filter .	16
2.3 State Definition	19
III. Observability Analysis	23
3.1 Non-Linear Least Squares Estimation	23
3.2 Analysis	24
IV. Performance Analysis	32
4.1 Filter Tuning	33
4.2 Monte Carlo Simulation	37
4.2.1 Two Satellite Constellation	39
4.2.2 Five Satellite Constellation	41
4.2.3 Ten Satellite Constellation	48
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	55
Bibliography	57
Vita	5 9

List of Figures

-

Figu	re	Page
1.	Reference System	5
2.	True Error and Covariance as a Function of Time with zero	
	dynamics noise	34
3.	True Error and Covariance as a Function of Time with Dynamics	
	Noise on the order of $2.25 \times 10^{-14} \text{KM}^2/\text{SEC}^2$	36
4.	Filter Tuned with Dynamics Noise Covariance of	
	9X10 ⁻¹⁸ KM ² /SEC ²	37
5.	Average Error for a Two Satellite Constellation	40
6.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for a Two Satellite Constellation	41
7.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 2	43
8.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 2	44
9.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 3	45
10.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 3	46
11.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 5	4 7
12.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 5	47

iv

Figu	re	Page
13.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 2	49
14.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 2	50
15.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 5	51
16.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 5	52
17.	Average Error Between Satellites 1 and 10	53
18.	Comparison of Average True Error and Covariance Versus Time	
	for Satellites 1 and 10	54

-

ABSTRACT

The relative position determination of a cluster of satellites operating in a low earth orbit is investigated. A U-D Covariance Factorization Kalman Filter is used for the on-board estimator with dynamics based on the Clohessy-Wiltshire equations. Measurements consist of range data between a single host satellite and the remaining cluster. Therefore only relative position and velocity states with respect to the host satellite can be determined. A 15-sample Monte Carlo simulation was conducted with clusters of 2, 5 and 10 satellites, respectively. Performance results consist of average error, average true error and filter covariance as a function of time.

vi

AUTONOMOUS NAVIGATION

OF A

SATELLITE CLUSTER

I. Introduction

The concept of using a recursive filter for relative position determination for a cluster of satellites acting as a space based radar was the topic of two previous Air Force Institute of Technology masters' theses. The initial concept called for a cluster of up to ten satellites orbiting in a near circular, low earth orbit. The cluster was placed within a volume of space of dimensions 500 X 500 X 500 meters³ and the accuracy requirement of the filter was 25 meters. The accuracy was based upon the requirement to form a clear, cohesive image and is a function of the radar's wavelength. The filter operated on range data determined from synchronized clock pulses.

Captain Michael L. P. Ward investigated the feasibility of using a recursive filter to determine the relative position of each satellite within the cluster. The filter was a U-D covariance factorization Kalman filter. During testing, Captain Ward discovered that the downrange component of the state was unobservable (6:2-17). The

cluster's state was therefore modified to include only relative downrange components. The filter's performance satisfied the required accuracy and proved promising under initial testing (6:4-1). The continued testing of the filter was conducted by Captain Sherrie Norton Filer.

Captain Filer investigated the discrepancy between the results from each satellite (3:2). Captain Ward's initial testing revealed that filter performance was different for each satellite. The satellite that contains the filter under investigation is defined as the host satellite. During continued research, Captain Filer discovered that the filter for the host satellite, designated satellite #1, was unable to update its state vector components. Additional information was sent to satellite #1's filter in an effort to improve its ability to update its own state. When this effort proved unsuccessful, Captain Filer initiated a search for other unobservable state components. The research yielded mixed results; it seems that none of the states were truly unobservable (3:52).

The purpose of this thesis is to continue the investigation into the unobservability of the state components. The orbital altitude, cluster radius, and accuracy requirement will remain the same. The cluster geometry will be a random distribution of satellites within

the cluster volume. Satellite #1 will be considered the primary satellite and its filter's performance will be the source of the results presented in this thesis. Extensive usage of Captains Ward and Filer's computer code will be made in an effort to reduce development and testing time.

II. Background

The U-D covariance factorization filter computer code was originally generated by Captain Ward. Additionally, a truth model was developed to provide the estimator with perfect or corrupted range data and to provide a true state for comparison against the estimator's state. The following sections detail the development of the truth model and the estimator as previously presented by Captain Ward (6:2-1-2-21).

2.1 Truth Model

The truth model was base on two-body orbital dynamics and provided the cluster's true state and the relative distance between each satellite. The range data is a relative measurement and therefore absolute positions cannot be determined by the estimation filter. Alternatively, the relative distance is defined with respect to a rotating reference point located in a circular orbit of radius R with velocity $\sqrt{\mu/R}$. The rotating reference frame $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z})$ rotates with respect to an earth-centered inertial reference frame $(\hat{t}, \hat{j}, \hat{k})$ at a constant angular rate of $\omega \hat{k}$ (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. Reference System. (3:5).

The reference point's initial position and velocity are:

$$r_{ref} = \begin{pmatrix} R \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

$$v_{ref} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0\\ \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{R}}\\ 0 \end{array} \right\}$$
(2)

The position of each satellite within the cluster was defined randomly about the reference point and takes the form:

$$r_i = \begin{pmatrix} R \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \{n_i\}^* (500 meters)$$
(3)

where n_i is a vector of random numbers between -0.5 and 0.5 from a uniformly distributed random number generator.

The radial and out-of-plane components of a satellite's velocity are determined by the Clohessy-Wiltshire equations (these equations will be introduced in the next section) and take the form: (8:80)

$$v_i \hat{l} = \eta (r_i \hat{l} - r_{ref} \hat{l}) \tag{4}$$

$$v_i \hat{k} = \eta r_i \hat{k} \tag{5}$$

where η is the mean motion of the reference point.

The third component of the satellite's velocity is determined from the constraint that the orbital periods of all satellites within the cluster must be equal to ensure that the cluster remains intact. From Kepler's laws, the orbital period of an elliptical orbit is a function of the semi-major axis of the orbit (2:33). Therefore, the semi-major axis of each satellite must be the same and equal to the radius of the reference point. Utilizing the energy equation, one may solve for the third velocity component to obtain:

$$v_i \hat{j} = \sqrt{2\mu \left(\frac{1}{r_i} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha\right) - v_i \hat{i} \cdot v_i \hat{i} - v_i \hat{k} \cdot v_i \hat{k}} \quad \hat{j}$$
(6)

The above information may be used to form the inputs to the estimator. Captain Ward defined the initial true state as the position and velocity components of each satellite expressed with respect to the rotating reference frame [ROT]. Initially, the axes of both the fixed, inertial frame [FIX] and the rotating frame are aligned and the position and velocity may be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{r}_{i[\text{ROT}]} = (\mathbf{r}_{i} - \mathbf{r}_{ref})_{[\text{FIX}]}$$
(7)

$$\mathbf{v}_{i[\text{ROT}]} = (\mathbf{v}_{i} - \mathbf{v}_{rof})_{[\text{FIX}]} - \omega \times \mathbf{r}_{i[\text{ROT}]}$$
(8)

therefore the state at t=0 is

$$X_{t}(0) = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_{1}_{[ROT]} \\ V_{1}_{[ROT]} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma_{s}_{[ROT]} \\ V_{s}_{[ROT]} \end{bmatrix}$$
(9)

Additionally, the truth model outputs an s-1 relative measurement vector.

$$z_{t} = \begin{bmatrix} |r_{1} - r_{2}| \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ |r_{1} - r_{s}| \end{bmatrix} + u_{t}$$
(10)

where u_i represents zero-mean, white Gaussian noise with an associated covariance of R_i (4:330). The noise u_i is the best representation for errors in computing the range measurements from the clock pulses. There are numerous sources for the errors, but for the purpose of this thesis

the errors are lumped together into a single term and considered independent from measurement to measurement (6:2-6).

The future position and velocity vectors for each satellite are determined by the solution of the Kepler problem and the f and g equations defined in terms of the eccentric anomaly E (2:219). The equations take the following form:

$$f = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{r_o} (1 - \cos \Delta E) \tag{11}$$

$$g = t - \sqrt{\frac{a^3}{\mu}} (\Delta E - \sin \Delta E)$$
 (12)

$$\dot{f} = \frac{\sqrt{\mu a} \sin \Delta E}{r r_o}$$
(13)

$$\dot{g} = 1 - \frac{a}{r} (1 - \cos \Delta E) \tag{14}$$

where ΔE and r are defined as:

$$\Delta E = E_f - E_o \tag{15}$$

$$r = a(1 - e\cos E_f) \tag{16}$$

The value of the eccentric anomaly, E_f , for any time twas determined by a Newton iteration scheme due to the transcendental nature of the Kepler equation. Once $f, g, \dot{f}, and \dot{g}$ are determined, the new position and velocity vectors for each satellite may be calculated using:

$$r(t) = fr_o + gv_o \tag{17}$$

$$v(t) = \dot{f}r_{o} + \dot{g}v_{o} \tag{18}$$

Once the position and velocity of each satellite with respect to the inertial reference frame have been determined, the relative position and velocity vectors with respect to the rotating reference frame can be determined. First, the new inertial position and velocity vectors of the reference point must be determined. This is easily accomplished by a rotation about the \hat{k} axis through an angle θ defined as:

$$\theta = \omega \cdot t \tag{19}$$

Therefore, the new inertial position and velocity vectors for the reference point are:

$$r_{ref[fix]}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} R\cos\theta \\ R\sin\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(20)
$$v_{ref[fix]}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{\mu}{R}}\sin\theta \\ \sqrt{\frac{\mu}{R}}\cos\theta \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(21)

The inertial, relative position and velocity vectors between each satellite and the reference point are determined by subtracting the two solutions.

$$r_{rel[fix]} = [r(t) - r_{ref}(t)] = r_1 \hat{i} + r_2 \hat{j} + r_3 \hat{k}$$
(22)

$$v_{rel[fix]} = [v(t) - v_{ref}(t)] = v_1 \hat{i} + v_2 \hat{j} + v_3 \hat{k}$$
(23)

Since the inertial and the rotating reference frames are no longer aligned, eqns (22) and (23) must undergo a coordinate transformation through the angle θ as previously defined. The relative position and velocity vectors expressed with respect to the rotating reference frame are:

$$\begin{bmatrix} r_{1[\text{ROT}]} \\ v_{1[\text{ROT}]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} r_{1}\cos\theta + r_{2}\sin\theta \\ -r_{1}\sin\theta + r_{2}\cos\theta \\ r_{3} \\ v_{1}\cos\theta + v_{2}\sin\theta + \omega \cdot r_{2} \\ -v_{1}\sin\theta + v_{2}\cos\theta - \omega \cdot r_{1} \\ v_{3} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \\ \dot{x} \\ \dot{y} \\ \dot{z} \end{bmatrix}$$
(24)

Once the position vectors expressed in the rotating reference frame have been determined, the filter inputs can be calculated as before.

2.2 Kalman Filter

The extended Kalman filter is used due to the nonlinear nature of the measurements. The 'U-D covariance factorization' version of the Kalman filter was used to solve numerical problems encountered by Captain Ward (6:2-14). This form of the Kalman filter will continue to be used for the estimator once the observability problems are identified and corrected.

The system's state propagation is described in terms of a linear stochastic differential equation. The available filter inputs are discrete-time, noise corrupted, nonlinear measurements of the range between the satellites. The Kalman propagation equations for the system are (4:220):

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_i^-) = \Phi(t_i, t_{i-1}) \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_{i-1}^+)$$
(25)

 $P(t_i^{-}) = \Phi(t_i, t_{i-1}) P(t_{i-1}^{+}) \Phi^{T}(t_i, t_{i-1}) + G_d(t_{i-1}) Q_d(t_{i-1}) G_d^{T}(t_{i-1})$ (26)

Where

 Q_d = The covariance of the dynamics driving noise. $\hat{x}(t_i^-)$ = The estimated state after time propagation. $\hat{x}(t_i^+)$ = The estimated state after the measurement update. G_d = Equals the identity matrix (because the model is an equivalent discrete-time representation of a continuous-time system (4:377))

 Φ = The state transition matrix.

The time argument (t_i^*) will be replaced by (\pm) for the remainder of the text. The first time propagation occurs before any measurement updates, thus the initial filter state and covariance must be established (6:2-10). For

ease in studying the steady state behavior of the filter, \hat{x}_o will be set equal to $x_i(0)$. The initial state covariance matrix P_o will be diagonal with position elements of order $10^{-6}km^2$ and velocity elements of order $10^{-12}km^2/sec^2$ respectively.

The extended Kalman filter update equations are (5:44)

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}(+) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}(-)\mathbf{K}\{\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{h}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}(-)]\}$$
 (27)

$$P(+) = P(-) - KHP(-)$$
 (28)

K is the Kalman filter gain; an expression defining the gain will be developed shortly.

The measurement vector $h(\hat{x},t)$ is the filter's estimate of the range between the satellites. Therefore, the residual is the difference between the observed data vector and the measurement vector, $z-h[\hat{x}(-)]$. The measurement vector's form is:

$$\mathbf{h} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{(x_1 - x_2)^2 + (y_1 - y_2)^2 + (z_1 - z_2)^2} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \sqrt{(x_1 - x_s)^2 + (y_1 - y_s)^2 + (z_1 - z_s)^2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ \vdots \\ h_{s-1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(29)

The matrix H is developed from linearizing the h vector with respect to the state components and evaluating it after the time propagation of the state, $\hat{x}(-)$:

$$H = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x = \hat{x}(-)}$$
(30)

Which has the following form:

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{1} & -\mathbf{H}_{1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{H}_{2} & 0 & -\mathbf{H}_{2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_{s-1} & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\mathbf{H}_{s-1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(31)

where

$$\mathbf{H}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_{1} - x_{2}}{h_{1}} & \frac{y_{1} - y_{2}}{h_{1}} & \frac{z_{1} - z_{2}}{h_{1}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(32)

$$\mathbf{H}_{s-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_1 - x_s}{h_{s-1}} & \frac{y_1 - y_s}{h_{s-1}} & \frac{z_1 - z_s}{h_{s-1}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(33)

2.2.1 Dynamics

The system dynamics, i.e. the state transition matrix, is based upon the Clohessy-Wiltshire equations of motion. These equations describe "the relative motion of two satellites when one is in a circular orbit." (8:78):

$$\ddot{x} - 2\eta \dot{y} - 3\eta^2 x = 0 \tag{34}$$

$$\ddot{y} + 2\eta \dot{x} = 0 \tag{35}$$

$$\ddot{z} + \eta^2 z = 0 \tag{36}$$

One may integrate these equations about the initial conditions $x_o, \dot{x}_o, y_o, \dot{y}_o, z_o, \text{and } \dot{z}_o$ to obtain the position and velocity solutions (8:79-81)

$$x(t) = -\left(\frac{2}{\eta}\dot{y}_{o} + 3x_{o}\right)\cos\eta t + \frac{\dot{x}_{o}}{\eta}\sin\eta t + 4x_{o} + \frac{2}{\eta}\dot{y}_{o} \quad (37)$$

$$y(t) = y_{o} - (3\dot{y}_{o} + 6\eta x_{o})t + \left(\frac{4\dot{y}_{o}}{\eta} + 6x_{o}\right)\sin\eta t + \frac{2\dot{x}_{o}}{\eta}\cos\eta t - \frac{2\dot{x}_{o}}{\eta}$$
(38)

$$z(t) = z_o \cos \eta t + \frac{\dot{z}_o}{\eta} \sin \eta t$$
 (39)

$$\dot{x}(t) = (2\dot{y}_o + 3\eta x_o)\sin\eta t + \dot{x}_o\cos\eta t \tag{40}$$

$$\dot{y}(t) = -3\dot{y}_o - 6\eta x_o + (6\eta x_o + 4\dot{y}_o)\cos\eta t - 2\dot{x}_o\sin\eta t$$
 (41)

$$\dot{z}(t) = -z_o \eta \sin \eta t + \dot{z}_o \cos \eta t \tag{42}$$

Now, one may develop the state transition matrix (8:81).

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) & 0 \\ 6(\sin\psi - \psi) & 1 & 0 & \frac{2}{\eta}(\cos\psi - 1) & \frac{4}{\eta}\sin\psi - \frac{3\psi}{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi & 0 \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & 0 & 0 & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi \end{bmatrix}$$
(43)

where ψ is $\eta \delta t$ and δt is the sample time. Generalizing the state propagation equation for the s satellites yields

2.2.2 U-D Covariance Factorization Filter

The U-D filter is especially valuable for small word length micro-processors, since it achieves twice the numerical precision capability for the same wordlength (4:400). The basis of the filter is the factorization of the covariance matrices into a unitary upper triangular and a diagonal matrix, such that

$$P(-) = U(-)D(-)U'(-)$$
(45)
$$P(+) = U(+)D(+)U^{T}(+)$$
(46)

The algorithm is initiated with the same initial covariance values as stated above. First, the initial n-by-n covariance matrix P_o (where n is the number of states) is factored into the UDU^T form by the following steps:

First, for the n^{th} column determine

$$D_{nn} = P_{nn} \tag{47}$$

$$U_{in} = \{ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & i = n \\ P_{in}/D_{nn} & i = n-1, n-2, \dots, 1 \end{array}$$
(48)

Then for the remaining columns, j = n - 1, n - 2, ..., l determine

$$D_{jj} = P_{jj} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{n} D_{kk} U_{jk}^{2}$$
(49)

$$D_{jj} = \begin{cases} 0 & i > j \\ 1 & i = j \\ \left[P_{ij} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{n} D_{kk} U_{ik} U_{jk} \right] / D_{jj} & i = j-1, j-2, \dots, 1 \end{cases}$$
(50)

Once the initial U and D matrices are determined, the state can be propagated forward to the first update time. The n-by-2n matrix Y(-) is formed by augmenting the state propagation equation and the identity matrix G_d .

$$Y(-) = [\Phi U(+) | G_d]$$
(51)

Finally, the 2n-by-2n matrix $\tilde{D}(-)$ is formed by using the D(+) and Q_d matrices as the block diagonal elements.

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}}(-) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}(+) & 0\\ 0 & \mathbf{Q}_{d} \end{bmatrix}$$
(52)

The transpose of the Y(-) matrix forms a matrix of column vectors a_i of length 2n.

 $Y^{\mathsf{T}}(-) = [a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_n]$ (53)

The propagation is accomplished by calculating the following relationships for k = n, n-1, ..., l:

$$\mathbf{c}_{k} = \mathbf{\tilde{D}}(-)\mathbf{a}_{k} \quad (\mathbf{c}_{kj} = \mathbf{\tilde{D}}_{jj}(-)\mathbf{a}_{jk}, \quad j = 1, 2, ..., 2n)$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{kk}(-) = \mathbf{a}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{c}_{k}$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{k} = \mathbf{c}_{k}/\mathbf{D}_{kk}(-) \quad (54)$$

$$U_{jk}(-) = \mathbf{a}_{j}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{d}_{k} \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., k-1$$

$$\mathbf{a}_{j} \leftarrow \mathbf{a}_{j} - U_{jk}(-)\mathbf{a}_{k} \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., k-1$$

The final step of the U-D covariance factorization algorithm is the scalar measurement update. The following equations complete the update using the previously computed $U^{T}(-)$ and D(-) matrices, the 1-by-n rows of the $H(t_{i})$ matrix and the measurement covariance value.

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{U}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{H}^{\mathsf{T}}$$

 $v_{j} = D_{jj}(-)f_{j} \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., n$ (55)
 $a_{o} = R$

Then, for k = 1, 2, ..., n

$$a_{k} = a_{k-1} + f_{k}v_{k}$$

$$D_{kk}(+) = D_{kk}(-)a_{k-1}/a_{k}$$

$$b_{k} \leftarrow v_{k} \qquad (56)$$

$$p_{k} = -f_{k}/a_{k-1}$$

$$U_{jk}(+) = U_{jk}(-) + b_{j}P_{k} \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., k-1$$

$$b_{j} \leftarrow b_{j} + U_{jk}(-)v_{k} \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., k-1$$

The filter gain is then determined by

$$\mathbf{K} = \frac{\mathbf{b}}{a_n} \tag{57}$$

Finally, the state vector, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(+)$ and the covariance matrix, P(+) can be determined using Eqns 27 and 28.

2.3 State Definition

The state for the cluster was initially composed of the position and velocity components with respect to the rotating reference point. That is, until Captain Ward discovered that the downrange, y, component of each satellite was unobservable. The component was removed from satellite #1's state and for satellites #2-s, the component was replaced with a relative down-range component measured with respect to satellite #1. The state vector for satellite #1 is updated to

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1} \\ z_{1} \\ \dot{x}_{1} \\ \dot{y}_{1} \\ \dot{z}_{1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(58)

While the state vectors for satellites #2-s appear as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{i} \\ \Delta y_{i} \\ z_{i} \\ \dot{x}_{i} \\ \dot{y}_{i} \\ \dot{z}_{i} \end{bmatrix} \qquad i = 2, 3, \dots, s \tag{59}$$

Where Δy_i is determined by subtracting the y solution for satellites #2-s from the y solution for satellite #1. Therefore,

$$\Delta y_{i}(+) = y_{1}(+) - y_{i}(+)$$

$$= [6(\sin \psi - \psi)](x_{1} - x_{i}) + (y_{1}(-) - y_{i}(-)) + (60)$$

$$\left[\frac{2}{\eta}(\cos \psi - 1)\right](\dot{x}_{1} - \dot{x}_{i}) + \left(\frac{4}{\eta}\sin \psi - \frac{3\psi}{\eta}\right)(\dot{y}_{1} - \dot{y}_{i})$$

The generalized state transition matrix, $\Phi_{\rm r}$ becomes

Where

$$\Phi_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & 0 & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi & 0 \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & 0 & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi & 0 \\ 0 & -\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi \end{bmatrix} (62)$$

$$\Phi_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) & 0 \\ -6(\sin\psi - \psi) & 1 & 0 & -\frac{2}{\eta}(\cos\psi - 1) & -\frac{4}{\eta}\sin\psi + \frac{3\psi}{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi & 0 \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & 0 & 0 & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi \end{bmatrix}$$
(63)

and

Additionally, the h vector and the H matrix are modified to yield

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{x_{1} - x_{i+1}}{h_{1}} & \frac{z_{1} - z_{i+1}}{h_{1}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(67)

$$H_{i} = \left[-\left(\frac{x_{1} - x_{i+1}}{h_{i}}\right) \quad \frac{\Delta y_{i+1}}{h_{i}} \quad -\left(\frac{z_{1} - z_{i+1}}{h_{i}}\right) \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \right]$$
(68)

Once minor changes are made to the truth model and the estimator algorithms, the computer program is exactly as it was when Captain Ward generated his results.

III. Observability Analysis

The search for unobservable states was complicated by the use of the U-D covariance factorization algorithm, since the filter does not directly invert any matrices. Therefore, the filter was replaced by a non-linear least squares filter to take advantage of the fact that the matrix $\sum T^{T}Q^{-1}T$ (to be developed shortly) is inverted during the estimation process.

3.1 Non-Linear Least Squares Estimation

The equations of interest in the non-linear least squares problem are the update to the reference trajectory equation, the covariance of the estimate equation, and the residual equation. The update to the reference trajectory is given by:

$$\delta \mathbf{x}(t_{o}) = (T^{T}Q^{-1}T)^{-1}T^{T}Q^{-1}\mathbf{r}$$
(69)

Where for convenience the matrix product $H \Phi(t_i, t_o)$ was redefined as T. The vector r is the residual vector. The trajectory estimate is then given by:

$$\mathbf{x}(t_o) = \mathbf{x}_{ref}(t_o) + \delta \mathbf{x}(t_o) \tag{70}$$

The estimate covariance is given by:

$$P_{\delta x} = (T^{T}Q^{-1}T)^{-1}$$
(71)

Finally, the residual vector is given by the difference of the observed and the calculated data vector.

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}(t_o), t_i), t_i)$$
(72)

The variables that appear on the right hand sides of the above equations were previously defined in Chapter 2. The inversion of the matrix product $T^TQ^{-1}T$ is the foundation of the calculations that appear in eqns 69-71. If the matrix is singular, a zero eigenvalue will exist (1:357), and the estimate covariance and the state update defined by eqns 69 and 71, respectively, will be undefined. In other words, unobservable states are present if the matrix is singular. Therefore, the ability to successfully invert the matrix $T^TQ^{-1}T$ is the key to the removal of the unobservable states.

3.2 Analysis

The analysis initially consisted of inverting the matrix $\sum T^{T}Q^{-1}T$ using a Gaussian elimination with maximal pivoting algorithm. Several assumptions were made to simplify the analysis: namely, the constellation consisted of only two satellites which greatly simplifies the problem; the data vector consisted not of the range between

the satellites, but consisted of the actual components of the state and the individual data measurements were considered independent and each equally contributing to the estimate to eliminate any questions about the data causing observability problems; and finally, the initial reference state was defined as the initial true state determined by the truth model thus reducing the analysis to a single iteration of the non-linear least squares estimation algorithm.

The first attempt to evaluate the inverse of $\sum T^{T}Q^{-1}T$ yielded a singular matrix as expected, confirming earlier suspicions of state unobservability. The next step was to redefine the state and update all equations defined with respect to the new state components (this task follows the steps outlined in Section 2.3). But which state components should be removed? An examination of the $\sum T^{T}Q^{-1}T$ matrix for which the Gaussian elimination process failed yielded a matrix of the following form.

where X is a non-zero value. The z and \dot{z} components were removed in an assumption that an absolute horizontal plane of reference could not be determined.

The new state consists of the x, \dot{x} , and \dot{y} components for satellites #1 and #2 and the relative components Δy , Δz , and $\Delta \dot{z}$ between satellites #1 and #2. The new equations for the non-linear least squares analysis assume the following form:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{y}_1 \\ x_2 \\ \Delta y_2 \\ \Delta y_2 \\ \Delta z_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \dot{y}_2 \\ \dot{y}_2 \\ \dot{y}_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{h}$$
(74)

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1 & 0\\ \Phi_{12} & \Phi_2 \end{bmatrix}$$
(75)

$$\Phi_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi \end{bmatrix}$$
(76)

$$\Phi_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) & 0 \\ -6(\sin\psi - \psi) & 1 & 0 & -\frac{2}{\eta}(\cos\psi - 1) & -\frac{4}{\eta}\sin\psi + \frac{3\psi}{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi & 0 \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & 0 & 0 & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi \end{bmatrix}$$
(78)

Again, the inversion of $\sum T^T Q^{-1}T$ failed, yielding a singular matrix. The Gaussian elimination process reduced the matrix to

	X	Х	X	Х	Х	Х	X	Х	X
	X	X	Х	Х	Х	X	Х	X	X
	X	X	X	X	X	Х	X	Х	X
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Χ	X	Х	Х	X	X	X	X	X
	X	X	X	Х	Х	X	X	Х	X
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	X_{-}	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	$\lfloor X \rfloor$

One may examine eqns 73 and 79 to conclude that the zero rows corresponding to the z_2 and \dot{z}_2 components were removed by introducing relative z and \dot{z} components into the state. Based upon this conclusion, the zero rows for the $x_2, \dot{x}_2, \text{and} \dot{y}_2$ components may be removed by introducing relative $\Delta x, \Delta \dot{x}, \text{and} \Delta \dot{y}$ components into the state. This discovery warranted a re-examination of the solutions to the Clohessy-Wiltshire equations. If the solutions for satellite #1 and #2 are subtracted from each other and if like terms are collected, one obtains the following set of equations.

$$\Delta x(+) = (4 - 3\cos\psi)\Delta x_{o}(-) + \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta}\Delta \dot{x}_{o}(-) + \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi)\Delta \dot{y}_{o}(-) \quad (80)$$

$$\Delta y(+) = [6(\sin\psi - \psi)]\Delta x_{o}(-) + \Delta y_{o}(-) + \frac{2}{\eta}(\cos\psi - 1)\Delta \dot{x}_{o}(-) + \left(\frac{4}{\eta}\sin\psi - \frac{3\psi}{\eta}\right)\Delta \dot{y}_{o}(-) \quad (81)$$

$$\Delta z(+) = \cos \psi \Delta z_{o}(-) + \sin \frac{\psi}{\eta} \Delta \dot{z}_{o}(-)$$
(82)

$$\Delta \dot{x}(+) = 3\eta \sin \psi \Delta x_o(-) + \cos \psi \Delta \dot{x}_o(-) + 2\sin \psi \Delta \dot{y}_o(-)$$
(83)

$$\Delta \dot{y}(+) = 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1)\Delta x_o(-) - 2\sin\psi\Delta \dot{x}_o(-) + (-3 + 4\cos\psi)\Delta \dot{y}_o(-0.84)$$

$$\Delta \dot{z}(+) = -\eta \sin \psi \Delta z_o(-) + \cos \psi \Delta \dot{z}_o(-)$$
(85)

This set of equations indicates that there is no possibility for determining the position and velocity state components separately for satellites #1 and #2 based upon a range measurement between the two satellites. For example, examining the $\Delta x(+)$ equation, an increase in the $x_1, \dot{x}_1, \text{and } \dot{y}_1$ components and a corresponding increase in the $x_2, \dot{x}_2, \text{and } \dot{y}_2$ components would yield the same solution as if no change had occurred at all. In other words, satellite #1, the filter's host satellite, considers itself at the origin of the reference frame and determines the relative motion of the other satellite with respect to itself. Once identified, the discovery seems obvious when one considers that range is a relative measurement and by itself does not yield any position information.

Equations 80-85 constitute the new dynamics model that the filter will use during the estimation process. The new state vector and state transition matrix for a cluster of s satellites assume the following form:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta x_{2} \\ \Delta y_{2} \\ \Delta z_{2} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{2} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{3} \\ \Delta x_{5} \\ \Delta x_{5} \\ \Delta x_{5} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{5} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{5} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{5} \\ \Delta \dot{x}_{5} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1} - x_{2} \\ y_{1} - y_{2} \\ \dot{x}_{1} - \dot{x}_{2} \\ \dot{x}_{1} - \dot{x}_{2} \\ \vdots \\ \ddots \\ x_{1} - x_{5} \\ y_{1} - y_{5} \\ \dot{x}_{1} - \dot{x}_{5} \\ \dot{x}_{1} - \dot{x}_{5} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} (+) = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \Phi & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \phi \end{bmatrix} \{ \hat{\mathbf{x}} (-) \}$$
(87)

where

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} 4 - 3\cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} & \frac{2}{\eta}(1 - \cos\psi) & 0 \\ 6(\sin\psi - \psi) & 1 & 0 & \frac{2}{\eta}(\cos\psi - 1) & \frac{4}{\eta}\sin\psi - \frac{3\psi}{\eta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 0 & 0 & \frac{\sin\psi}{\eta} \\ 3\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi & 2\sin\psi & 0 \\ 6\eta(\cos\psi - 1) & 0 & 0 & -2\sin\psi & -3 + 4\cos\psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\eta\sin\psi & 0 & 0 & \cos\psi \end{bmatrix}$$

(88)

Additionally, the h vector and the H matrix are now defined as

$$\mathbf{h} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\Delta x_{2}^{2} + \Delta y_{2}^{2} + \Delta z_{2}^{2}} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \sqrt{\Delta x_{s}^{2} + \Delta y_{s}^{2} + \Delta z_{s}^{2}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{2} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ h_{s} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{2} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & H_{3} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & H_{s} \end{bmatrix}$$
(89)
$$(90)$$

where

$$\mathbf{H}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta x_{i}}{h_{i}} & \frac{\Delta y_{i}}{h_{i}} & \frac{\Delta z_{i}}{h_{i}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(91)

IV. Performance Analysis

Once the observable states are defined and the filter algorithm completed, the next step is to tune the filter and conduct a Monte Carlo simulation in order to assess the filter's performance. The tuning of the filter consists of varying the diagonal elements of the dynamics noise covariance matrix Q_d ; a rather simplified approach. Once the filter is adequately tuned, a Monte Carlo simulation will be conducted. The constellation size will be varied and so will the random number seed used to corrupt the range data. Fifteen test cases will be evaluated for constellations of two, five, and ten satellites. The positional errors between the truth model and the estimator will be determined at each time step. Average error versus time and average true error and filter covariance versus time plots will be generated. The average error should be near zero and the average true error and the filter covariance should be approximately equal.

The filter's performance is examined by comparing the values of the true error and the covariance of the estimate. The true error is the magnitude of the position difference between the truth model state and the estimate state.

TRUE ERROR =
$$\sqrt{E_x^2 + E_y^2 + E_z^2}$$
 (92)

where E_2 is the difference between the Δx , Δy , or Δz component of the true state and the estimate state. The estimate's covariance is equal to the square root of the sum of the squares of the eigenvalues associated with the position components of the estimated state.

$$\sigma = \sqrt{(Eigenvalue(x))^2 + (Eigenvalue(y))^2 + (Eigenvalue(z))^2}$$
(93)

4.1 Filter Tuning

The first step in tuning the filter is to assess the filter's performance with the elements of the dynamics noise matrix set to zero. The true error and the covariance are plotted together in Figure 2 for approximately 20 orbits with a time step of 300 seconds. After the initial transient, the covariance exponentially dec.yed approaching zero. The estimate approaches perfection as the covariance approaches zero. Once the covariance reaches zero, the estimate will no longer change with time and a state of ignorance will exist concerning the future behavior of the estimated state. Therefore, the filter must be tuned so that the covariance on the average will neither decay to zero nor grow to infinity (7:84).



Figure 2. True error and covariance as a function of time with zero dynamics noise.

The process of tuning was confined to the diagonal elements of the dynamics noise covariance matrix Q_d with a constellation consisting of two satellites. The first task was to establish a ballpark initial value for the diagonal elements. The range between satellites was assumed to be accurate to within one centimeter. Therefore, one may

determine an acceleration value that will yield approximately a one centimeter error in position after one orbit by solving the following equation for a.

$$0.01 meters = \frac{1}{2}a(Period)^2$$
(94)

The period is approximately 6300 seconds and the calculated value of "a" is approximately $5X10^{-10}KM/SEC^2$. Initially, only the diagonal elements corresponding to the relative velocity components were changed. Therefore, the elements assumed a value equal to:

$$Q_d = (a \Delta t_{update})^2 \tag{95}$$

The update time was 300 seconds and the new diagonal elements were approximately $2.25 \times 10^{-14} K M^2 / \text{SEC}^2$. The exponential decay of the zero dynamics noise filter was removed, but the true error curve was considerably below the covariance curve. Therefore, the filter was overestimating the error of the estimate (see Figure 3).





Several values later, the filter was successfully tuned with an acceleration value of $1X10^{-11}KM/SEC^2$ and a noise covariance of $9X10^{-18}KM^2/SEC^2$. Figure 4 illustrates the desired result that the true error and the covariance curves overlap one another.



Figure 4. Filter tuned with dynamics noise covariance of $9X10^{-18}KM^2/\text{SEC}^2$.

The diagonal elements of the noise covariance matrix corresponding to the position components were varied but did not yield any appreciable benefits. For all subsequent testing, these elements remained set to zero.

4.2 Monte Carlo Simulation

Once the filter was successfully tuned, a 15-sample Monte Carlo simulation was conducted for constellations of 2, 5, and 10 satellites. The purpose of the simulation is to test the filter's performance based upon varying initial The truth model generated the true state and conditions. the range data between the host satellite and the remaining satellites at each time step. The initial estimator state was set equal to the initial state determined from the truth model. The random number generator seed used during the corruption of the range data was changed for each simulation run. For each constellation size and for each simulation run, the positional errors between the truth model and the estimator, and the filter covariance were calculated and stored within separate data files. The final results consisted of an average error, an average true error, and the filter covariance at each time step. For constellations of 5 and 10 satellites, the average errors and covariance were determined for three different groupings of satellites. For example, the error data was calculated between satellites #1 and #2, #1 and #3, and #1 and #5 for the five satellite constellation.

The average error is determined by summing the positional errors from the 15 data files for each time step and dividing by 15.

$$\overline{E} = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (E_x + E_y + E_z)_i$$
(96)

The average true error is determined by summing the square of the positional errors from the data files, dividing by 15 and taking the square root.

$$\overline{E}_{T} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{15} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (E_{x}^{2} + E_{y}^{2} + E_{z}^{2})_{i}}$$
(97)

The covariance calculated by the estimator at each time step is recorded in an additional data file. The average error should be approximately equal to zero and the average true error and the filter covariance should be approximately equal.

4.2.1 Two Satellite Cluster

Figures 5 and 6 depict the average error and the average true error and covariance results for a two satellite cluster. As expected the average error curve is near zero and the average true error and the filter covariance curves are nearly equal as a function of time. The average true error approaches a value of approximately 3 centimeters or three times the range measurement error and is well within the 25 meter accuracy requirement (3:vii). The steady state filter performance exhibits an oscillatory nature with a period equal to the orbital period of the cluster (approximately 6300 seconds).



Figure 5. Average error versus time for a two satellite cluster.





4.2.2 Five Satellite Cluster

Figures 7-12 depict the average error and the average true error and covariance results for a five satellite cluster. The filter was not re-tuned. The diagonal values of the dynamics noise matrix from the 'tuned' two satellite constellation case were assigned to the diagonal elements of the three additional satellites. Figures 7 and 8 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and two. Figures 9

and 10 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and three. Figures 11 and 12 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and five. The filter performs as desired with an average true error on the order of two to three times the range measurement error. The filter continues to exhibit the oscillatory behavior previously noted.



Figure 7. Average error between satellites 1 and 2.



Figure 8. Comparison of average true error and covariance versus time for satellites 1 and 2.



Figure 9. Average error between satellites 1 and 3.



Figure 10. Comparison of average true error and covariance versus time for satellites 1 and 3.



Figure 12. Comparison of average true error and covariance versus time for satellites 1 and 5.

4.2.3 Ten Satellite Cluster

Figures 13-18 depict the average error and the average true error and covariance results for a ten satellite cluster. Again, the filter was not re-tuned and the additional diagonal elements of the dynamics noise matrix were assigned the same values as previously used. Figures 13 and 14 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and two. Figures 15 and 16 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and five. Figures 17 and 18 are the error plots for relative position determination between satellites one and ten. The expected data trends are obtained for the ten satellite cluster The average true errors are approximately two to case. three times the range measurement error and again the oscillatory behavior of the filter is exhibited as previously discussed.



Figure 13. Average error between satellites 1 and 2.







Figure 15. Average error between satellites 1 and 5.







Figure 17. Average error between satellites 1 and 10.



Figure 18. Comparison of average true error and covariance versus time for satellites 1 and 10.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Relative position determination of a satellite cluster using an on-board estimator is possible and yields good results tested against a two-body astrodynamics model. The state of the cluster can only involve relative position and velocity components between the filter host satellite and the remaining satellites. The U-D Covariance Factorization Kalman Filter was tuned and subjected to a 15-sample Monte Carlo Simulation. The error results presented illustrate good behavior of the average error, the average true error, and the filter covariance. The average true errors were approximately three times the range measurement error.

Further investigations into this topic should include a full tuning analysis, a filter robustness test, a test of the filter's performance using a more accurate truth model and an investigation into the filter's cyclic behavior. The variation of non-diagonal components of the dynamics noise covariance matrix should be investigated for any significant gain in performance or accuracy. A full test of the filter's robustness should be conducted to analyze the filter's performance with a poor initial guess for the initial state, and with periods of highly inaccurate range data. A test with an extremely accurate

perturbations model for the truth model should be conducted as a preliminary test to establish the filter's flight-readiness. Finally, the filter's cyclic behavior should be investigated to fully understand the filter's performance.

Bibliography

- Agnew, Jeanne and Robert C. Knapp. <u>Linear Algebra With</u> <u>Applications</u>. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co, 1978.
- Bate, Roger and others. <u>Fundamentals of Astrodynamics</u>. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.
- 3. Filer, Captain Sherrie Norton. <u>Investigation of the</u> <u>Observability of a Satellite Cluster in a Near Circular</u> <u>Orbit.</u> MS thesis, AFIT/GA/eny/89D-2, School of Engineering, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, December 1989.
- 4. Maybeck, Peter S. <u>Stochastic Models, Estimation, and</u> <u>Control Volume 1.</u> New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- 5. Maybeck, Peter S. <u>Stochastic Models, Estimation, and</u> <u>Control Volume 2.</u> New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- 6. Ward, Captain Michael L. P. <u>Estimated Satellite</u> <u>Cluster Elements in Near Circular Orbit.</u> MS thesis, AFIT/GA/AA/88D-13, School of Engineering, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, December 1988.
- 7. Wiesel, William B. Class handout distributed in MECH 731, <u>Modern Methods of Orbit Determination</u>. School of Engineering, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, April 1990.

<u>Bibliography</u>

 Wiesel, William B. <u>Spaceflight Dynamics</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1989.

Captain Stephen C. Johnston was born 6 February 1960 in Enid, Oklahoma. He graduated from Mesa High School in Mesa, Arizona in 1978. Later he attended Arizona State University, from which he received a degree of Bachelor of Science in Physics. Upon graduated, he attended Officer Training School at Lackland AFB TX and was commissioned a Second Lieutenant on 15 February 1983. He was assigned to the Engineering Conversion Program and attended Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama. He graduated with a degree of Bachelor of Science in Aerospace Engineering. Upon graduation, he was assigned to the Air Force Satellite Control Facility, Sunnyvale AFS CA. He was assigned to several satellite programs including the Anti-Satellite/Instrumented Test Vehicle program. He departed as the Division's Chief of Operations in April 1989 to attend the School of Engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Permanent address: 3847 Hillsboro Drive Beavercreek, Ohio 45431

59

VITA

REPORT DO	CUMENTATION PA	GE	241	- y pproyect - N.C 020 4-0188
Helds enjoyed provider to the solution of the	(i) The second secon	a constraining the time for re- constraint frend comments rega- ting on cares formatoriate to a constraint work freduction frend to constraint work freduction frend to constraint work freduction frend to constraint frequency and the second seco	verwing instruct ding this burd end information (compara- ect (0704-0388) - 20 eff	Search on providing duta sources mitter as in a lotter appoint of the on since includes (2015) artfers in in provide (2008).
T, AGRINGY QOR (INLY (IQUA) (PARS)	December 1990	Master's T	hesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBSTILE	- 8 - 16 - 17 - 2. 2019 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 20 - 2		5. FUNDING N	IUMBERS
AUTONOMOUS NAVIGATIO	U OF A SATELLITE	CLUSTER		
6. AUTHOR(S)				
Stephen C. Johnston,	Capt, JSAF			
7. PERFORMING CRGANIZATION DA A	(-5) AND ADDRESS(LS)		8. PERFORMIN REPORT NU	G ORGANIZATION
Air Force Institute	cf Technology			
WPAFB, OH 45433-658	-		AFIT/GA,	/ENY/90 D-9
Na _{kat} in the second				
9. SPONSORING/ MONITORING AGEN	NAMES AND ADDRESS(15)		10. SPONSORI AGENCY R	NG/MONITORING
n ann an faile an an ann ann ann ann ann ann an ann an a]	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY ST	A TEMENT		12b. DISTRIBL	ITION CODE
Approved for public	release: distribu	tion		
unlimited				
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)				
The relative positio	on determination c	f a cluster	of satel	lites
operating in a low e	arth orbit is inv	estigated.	A U-D Co	variance
Factorization Kalman	Filter is used f	or the on-bo	ard estim	mator with
dynamics based on th	e Clohessy-Wiltsh	ire equation	s. Meas	urements
consist of range dat	a between a singl	e host satel	lite and	the
remaining cluster.	Therefore only re	lative posit	ion and '	velocity
states with respect	to the host satel	lite can b e	determin	ed. A 15
sample Monte Carlo s	imulation was cor	ducted with	clusters	of 2, 5, an
10 satellites, respe	ectively. Perform	ance results	consist	s of average
error, average true	error and filter	covariance a	s a func	tion of time
14. SUBJECT TERMS	****		15.	NUMBER OF PAGES
Satellite Cluster, R	alman Filter ,	linnes, I.Th	()) ~ 16. I	65 PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION 18	SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	19. SECURITY CLASSIF	CATION 20.	LIMITATION OF ABSTRA
Unclassified U	Inclassified	Unclassified		UL
11511 7540 01-280-5500		میں ہوتی ہوتی ہوتی ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے ہوتے	Standar	d Form 298 (Rev. 2-89

produktion and the second s

,-----

.

2400-31-2 2400-31-2

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

.

.

GLINERAL INSTRUCTION	15 FOR COMPLETING SF 298
The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used that this information be consistent with the resi Instructions for filling in each block of the form fo optical scanning requirements.	in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important t of the report, particularly the cover and title page. llow. It is important to stay within the lines to meet
Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave Blank) Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.	Block 12a. <u>Distribution/Availablity Statement.</u> Denote public availability or limitation. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR)
Block 3. <u>Type of Report and Dates Covered.</u> State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).	DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."
Block 4. <u>Title and Subtitle</u> . A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number.	DOE - See authorities NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2. NTIS - Leave blank.
and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.	Block 12b. <u>Distribution Code.</u> DOD - DOD - Leave blank DOE - DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories
Block 5. <u>Funding Numbers</u> . To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:	from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports NASA - NASA - Leave blank NTIS - NTIS - Leave blank.
C- ContractPR- ProjectG- GrantTA- TaskPE- ProgramWU- Work UnitElementAccession No.	Block 13. <u>Abstract.</u> Include a brief (Maximum 200 words) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.
Block 6. <u>Author(s)</u> . Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s)	Block 14. <u>Subject Terms.</u> Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.
Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es), Self-explanatory.	Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.
Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number, Enter the unique alphanumeric report	Block 16. <u>Price Code.</u> Enter appropriate price code (NTIS only).
number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.	Blocks 17 19. <u>Security Classifications.</u> Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security
Names(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.	Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.
Report Number. (If known)	Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block
information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with; Trans. of, To be published in When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.	must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.
