




POLITECNICO
MILANO 1863

SCUOLA DI INGEGNERIA INDUSTRIALE
E DELL'INFORMAZIONE



Simulation of a LEO orbiting microsat on Simulink

MSc IN SPACE ENGINEERING

Authors:

| | | |
|----------|---------------------|---|
| 10723712 | MARCELLO PARESCHI | (BSc AEROSPACE ENGINEERING - POLITECNICO DI MILANO) |
| 10836125 | DANIELE PATERNOSTER | (BSc AEROSPACE ENGINEERING - POLITECNICO DI MILANO) |
| 10711624 | ALEX CRISTIAN TURCU | (BSc AEROSPACE ENGINEERING - POLITECNICO DI MILANO) |
| 10884250 | TAMIM HARUN OR | (BCs) |

Professor: FRANCO BERNELLI ZAZZERA

Academic year: 2023-2024

Abstract

La presente relazione di prova finale intende dare una descrizione dell'endoreattore F-1 prodotto da Rocketdyne. Cinque di questi motori vennero installati sul primo stadio S-IC del vettore Saturn V che portò il primo uomo sulla luna. L'obiettivo di questo stadio era quello di portare il razzo ad una quota di 61 km, fornendo un $\Delta v \approx 2300$ m/s. Questo primo requisito verrà mostrato attraverso un modello matematico che simula il volo dello stadio S-IC.

Di seguito verranno analizzati i principali sistemi per un singolo motore, partendo dal sistema di stoccaggio e alimentazione dei propellenti costituito dai serbatoi e dalla turbopompa, passando per il sistema di generazione di potenza che comprende il gas generator e la turbina. Passando dalla camera di combustione si arriva infine al sistema di espansione gasdinamica e allo studio del suo raffreddamento. Si provvederà inoltre a dare una descrizione qualitativa e quantitativa delle scelte progettuali applicate ai tempi.

La discussione dei processi di combustione del gas generator e della camera di spinta si basa su dati provenienti da simulazioni eseguite con i programmi CEAM e RPA.

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Abstract | I |
| Contents | II |
| 1 Symbols | III |
| 1.1 Analisi della missione | III |
| 1.2 Analisi della missione 2 | III |
| 2 Requirements | 1 |
| 2.1 Mandatory requests for simulation | 1 |
| 3 Framework Analysis | 1 |
| 3.1 Satellite characterization | 1 |
| 3.2 Orbit characterization | 1 |
| 4 Dynamics | 1 |
| 5 Kinematics | 1 |
| 6 Disturbances analysis | 1 |
| 6.1 Magnetic Disturbance | 1 |
| 6.2 SRP Disturbance | 1 |
| 6.3 Drag Disturbance | 2 |
| 6.4 Gravity Gradient Disturbance | 2 |
| 6.5 Simulation of all disturbances | 3 |
| 7 Sensors | 3 |
| 7.1 Horizon Sensor | 3 |
| Bibliography | 5 |

1. Symbols

1.1. Analisi della missione

A_e [m^2] area di efflusso totale
 ϕ [rad] angolo di traiettoria del razzo

1.2. Analisi della missione 2

A_e [m^2] area di efflusso totale
 ϕ [rad] angolo di traiettoria del razzo

2. Requirements

2.1. Mandatory requests for simulation

[1]

3. Framework Analysis

3.1. Satellite characterization

3.2. Orbit characterization

4. Dynamics

The equations of the dynamics rotating body motion used throughout the simulation are the Euler equations since rigid body motion assumption is made. The set of equations are referred to the principal axis frame of the satellite. This frame will be also called reference frame \mathcal{B} , it is described by three unit vectors $\{x_b, y_b, z_b\}$, that are in the direction of principal inertia axis.

$$I\dot{\omega} + \omega \times I\omega = M_d + M_c$$

In the above equation the external torque has been divided in to 2 contributions, with clear distinction. M_d describes the disturbance torques that act on the spacecraft due to environment and presented in the previous section, while M_c is referred to the control torque that the actuators are generating to perform the tasks required by the control logic.

With particular reference to the Simulink model, two configurations of the satellite were considered: undeployed configuration (for detumbling phase) and extended configuration (for slew and pointing phases). As a consequence, the mass distribution and hence the inertia matrix are different in terms of numerical values. This fact has been taken into account by implementing a logic in the dynamic block of Simulink, that switches between the two matrices using a flag based on the activation of the De-Tumbling control. This instantaneous switch is not completely realistic since the extraction of the panels would require some finite time, and in some way could influence the real dynamic of the satellite. Anyhow, for the microsat considered, the retracted configuration allows a faster detumbling, and also inertia loads and stresses are reduced on the solar panels.

5. Kinematics

6. Disturbances analysis

In order to make a realistic simulation of the rotating motion of the spacecraft, the environment disturbances has to be taken into account. The preliminary study of these external torques is crucial for a realistic simulation. In the following paragraphs a brief introduction will be done for all the main disturbances, then the simulation of the specific satellite and orbit will be presented, mainly to choose the two most relevant disturbances. This choice is reasonable since there are always two predominant effects of disturbance, while the other can be supposed small (usually some order of magnitude smaller, but always depends on the specific case).

6.1. Magnetic Disturbance

6.2. SRP Disturbance

SRP radiation torque is the disturbance generated by electromagnetic waves that impacts on the spacecraft panels and generate a force. These forces acting on some of the panels could give rise to a net torque around the center of mass of the spacecraft. Only sun radiation will be considered in this case, a more deep analysis should consider infrared Earth radiation and reflected Earth radiation. In addition, no eclipse condition will be analyzed during all the simulation, a reasonable assumption for the sun-synchronous case orbit.

The formula to calculate the force acting on each discrete panel is:

$$F_i = -PA_i \left(\hat{S}_B \cdot \hat{N}_{B,i} \right) \left[(1 - \rho_s) \hat{S}_B + \left(2\rho_s \left(\hat{S}_B \cdot \hat{N}_{B,i} \right) + \frac{2}{3}\rho_d \right) \hat{N}_{B,i} \right]$$

In order to simulate this kind of disturbance the coefficients of absorption, specular reflection and diffusion has to be decided. These values clearly depends on the material that will be chosen to construct the main body of the spacecraft, and the solar panels. Since these parameters are related through an energetic balance, we could only decide two of them and the third follows. In order to determine the force on each surface, also the geometry of the panels of the satellite has to be given, in particular size of each panel (fully defined in section ...) and direction of the normal of the panel in \mathcal{B} frame. The direction of sun \hat{S}_B , has been firstly modeled in ECI frame considering the obliquity ϵ of earth's rotation axis with respect to the ecliptic plane, then through attitude matrix, the unit vector \hat{S}_B

has been computed. Lastly, to calculate the torque we should know where the resulting force on each panel acts (i.e. the centre of SRP force for each panel). No detailed calculation has been made on this aspect, it is assumed as first approximation that the forces acts on the geometric center of the corresponding plate. Also, in order to correctly calculate the total torque a shadow check must be performed, this is simply implemented in Simulink by checking the sign of the dot product of the normal vector of the plate and the sun direction.

6.3. Drag Disturbance

Over extended periods, the spacecraft's engagement with the higher strates of Earth's atmosphere results in the generation of a torque around its mass center. This influence may not be trivial. At altitudes less than 400 kilometers, the aerodynamic torque is the predominant factor, though its significance diminishes considerably beyond 700 kilometers altitude. For the simulation, the panels are considered from geometry data of section (..ref) the coefficient of drag C_d has been set to 2.2, the relative velocity considers the rotation of Earth around its axis and also the rotation motion of the spacecraft. As for the SRP case, a sort of shadow check has to be implemented based on the dot product between the relative velocity and the normal of the surface. This check is required since the modelling of the surface is composed of two faces, usually one impacts with the relative air movement while the other is behind and doesn't impact. As for SRP disturbance, for the drag torque the vector r_i as distance of centre of pressure to centre of mass, should be evaluated. As a first approximation, the point of action of the force for each face is the middle point of the surface under consideration.

$$T_{AERO} = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{r}_i \times \vec{F}_i, & \text{if } \vec{N}_{bi} \cdot \vec{v}_{rel}^b \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } \vec{N}_{bi} \cdot \vec{v}_{rel}^b < 0 \end{cases} \text{ with}$$

$$\vec{F}_i = -\frac{1}{2} \rho C_D v_{rel}^2 \vec{v}_{rel}^b (\vec{N}_{bi} \cdot \vec{v}_{rel}^b) A_i \quad n = \text{number of faces}$$

6.4. Gravity Gradient Disturbance

The gravity gradient disturbance account for the fact that the gravity around the spacecraft is not uniform, hence a non-negligible torque will arise from there. Studying the torque generated by an elementary force acting on the elementary mass dm the equation for this is obtained:

$$dM = -\mathbf{r} \times \frac{Gm_t dm}{|\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{r}|^3} (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{r})$$

Where \mathbf{r} is the distance of dm from the centre of mass and \mathbf{R} is the distance of the centre of mass from the centre of the Earth. Approximating this equation, and expressing the position vector of the centre of mass as the product of magnitude (R) with the direction cosines, it's possible to centre this torque in the principal inertia axes. Integrating this equation the final form is achieved.

$$M_x = \frac{3Gm_t}{R^3} (I_z - I_y) c_2 c_3$$

$$M_y = \frac{3Gm_t}{R^3} (I_x - I_z) c_1 c_3$$

$$M_z = \frac{3Gm_t}{R^3} (I_y - I_x) c_1 c_2$$

The c_1, c_2 and c_3 are the direction cosines of the radial direction in the principal axes. Therefore if one of the principal axes is aligned with the radial direction the torque will be zero because only one of the direction cosines is non-zero. It's clear that this disturbance acts in a continuous manner throughout the orbit motion and the torque produced depends mainly on the attitude matrix.

Instead, the stability configuration depends on the distribution of mass of the spacecraft with respect to the orientation we want to achieve. For our case of study, inspired by the ESAIL mission from ESA, the satellite is nadir pointing. In particular the x_b direction has to be aligned with the nadir, while the z_b has to point the sun for solar panels requirements. Using the numerical values of the spacecraft, and the orientation requirements just mentioned this particular configuration results unstable to GG disturbance.

6.5. Simulation of all disturbances




Figure 1: Simulation of all disturbances

The control-free motion has been simulated with all the disturbances for three full periods. The initial condition were set to null initial angular velocity and null Euler angles in the 312 set.

From the graphs of Figure 1 it is clear that SRP disturbance is negligible in our case, the graph shows only numerical zeros. In particular, this is due to the symmetry of the geometry of the spacecraft a small set off for the CoM would have produced a net torque. It is clear, that in this specific case, the two most relevant disturbances are due to magnetic field interaction and the gravity gradient torque since the atmospheric drag torque is some orders of magnitude smaller.

Note that in the Gravity Gradient torque the y-axis component is almost null compared to the other components along x and z, this is due to the fact that the y-axis component of the torque depends on the difference between inertia moment along x and along z, for our case those two moments of inertia are very similar (reference).

7. Sensors

Sensors are fundamental tools that allows the SC to know its orientation or angular velocity. Their presence onboard is fundamental for having a controlled motion of the satellite. In this section, the 3 sensors used will be presented, it will be also clarified the motivation that lead the team to choose two additional sensors over the horizon sensor assigned.

7.1. Horizon Sensor

Horizon sensors are devices that can detect the centre of the planet, in our case Earth, and reconstruct the direction of that point with respect to the satellite. They usually work by analyzing the IR spectrum of the image through a

thermopile to reduce the visible light spectrum interference caused by transition of day and night on earth. Due to the nadir pointing requirement a static earth sensor has been chosen for this specific application. In particular, the *Meisei Earth Horizon* was chosen, which has the following specifics:

| <i>F.O.V. [deg]</i> | <i>Accuracy [deg]</i> | <i>Frequency [Hz]</i> |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 33 | 1 | 30 |

Table 1: Real data for Horizon Sensor

Due to operational requirements, the static sensor has to point the Earth, in particular the optical axis must have the same direction of the nadir (direction that links centre of earth and CoM of the S/C). To fulfill this request, a good option could be to position the sensor on the face that also contains the payload, that is the face of the spacecraft main body (cube) that has normal along the \mathbf{x}_b direction. The model implemented to simulate the behaviour of the sensor in the Simulink environment, was to take the real position of the S/C with respect to centre of Earth expressed in inertial space, change its direction multiplying by -1 and express it in the \mathcal{B} frame through the real attitude matrix $A_{B,N}$. This unit vector is the input of the sensor block, here it is sampled through a zero-order hold of frequency specified by Table 1 to simulate the digital nature of the sensor. Then some errors of measurements have to be added. It was decided to model two typical effects of real sensor: the mounting error that causes misalignment and also an accuracy error modeled with a band-limited white noise on all the components of the direction vector.

Bibliography

- [1] George C. Marshall Space Flight Center. *Saturn V Flight Manual SA-507*. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 10 1969.