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# Common part

## Team members

Claudio Vestini

Alex Berresford

Fizza Naqvi

Hani Moussa

## Code of Conduct

This Code of Conduct establishes guidelines for behaviour and collaboration among members of the [Project Name] group. We aim to create a respectful, inclusive, and productive environment for all participants.

Please continue from here.

## Summary of the project and objectives

This project…
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# 2024-21-10 First meeting

Present: Claudio Vestini, Hani Moussa, Alex Berresford, Fizza Naqvi

Apologies: None

Location and time: RSL Study Room 4 at 14:00

Author of minutes: Claudio Vestini

* Discussion of project organisation:
  + File system (GitHub repository, GitHub Projects roadmap (Gantt chart))
  + Google Drive folder
  + Report LaTeX file
  + References (.bib master file)
  + Meetings and WhatsApp group for communications
* Allocation of tasks (initial draft):
  + Claudio:
    - Aerothermal
    - Instrumentation
  + Hani:
    - Electronics
    - Interfaces
  + Fizza:
    - Trajectory
    - Internal heat generation
  + Alex:
    - Mechanical
    - Launch service provider
    - Launch environment
* Discussion of scientific goals:
  + CubeSat constraints dictated by launch service provider (size, weight, center of mass, electronics, stress response) - Alex
  + Ionospheric disruption due to re-entry impact - Fizza
  + Consideration of Magnus Effect during hypersonic re-entry – Alex
  + Budget analysis - everyone
  + Model Predictive Control for maintaining trajectory attitude (both in orbit and during re-entry). Use of cold gas thrusters as actuators - Claudio
  + Black box (GPS-tracked, ablative-protected) for retaining re-entry data – Alex
  + Materials testing for re-entry – Hani
  + Communications: information transfer during blackout – Claudio
  + Modelling the aerothermal environment in different re-entry stages - Claudio

### References

### Actions

* Discuss scientific goals with supervisors

### Deadlines

# 2024-22-10 Second meeting

Present: Alex, Claudio, Hani, Fizza, Tobias (Supervisor)

Apologies:

Location and time:LR7 at 2:00pm

Author of minutes: Alex Berresford

-Briefing Tobias on our progress, file system, organisation etc

-Mendeley for .bib file for automatically referencing papers

-Briefing Tobias on project ideas

-Ionosphere disturbances

-Feedback:Interesting, but a bit of a secondary goal, not directly related to re-entry

-Materials for re-entry

- Use Cubesat as a test rig for materials and how they demise in extreme flow conditions

-Feedback:On topic, very current bit of research for space industry

-How would you mitigate inequaltities in material conditions

-Sample sphere’s inside sacrificial shell?

-Altitude control using spin

-Magnus effect

-Feedback: Could be used to control material conditions to allow for testing

-Serious control problem

Overall Feedback:

-Find rough bounds to problem through research and rough calculations

-Budget unlimited, but must be justified

-Black box vs Comms system

-Both realistic, depends on specific design choices

Long Term goals

### References

### Actions

### Deadlines

Research Tasks by 29/10/2024

-Hani – sensors for material degradation

-Claudio – Magnus effect, and realism of generating spin

-Fizza – Look into trajectory, expected burn altitude and ideal orbital altitude as well as ionosphere

-Alex - Investigate different cubesat geometries, costs, pros, cons et. Keep up with Launch provider research.

# 2024-28-10 Third meeting

Present: Claudio Vestini, Hani Moussa, Alex Berresford, Fizza Naqvi

Apologies: None

Location and time: RSL Study Room 2 at 13:00

Author of minutes: Fizza Naqvi

* Discussion on how to get Mendeley working for references
* Hani’s research: discussion on the different types of sensors that already exist
  + Accoustic emission sensor
  + Recession sensors (used to measure how thermal protection systems are damaged as they enter the atmosphere); NASA and ESA has used this before so there’s lots of information available
  + Look into what we’re actually going to measure before deciding on what sensors we should use
  + Ensure that our experiment cannot be easily conducted on Earth
* Claudio’s research: magnus effect and MPC
  + Magnus effect at hypersonic speeds works very differently
  + Most research is done on sphere’s but calculations might be able to be manipulated to work with a cube
  + Looking at simulations- the ones that are currently available are limited as it won’t test everything we need
  + Magnus effect can be tested when we have our CAD models
  + For control: our main options are cold gas thrusters
  + Reaction wheels- cheapest, easiest to manufacture, least risk involved but takes up lots of space, quite heavy
  + other forms of thrust such as hypergolic- mainly used in thrust systems in capsules or small satellites; easy however it’s extremely toxic; slightly more expensive
  + MPC
  + Find a company that has architecture already made up for this or make it from scratch
  + We need 2 separate controllers
* Fizza’s research:
  + Burn up altitude is typically 80-120km but depends on size, mass orientation and material composition
  + Design for Design study- use semi controlled re-entry
  + Trajectory model that simulated Cubesat re-entry trajectory; lots of assumptions are made on the atmosphere calculations and dynamic calculations
  + Ionospheric impact research- the range at which satellite demise occurs overlaps with the “E region” which reflects radiowaves and is essential for long distance communication
  + Could monitor atmospheric composition changes because materials from the cubesat could remain in the ionosphere temporarily- use spectrometers to detect the wavelengths and see how the different material affects the ionosphere composition, therefore radio wave reflection and long distance communication
* Alex’s research:
  + NASA has info on different possible cubesat sizes- we want to do a 1U size due to how easy the geometry is, but we could expand greater if needed
  + Endurosat- cost calculator; limited to a 1.5U platform

### References

### Actions

* Ask Tobias about what data would be good for our measurements

### Deadlines

# 2024-29-10 Fourth meeting

Present: Alex, Claudio, Hani, Fizza, Luke (Supervisor)

Apologies: None

Location and time:LR7 at 2:00pm

Author of minutes: Hani Moussa

* Discussion of mission (material testing for hypersonic re-entry)
  + Recession sensors/Acoustic emission sensors
  + Experimental use of sensors is viable if well-researched
  + Acoustic environment information could be researched
* Thrust for deorbit
  + Low orbits will be brought in by drag
  + Active re-entry is likely more practical
  + Consider price/how well-established each technology for thrust is
    - Ion thrusters are for longer missions
    - Cold gas thrusters may be more practical/cheaper
* Launch Service Provider
  + Can get in touch with providers/external companies/physics department
    - Be upfront and professional
    - Can get basic information on launch costs
  + Materials not easily comparable between companies
* Model Predictive Control
  + Model needed for cube tumbling into atmosphere
  + Relation to materials testing
    - Initial idea - even tumbling on all sides
    - Speed of trajectory/speed of tumbling need to be considered relatively
* Possible secondary mission objectives
  + Magnus effect in orbit
  + Ionosphere experimentation
    - Difficult to measure through the atmosphere
    - Good to look at environmental effects of satellite demise
* Transmitting data
  + Blackbox/Comms system options
  + Formalise choice process/create spreadsheet and compare qualities
    - Quantity of data
    - Rate of data
    - Likelihood of survivability
    - Price
  + Justification should be in logbook and report
  + Can carry out a similar process for sensors
* Originality of design
  + Use necessary qualities of product to pick items off the shelf
  + Microcontrollers/thrusters etc.
  + Need to be space-certified or need to be tested (legislation side of things)
* Deciding next steps
  + Need to add numbers to decisions
  + Batteries and reaction wheels
  + Comms/Blackbox
  + Mass limit and Budget need to be considered

### References

### Actions

* Alex - Re-entry breakup (Blackbox system), cold gas thruster comparison
* Claudio - Spin rate vs re-entry rate, motors needed for reaction wheels and their weight
* Fizza – Ionosphere measurement specifics, background trajectory information
* Hani - Compare possible options for sensors in more depth
* Long term considerations – get in contact with relevant companies for information

### Deadlines

# 2024-10-05 Fifth meeting

Present: Claudio, Alex, Fizza, Hani

Apologies: None

Location and time: RSL at 5pm

Author of minutes: Claudio

Content goes here

* Alex – re-entry system:
  + Blackbox Idea not going to work due to weight restrictions, 4.0 kg + housing -> 8.6kg
  + Thrusters: factsheets -> possible choices (not clear, contact companies):
    - 300g mass, 100uN to 10mN thrust – hydrazene
    - HPGC thruster – low toxicity, low freeze point, 40g mass (no nozzle),
  + Batteries:
    - Optimus 30: large dimensions, 268g 30wHR
    - B14 modular: 375g, 45Whr, no NASA certification
* Fizza:
  + Ionosphere:
    - studies by ESA, cannot use as classified
    - Remote sensing – companies:
      * Ground-based: higher resolution, no data storage problem
      * Balloons: difficult, coordination complexity, path complexity, time complexity
    - Justification of secondary objective due to regulations
* Hani:
  + Sensors:
    - Spreadsheet of several sensors for comparison:
    - Recession sensors not readily available – emerging technology, could build ourselves or contact ESA for purchase
    - GENERAL POINT: if price is not available, estimate in report
    - RSComponents website (not made for space, but cheap and used in the past in space applications), could lower price significantly
    - Papers: types of sensors used in projects – thermocouples (light, cheap, use several), mosaic core (infrared camera, not made for space so not certain we can certify it, 21mm largest dimension – viable (used in cubesats in the past))
    - Can we certify things that have not been certified for space? (ASK TOMORROW). How do we design tests.
    - Could be the case that we do not need to be as rigorous with certification as it is only necessary if you stay in atmosphere for a long time - > our satellite demises so could get away w/o certification if launch company is okay with it -> Ask someone at the company
* Claudio:
  + Book for general understanding of hypersonic regimes, for both trajectory and aerothermal environment – relations can be found nicely displayed in graphs
  + Mass of typical re-entry attitude control system below 200g – very slow rotation rates and very weak forces. Ditched idea of controlling during re-entry but could easily spin up using loads of time to do so before hitting atmosphere
  + Paper on reaction wheels design and modelling -need 3 of them
  + Found a paper on the design of a reaction wheel-controlled cubesat – very useful as it contains lots of pictures and cad files of the architecture – should use as reference when designing our own satellite (BEESAT)
  + Paper on empirical results of hypersonic testing of cubesat topologies.

### References

BEESAT: A Pico Satellite for the On Orbit Verification of Micro Wheels

### Actions

* Alex: document choice of no black box
* Fizza: document choice of ionosphere effects as secondary objective, document choice of ground sensing (why are alternatives not viable?)
* Hani: decide on recession sensors
* Claudio: look at thermal transfer rates for different spin rates

### Deadlines