



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

How Big is Too Big? Using SAL (Smallsat Affordability in LEO) to Evaluate the Small Satellite Tradespace

Vincent A. Lillard, Project Leader

Matthew R. Avery
Alexander J. Slawik
Geoffrey M. Koretsky

March 2019

Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

IDA Document NS D-10526

Log: H 2019-000105

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES
4850 Mark Center Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882



The Institute for Defense Analyses is a non-profit corporation that operates three federally funded research and development centers to provide objective analyses of national security issues, particularly those requiring scientific and technical expertise, and conduct related research on other national challenges.

About This Publication

This work was conducted by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) under contract HQ0034-14-D-0001, Task 4370, "Data Analysis Support," for the Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation. The views, opinions, and findings should not be construed as representing the official position of either the Department of Defense or the sponsoring organization.

Acknowledgments

The IDA Technical Review was conducted by Mr. Robert R. Soule, Director and Dr. Vincent A. Lillard from the Operational Evaluation Division.

For more information:

Vincent A. Lillard, Project Leader
vlillard@IDA.org • (703) 845-2230

Robert R. Soule, Director, Operational Evaluation Division
rsoule@ida.org • (703) 845-2482

Copyright Notice

© 2019 Institute for Defense Analyses
4850 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882 • (703) 845-2000.

This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at DFARS 252.227-7013 (a)(16) [Jun 2013].

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document NS D-10526

**How Big is Too Big? Using SAL (Smallsat Affordability
in LEO) to Evaluate the Small Satellite Tradespace**

Vincent A. Lillard, Project Leader

Matthew R. Avery
Alexander J. Slawik
Geoffrey M. Koretsky

Executive Summary

The public sector is increasingly making use of satellites in Low Earth Orbit (LEO) for a variety of applications, including imagery. Because the Department of Defense (DoD) also uses satellites to collect imagery, decision-makers are interested in whether the DoD also could find cost savings by using large constellations of small satellites. IDA created the Satellite Affordability in LEO (SAL) model to facilitate CAPE inquiries into the small satellite tradespace. SAL identifies the cheapest constellation capable of providing a desired level of performance within a set of design parameters. SAL achieves this using a combination of analytical models, statistical emulators, and geometric relationships. SAL is flexible and modular, allowing users to easily customize certain components while retaining default behavior in other cases. This tool allows users to quickly and responsively address questions about the utility of proliferated LEO constellations.

SAL uses a multi-step process to build a set of candidate constellations that meet user-specified performance requirements. Based on customizable assumptions about constellation cost, SAL determines the most cost-effective

constellation size for the desired performance level. Figure 1 shows optimal constellation size as a function of desired access time for SAL's default cost assumptions.




Figure 1. Constellation size as a function of Mean Time to Access (MTTA) using the default cost assumptions in SAL

SAL generates these outputs using the following algorithm:

1. For a desired MTTA and National Imagery Interpretability Rating Scale (NIIRS) value, select a candidate set of constellation sizes.

2. For each constellation size, identify the swath of ground each satellite would have to cover to achieve the desired MTTA.
3. Identify the collection of satellite configurations (altitude and sensor size combinations) that would achieve the desired swath width and NIIRS.
4. Of this set, choose the cheapest.
5. Repeat for each constellation size in the candidate set.
6. Select the constellation size that has the cheapest constellation.

Many steps in this algorithm are subject to user adjustment and customization, allowing SAL to incorporate new information and remain flexible and responsive in the rapidly-changing environment of proliferated smallsat constellations.

How Big Is Too Big?

Using SAL (Satellite Affordability in LEO)
to Evaluate the Small Satellite Tradespace



Matthew Avery

April 10, 2019

IDA Historically, the DoD has bought a few big satellites that orbit very far away



Global Positioning System

Orbits around 20,000 km above
Earth

Currently 31 in orbit

Each weighs around 2,000 kg

Most other constellations are
smaller!

The current industry trend is large constellations of small satellites

Starlink

SpaceX's global communications constellation

4,425 satellites planned

Orbits around 1,300 km

Each will weigh less than 400kg

OneWeb

Airbus global communications constellation

600-700 satellites planned

Orbits around 1,200 km

Each will weigh about 150 kg

SAL overview

What to use SAL for

- Determining the optimal constellation size for a given level of performance
- Comparing the effect of different cost assumptions on optimal constellation size
- First-order estimates of constellation cost


What NOT to use SAL for

- Decision-level constellation cost calculations
- Determining whether a mission is feasible
- Evaluating the accuracy of cost functions

SAL accounts for key constellation characteristics

- Constellation Size
- Altitude
- Satellite Look Angle
- Swath Width
- Other Orbital Characteristics
 - F-number
 - Number of orbital planes
- Sensor Aperture Size
- Image Quality (NIIRS rating)
- Mean Time to Access (MTTA)
- Cost
 - Sensor cost
 - Bus cost
 - Launch cost
 - Transmission cost

Illustration of swath width




How does SAL find the optimal constellation size?

The algorithm employed by SAL is flexible and modular. New cost models can easily be substituted for default ones. The general approach used by SAL is described below:

1. For a desired MTTA and NIIRS rating, select a candidate set of constellation sizes.
2. For each constellation size, identify the swath of ground each satellite would have to cover to achieve the desired MTTA.
3. Identify the collection of satellite configurations (altitude/sensor size combinations) that would achieve the desired swath width and NIIRS.
4. Of this set, choose the cheapest.
5. Repeat for each constellation size in the candidate set.
6. Select the constellation size that has the cheapest constellation.


For a given MTTA, SAL first identifies constellation requirements

MTTA = 25 min




Many combinations of constellation size and swath width can achieve a desired level of performance (MTTA).

Next, SAL determines which constellations can meet these requirements



These constellations achieve the desired swath width via different combinations of altitude and look angle.


For each candidate constellation, SAL estimates the aperture size



These trends look similar to those in the previous plot because aperture size is determined based on swath width, altitude, and look angle.

Using these aperture sizes and the default cost functions, SAL estimates the cost of each candidate

MTTA = 25 min, NIIRS = 5




Because each constellation provides equivalent performance, the desired choice is the minimum cost option.



By searching across a fine grid of look angles and altitude, we can find the cheapest constellation for each constellation size


MTTA = 25 min, NIIRS = 5



This plot only shows four look angles, but SAL considers all options between 10 and 45 degrees.


The nadir of this curve is SAL's estimate of the cheapest constellation that will provide an MTTA of 25 minutes with NIIRS 5 image quality

MTTA = 25 min, NIIRS = 5




This optimal value is specific to the chosen level of performance (NIIRS quality, MTTA)

Repeating this process across different MTTAs allows us to look at the full space of choices




This plot only shows four look angles, but SAL considers all options between 10 and 45 degrees.

IDA




By finding the best constellation size under different design constraints or cost assumptions, we can determine what factors matter for optimizing a smallsat LEO constellation

Size of optimal constellation for different levels of economies of scale




Constellation size sensitivity to NIIRS




NIIRS rating makes a dramatic difference in the optimal constellation size. For lower MTTA (<30), lower NIIRS rating constellations will be substantially smaller than higher NIIRS rating constellations.

Constellation size sensitivity to learning (payload only)




Efficiencies in payload production have no impact on optimal constellation size.

Constellation size sensitivity to learning (satellite bus only)




Efficiencies in satellite bus production make a small and consistent difference in optimal constellation size.

Constellation size sensitivity to learning




Similar to the bus-only picture, we see sustained and minor differences in constellation size when economies of scale are increased.

Constellation size sensitivity to transmission model



Cross-linked constellations will tend to be a bit smaller than constellations with large numbers of fixed ground stations.

Constellation size sensitivity to inclusion of replenishment costs




When we take replenishment into account, we almost invariably want a smaller constellation of large, long-lived satellites.

Important considerations for SAL

- SAL assumes monotonic relationships for most factors
 - Performance as a function of constellation size
 - Cost as a function of most factors
- Sensor aperture size and total weight are the main drivers of cost
- MTTA is chosen metric, though data exist to use others (max gap, etc.) if desired
- “Access” measured by constellation ability to look at a point at a given time, not ability to look at *all* points simultaneously
- Optical sensors only (for now....)

SAL estimates the cheapest constellation size as a function of performance level



This plot shows SAL's best estimate of constellation size under the default cost settings. Under different assumptions, the cheapest constellation size for a given performance level may change!

Conclusions

- SAL can tell us a lot about the most important considerations for planning smallsat constellations
 - How far from the optimal constellation size will we be if we overestimate our economies of scale?
 - How much do mission considerations (e.g., image resolution requirements) drive us toward larger or smaller constellations?
- Higher fidelity cost models can improve the raw cost estimates from SAL, although this isn't SAL's primary function
- Expanding the set of orbits (beyond polar sun-synchronous) considered by SAL might show new tradeoffs and possibilities
- Future work comparing proliferated LEO constellations to "large sats" should be **mission focused** in terms of having realistic mission requirements
 - Comparisons within LEO are useful, but MEO and GEO are still out there
 - Without a set of mission requirements, there are too many degrees of freedom to get definitive answers about whether small is better than large

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 03-2019		2. REPORT TYPE IDA Publication		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE How Big is Too Big? Using SAL (Smallsat Affordability in LEO) to Evaluate the Small Satellite Tradespace				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER HQ0034-14-D-0001	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER _____	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER _____	
6. AUTHOR(S) Matthew R. Avery (OED); Alexander J. Slawik (SED); Geoffrey M. Koretsky (SED);				5d. PROJECT NUMBER BA-09-4370	
				5e. TASK NUMBER _____	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER _____	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Institute for Defense Analyses 4850 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER D-10526-NS H 2019-000105	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Secretary of Defense—Office of Cost Assessment Program Evaluation (OSD/CAPE) 1800 Defense Pentagon Washington, DC 20301				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER _____	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release. Distribution unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES _____					
14. ABSTRACT The Satellite Affordability in LEO (SAL) model identifies the cheapest constellation capable of providing a desired level of performance within certain constraints. SAL achieves this using a combination of analytical models, statistical emulators, and geometric relationships. SAL is flexible and modular, allowing users to customize certain components while retaining default behavior in other cases. This is desirable if users wish to consider an alternative cost formulation or different types of payload. Uses for SAL include examining cost tradeoffs with respect to factors like constellation size and desired performance level, evaluating the sensitivity of constellation costs to different assumptions about cost behavior, and providing a first-pass look at what proliferated smallsats might be capable of. At this point, SAL is limited to Walker constellations with sun-synchronous, polar orbits.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS small satellites; pLEO; ISR; models and simulations (M&S)					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Vincent Lillard (OED)
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	Unlimited	30	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (703) 845-2230