

1 Aim of the document

This document has been created in order to take a decision about the physical topology of our satellite's network and also to decide if we want or need global coverage or not. It is a very important decision due to the fact that reliability, performance and security are related with the physical topology. The most usual are:

- Mesh
- Star
- Bus
- Ring
- Hybrid

In the following section the members of the groups will explain what they think the best option is, giving reasons for and against that decision.

2 Propuesta Boyan

Options:

- Ideal case scenario: Global Coverage with lowest possible orbit.
- Not so ideal case scenario: Global Coverage with some satellites in a higher orbit acting as a hub.

After reviewing [8], [6], [5], [9], [2], [4], [7] and [1] my proposal is the next:

• Use of the **Manhattan Topology** for our constellation, mixed with a *Walker Delta* or a *Walker Polar* orbits configuration.

"The Manhattan network is the underlying form of the ISL satellite constellation's network topology. This is a regular topology named after the regular grid street pattern established in Manhattan Island, New York. It is a toroidal mesh network with each node having four unidirectional links: two transmit and two receive [Maxemchuk87], as shown in figure 2.9. Manhattan networks have been extensively discussed in computing literature in the context of parallel computing. The Manhattan network forms the basic topology of the type (2) constellation. The Manhattan network is also known as a multiaccess mesh or multimesh network [ToddHahne97]. The form of the Manhattan network with bidirectional links is known as either the bi-directional Manhattan network, as the HR4- net [ChungSharAg94], or as the shufflenet. However, orbital geometry leads to differences from previously discussed Manhattan networks. In fact, the constellation network is a slightly variant form, with bidirectional ISLs and with two half-twists where the sense of rotation changes due to each satellite seeing its neighbours swap sides while 'down' remains constant as the satellites reach and pass through their highest latitudes. The topologies of the space segments of Iridium, Teledesic, and Spaceway NGSO can be considered as variations on the type of bi-directional Manhattan network shown in figure 2.10." [9, p. 32] (en Mendeley)





Figure 2.9 - classic unidirectional Manhattan network



bi-directional ISLs have added direction arrows purely to illustrate crossing of orbital planes at highest latitudes, where neighbours swap places.

Figure 2.10 - ISL topology of LEO constellation: Walker 7/6/2

3 Propuesta Eva

3.1 Coverage

To take a decision about whether our constellation should have global coverage or not, we have to take into account our objectives. The aim of the constellation is to provide low latency communications between our client's satellite and the client. We can create Ground Stations and put them in adequate places where the signal could be received. But the client, who has already a satellite, is surely to have a ground station, so the most proper thing to do will be assure him that the data could be received to they ground station with low latency. So, in my opinion, we should have global coverage in order to satisfy the client's needs.

3.2 Physical topology

Regarding the physical topology, I think there are few things that needs to be said before taking a decision. First of all, we need to be aware of the physical topologies possible for our constellation. For example, we can't use a total *mesh* topology because not all the satellites will be seen by one of them. Secondly, although the *star* topology seems a good option (cheap,

robust, secure), we have a problem. The hub will probably need to stay in a higher orbit and will require higher power. For this reason, it will probably be bigger than a 3U CubeSat, that is the maximum we fixed in the Project Charter. Finally, in order to design our constellation and its links, it's good to know that there are problems connecting two satellites moving in opposite directions which is too expensive or even infeasible with the existing technology. [3]. We still don't know if all our satellites will be moving in the same direction or not, but it is an important fact that if they do, we won't be able to connect them even if they are close to each other. Now, here comes my proposal: I think the best thing to do is to connect the satellites located in the same plane in *ring*, and then create other *rings* connecting one satellite of each plane to a satellite of the other. Each satellite will be connected to 4 satellites, two of their same plane and two of different planes. To get a clear image of what I am explaining, is useful to check the Teledesic physical topology. [10]

4 Propuesta Josep

4.1 Coverage

I hold the view that we should offer as much coverage as possible, ideally full coverage, so that the range of clients is as broad as possible. So if it is technically feasible, I think we should intend to create a full coverage network. I agree with Eva, we do not need to create Ground Stations all around the world, it is responsibility of the client, which is supposed to be a professional of the field, and therefore would have a proper Ground Station, hardware and knowledge to use and dominate it.

4.2 Physical topology

As it has been already said before, both mesh and star topology do not match our requirements. Moreover, [Waiting for answers on Slack! Tomorrow early (10 am or so) i'll complete this part]

References

- [1] P Baumann, A Dehmel, P Furtado, R Ritsch, and N Widmann. The Multidimensional. pages 575–577.
- [2] book chapter in Service Efficient Network Interconnection via Satellite. Satellite Constellation Design for Network Interconnection Using Non-Geo Satellites. 8, 2002.
- [3] Afonso Ferreira, Jérôme Galtier, Paolo Penna, Mascotte Team, Inria Cnrs Unsa, and Sophia Antipolis. Topological Design, Routing, and Handover in Satellite Networks. *Handbook of wireless networks and mobile computing*, 8:473–493, 2002.
- [4] CJ Goodwin. Chapter 2. pages 13–34, 1998.
- [5] William Horne, Carl F. Kwadrat, and Bernard L. Edwards. Inter-Satellite Communications Considerations and Requirements for Distributed Spacecraft and Formation Flying Systems. *SpaceOps 2002 Conference*, pages 1–10, 2002.
- [6] Paul Muri and Janise McNair. A survey of communication sub-systems for intersatellite linked systems and cubesat missions. *Journal of Communications*, 7(4):290–308, 2012.

- [7] Jiadong Sun, Jingnan Liu, Shiwei Fan, and Xiaochun Lu. China Satellite Navigation Conference (CSNC) 2015 proceedings: Volume I. *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering*, 340:15–26, 2015.
- [8] Lloyd Wood. A networking perspective on satellite constellations. *Lloydia (Cincinnati)*, 1998.
- [9] Lloyd Wood. Internetworking with satellite constellations. *Lloydia Cincinnati*, (February), 2001.
- [10] Lloyd Wood. Chapter 2. *Internetworking and Computing Over Satellite Networks*, pages 13–34, 2003.