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## reani What Are the Pieces of the Puzzle

( What do I want to do (Science Goals)?
What Am I Going to do (Instrument + Telescope)?
( Where Am I Going (Orbit)?
( What do I put everything on (Spacecraft)?

- Slewing? Pointing? Data? Vibration? Power?

How do I get there (Launch Vehicle)?

- Where are you going? How much mass?

How much will it all cost?
( How soon can I have it?

## What Are My Goals

( Science matrix ties science goals to mission design requirements
( Objectives are set by NASA Astrophysics roadmap

- Science teams measurement objectives and translate those objectives into measurement requirements, instruments and mission requirements

| Science Objectives | Measurement Objectives | Measurement Requirements | Instruments | Mission Requirements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Determine how planets form in dense disks of gas and dust around young stars |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Study the formation andevolution of planetary systems |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Explore the diversity of other worlds |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Search for habitable planets and life |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

( Astronomy missions are usually driven by the instrument and science requirements on the spacecraft
( Instrument design is done separately from the total mission design due to the complexity of the instrument design process

## How Much Is That Telescope?

|  |  | Mass | Power | Data rate | Technology Development | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (kg) | (W) | (kbps) |  | (\$ FY09) |
|  | Lyot Coronagraph | 150 | 50 | 70 |  | \$ 70 M |
|  | PIAA Coronagraph | 170 | 65 | 70 | Optics | \$ 90 M |
|  | Photometer | 120 | 75 | 300 |  | \$ 60 M |
|  | Interferometer | 120 | 250 | 5 |  | \$ 70 M |
|  | 50k x 50k FPA Wide Field Survey Camera | 350 | 200 | 400000 | FPA's | \$ 300 M |
|  | 2k $\times 2 \mathrm{k}$ camera | 10 | 10 | 600 |  | \$ 20 M |
|  | Vis Spectrometer | 40 | 30 | 3000 |  | \$ 30 M |
|  | IR Spectrometer | 40 | 30 | 3000 |  | \$ 20 M |
|  | UV Spectrometer | 40 | 30 | 3000 |  | \$ 40 M |


| $$ | 0.5 m Telescope | 30 | 25 | n/a |  | \$ 20 M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.0m Telescope | 150 | 75 | n/a |  | \$ 50 M |
|  | 1.5m Telescope | 300 | 225 | n/a |  | \$ 150 M |
|  | 2.0m Telescope | 700 | 300 | n/a |  | \$ 500 M |
|  | 4.0m Telescope | 2000 | 400 | n/a | Large optics, I \& T | \$ 1500 M |

Telescope Adjustments:

1. Add $50 \%$ to cost for off axis
2. Add $30 \%$ to cost for UV
3. Subtract 30\% from cost for IR only
4.Add 50\% for passive cooling (45 K)
5.Add 50\% for active (He) cooling (4 K)

Instrument Adjustments

1. Cryocooler or dewar add $\$ 50 \mathrm{M}$

## ( Key Trades

- Information System
- Power
- Propellant/Structure/Mass
- Pointing
- Cost



## Pointing Trades

( Pointing control - the ability to point the instrument payload at a specific target within a given accuracy.
( Pointing knowledge - the after-the-fact reconstruction of the true instrument position within a given accuracy.
( Pointing stability - holding a position within a tolerance for a fixed period of time (integration time).
( Slew rate - Slewing can be a significant period of the total mission life. Reaction wheels must be large enough to achieve the required rate.

|  | Pointing Control | Stability |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HST | 0.01 asec | $0.007 \mathrm{asec} / 24$ hours |
| Spitzer | 0.5 asec | $0.1 \mathrm{asec} / 200 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| WISE | 60 asec | $1 \mathrm{asec} / 9 \mathrm{sec}$ |

## Where Is My Data?

## ( Daily data volume

- Instrument data rate x operation/day
- Size of array, number of arrays, integration time, etc.
( Assume x2 lossless compression, 4 bytes=32 bits/pixel. Add 10\% overhead
( Link time is expensive. Ka band is expensive.
( Taking data while observing requires (expensive) steerable antenna
- Spitzer downlinks (once/1 day for 2 hours) and Kepler (once / 2-4 days)

|  | Low Earth <br> Orbit | L2 | Earth Trailing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Telecom rate Mbits/sec | $320,000(X$ <br> band) | $300(\mathrm{X})$ $320,000(\mathrm{Ka})$ | $3 / \mathrm{yr}^{\wedge} 2(\mathrm{X})$ |
| $3200 / \mathrm{yr}$ ^2 (Ka) |  |  |  |$|$

## What Is a Spacecraft?

|  |  | Spacecraft A | Spacecraft B | Spacecraft C | Spacecraft D |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payload Power | W (EOL) | 50 | 66 | 730 | 650 |
| Payload Mass Limit | kg | 70 | 200 | 380 | 650 |
| Bus Dry mass (w/o Payload) | kg | 60 | 125 | 600 | 350 |
| Science Data Downlink <br> capacity | kbps | 2000 | 2500 | 320000 | 80,000 |
| Science Data Storage <br> capability | Mbit | 3 | 2000 | 134000 | 100,000 |
| Pointing Knowledge | arcsec | 2880 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 |
| Pointing Control | arcsec | 2160 | 32 | 5 | 16 |
| Pointing Stability (Jitter) | arcsec/sec | 36 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.1 |
| Slewrate | deg/min | 60 | 390 | 240 | 120 |
| Mission Design Life | yrs | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| Cost | $\$$ FY09 | $\$ 50 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 125 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 150 \mathrm{M}$ |

## Orbit Selection

(Trading telecom needs vs. station keeping requirements vs. launch vehicle costs vs. eclipse and downlink opportunity issues vs. mission duration
(Trades usually require complete design of the spacecraft and mission to evaluate
( All subsystems can be impacted by the decision
( Spacecraft design and launch vehicle selection are similar for L2 and Earth trailing


## Where Is My Spacecraft?



|  | Low Earth Orbit <br> (Eq) | Low Earth <br> Orbit (Polar) | L2 | Earth <br> Trailing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Launch <br> Vehicle | Inexpensive | Modest | Expensive | Expensive |
| Thermal | Complex, hot Earth, <br> eclipses | Stable hot Earth | Stable, cold | Stable, cold |
| View of Sky | Earth and Moon <br> avoidance | Good along <br> terminator or <br> anti-sun | Excellent. <br> Constant <br> geometry | Excellent. Constant <br> geometry |
| Data Rates | Easy, high | Easy, high | Moderate | Expensive with time |
| Propulsion | De-orbit | De-orbit | L2 Entry, station <br> keeping | None |


|  | 600 km <br> Polar <br> Orbit | L2 | Earth <br> Trailing | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L/V A | 800 kg | N/A | N/A | $\$ 57 \mathrm{M}$ |
| L/V B | $6,800 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $3,495 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $3,485 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $\$ 136 \mathrm{M}$ |
| L/V C | $20,790 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $9,410 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $9,395 \mathrm{~kg}$ | $\$ 220 \mathrm{M}$ |

## How Expensive Will It All Be?

| COST SUMMARY (FY2009 \$ M ) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| WBS Elements | Total |
| Project Cost (\$ FY09) | \$514.1 M |
| Development Cost (Phases A - D) | \$396.8 M |
| 01.0 Project Management | \$15.3 M |
| 02.0 Project Systems Engineering | \$15.3 M |
| 03.0 Mission Assurance | \$12.2 M |
| 04.0 Science | \$10.0 M |
| 05.0 Payload System | \$100.0 M |
| Instrument 1 | \$100.0 M |
| Instrument 2 |  |
| Instrument 3 |  |
| Instrument 4 |  |
| Instrument 5 |  |
| 06.0 Flight System | \$100.0 M |
| 07.0 Mission Operations Preparation | \$15.0 M |
| 09.0 Ground Data Systems | \$15.0 M |
| 10.0 ATLO | \$14.0 M |
| 11.0 Education and Public Outreach | \$1.5 M |
| 12.0 Mission and Navigation Design | \$7.0 M |
| Development Reserves | \$91.6 M |
| Operations Cost (Phases E-F) | \$17.3 M |
| Operations | \$15.0 M |
| Operations Reserves | \$2.3 M |
| 8.0 Launch Vehicle | \$100.0 M |

```
5% of development
5% of development
4% of development
$15M
$15M
7% of Payload and Flight System
0.5% of development
$7M
    30%
$15M/yr years
    15%
```

| Class | Total <br> Cost <br> Limit | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Small Explorer | $\$ 105 \mathrm{M}$ | Highly focused. Single instrument. No technology. <br> No risk. NuStar, Galex. 2-3/decade |
| Medium <br> Explorer | $\$ 300 \mathrm{M}$ | Highly focused, Single instrument. No technology. <br> No risk. WISE |
| Discovery Class | $\$ 500 \mathrm{M}$ | Kepler. Not available to astronomy |
| ExoPlanet | $\$ 650-800$ | Sophisticated instrument. Broad appeal. GO <br> program. Modest technology? 1-2/decade? |
| Probe | M | $\$ 1,000-2,0$ |
| Spitzer, Chandra. Sophisticated instrument(s). Broad <br> Mapper <br> Observatory | Strong GO/GTO. 1/decade |  |
| Mega Flagship | $>\$ 5,000 \mathrm{M}$ | HST, JWST. 1/generation. Numerous complex <br> instruments. Very high technology risk. Should |
| feed many astronomers through GO programs |  |  |

## Design iteration and convergence



## Outline

1. Science goals, mission name (bonus for acronym and logo!!)
2. Define telescope and instrument
3. Choose orbit
4. Calculate data volume, rate and downlink
5. Calculate pointing requirements
6. Select spacecraft bus
7. Determine launch mass
8. Select launch vehicle
9. Describe major risks
10. Estimate total mission cost

## 1. Science goals

( Major science goals and relevance to field
(Mission name (and acronym/logo)

## reand 2. Define telescope and instrument

( Wavelength
( Size
) Sensitivity
( Resolution (spectral and angular)
( Thermal Requirements
. Duration
. Consider data rate, background noise, launch cost

## renve 4. Calculate data volume and rate

( Calculate data volume and rate
Is this consistent with orbit and downlink capabilities?

## reany 5. Calculate pointing requirements

* Use the least stringent pointing needed to accomplish the science
( Depends on size of instrument, telecom capability, pointing capability
( Telescope
. Bus
( Instrument
- Propellant
( Margin
(Mass
( Orbit
( Cost
. Unusual size
( New technologies
( Below guideline margins
( Telescope
) Bus
( Instrument
. Launch vehicle
M Operations
( Reserves

