Simultaneous spacecraft orbit estimation and control based on GPS measurements via extended Kalman filter
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Abstract The primary aim of this work is to provide simultaneous spacecraft orbit estimation and control based on the global positioning system (GPS) measurements suitable for application to the next coming Egyptian remote sensing satellites. Disturbance resulting from earth’s oblateness till the fourth order (i.e., $J_4$) is considered. In addition, aerodynamic drag and random disturbance effects are taken into consideration.
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1. Introduction

An estimation algorithm is used frequently to provide estimates of states to the control algorithm. The estimation algorithm utilizes the provided measurements coming from different sensors to obtain the required estimates of the states. These estimates are usually obtained in a least square sense to overcome the degradation coming from various disturbance sources acting on the sensors and the plant under consideration. Extended Kalman filter could be used as a standard estimation algorithm that could deal efficiently with the nonlinearities associated with the plant (the process) and the measurement processes. The unscented Kalman filter (Bhanderi, 2005), and the derivative free implementation of the extended Kalman filters (Quine, 2006), are other forms or substitutes of the extended Kalman filter those could deal more efficiently with the high nonlinearities. Unfortunately, these substitutes of the extended Kalman filter are characterized by high computational load that may not be suitable for application onboard a spacecraft. Simple estimation and control algorithms are considered to be a must onboard any spacecraft. Thus, a control algorithm such as that given in Luo and Tang (2005) is considered to be not adequate due to its complexity. The most common approaches of orbit control existing in the literature depend on C–W equations which describe two adjacent spacecraft’s relative motion as shown in Yang et al. (2010), Zhang et al. (2011). But these equations, in addition to those found in Jah and Kelecy (2010), did not include the effect of earth’s oblateness, limited thrust budget, or aerodynamic drag. The algorithms found in Tamer (2011), have the advantage of simplicity in addition to being able to include the effect of earth’s oblateness till the fourth order (i.e., $J_4$), limited thrust budget, and aerodynamic drag. The research at hand utilizes the extended Kalman filter for state estimation due to its relative low computational load compared to other estimation algorithms. In addition, the
control algorithm strategy of Tamer (2011), is adopted due to the same reason. Thus, simultaneous spacecraft orbit estimation and control is achieved taking into account disturbance sources such as earth’s oblateness till the fourth order (i.e., \( J_4 \)), limited thrust budget, and aerodynamic drag. Simplicity of the estimation and control algorithms could also be counted as surplus essential advantages. These advantages make them suitable for application onboard the next Egyptian remote sensing satellite, when the need arise to them.

2. Modeling spacecraft orbital motion and perturbations

The spacecraft orbital motion model is essentially that is well known by Cowell’s formulation (Tamer, 2009). The spacecraft orbital motion model is given as

$$
\mathbf{\dot{X}} = \begin{bmatrix}
\dot{X}_I \\
\dot{Y}_I \\
\dot{Z}_I
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
X_I \\
Y_I \\
Z_I \\
\dot{X}_I \\
\dot{Y}_I \\
\dot{Z}_I
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} + f(X) \tag{1}
$$

where \( R \) is the position vector of the spacecraft defined in the inertial axes (the subscript \((I)\) denotes the inertial axes, i.e., \( R_I = [X_I \ Y_I \ Z_I]^T \)), \( \mu_E \) the gravitational constant of the earth \( [\mu_E = 3.986 \times 10^{14} \text{ m}^3/\text{s}^2] \), \( a_I = [a_{X_I} \ a_{Y_I} \ a_{Z_I}]^T \) the perturbing accelerations expressed in the inertial frame of reference and \((\cdot)\) denotes the time derivative.

Figure 1 Orbital parameters for the initial and target orbits.
where $R_\oplus$ is the earth’s mean equatorial radius ($R_\oplus = 6378.1363 \times 10^3 \text{m}$), $P_{lm}$ are associated Legendre functions, $m$ is the model order, $l$ is the model degree, $C_{lm}$, and $S_{lm}$ are the dimensionless coefficients used to describe the shape and mass distribution inside the earth, $r_s$ is the geocentric distance and $\phi_s$ is the east longitude from Greenwich.

If the selected coordinate system in which the potential function is calculated coincides with the geocentric equatorial axes, the terms, $C_{1,0}$, $C_{1,1}$, and $S_{1,0}$ become zero. The term $C_{0,0}$ is equal to 1 and is corresponding to a spherical earth model. Thus, Eq. (2) turns out to be

$$U = \frac{\mu E}{r_s} \left(1 + \sum_{i=2}^{l} \sum_{m=0}^{\max(0,m)} \frac{R_m}{r_s} \cdot \frac{C_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \cos(m\phi_s) + \frac{S_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \sin(m\phi_s) \right)$$

(3)

The associated Legendre polynomial could be computed recursively by the relations (Vallado, 2001):

$$P_{0,0} = 1$$

$$P_{l,0} = (2l-1)P_{l-1,0} \cos \lambda$$

$$P_{l,m} = \frac{(2l-1)P_{l-1,m} \sin \lambda - (l-1)P_{l-2,0}}{l}$$

$$P_{l,m} = P_{l-2,m} + (2l-1)P_{l-1,m-1} \cos \lambda$$

(6)

(7)

where $\lambda$ is the latitude.

The partial derivatives of the gravitational potential function are

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} = \frac{\mu E}{r_s^3} \sum_{i=2}^{l} \sum_{m=0}^{\max(0,m)} \left( \frac{R_m}{r_s} \cdot \frac{C_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \sin(m\phi_s) \right)$$

(8)

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} = \frac{\mu E}{r_s^3} \sum_{i=2}^{l} \sum_{m=0}^{\max(0,m)} \left( \frac{R_m}{r_s} \cdot \frac{C_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \cos(m\phi_s) + \frac{S_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \sin(m\phi_s) \right)$$

(9)

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} = \frac{\mu E}{r_s^3} \sum_{i=2}^{l} \sum_{m=0}^{\max(0,m)} \left( \frac{R_m}{r_s} \cdot \frac{C_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \sin(m\phi_s) \right)$$

(10)

and finally, the perturbation acceleration in the earth centered earth fixed (ECEF) coordinate system is:

$$a_{xe} = \left\{ \frac{1}{r_s} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} = \frac{Z_E}{r_s^3 \sqrt{X_E^2 + Y_E^2}} \cdot \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} \right\} X_E - \frac{1}{X_E^2 + Y_E^2}$$

(11)

$$a_{ye} = \left\{ \frac{1}{r_s} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} = \frac{Z_E}{r_s^3 \sqrt{X_E^2 + Y_E^2}} \cdot \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} \right\} Y_E - \frac{1}{X_E^2 + Y_E^2}$$

(12)

$$a_{ze} = \frac{1}{r_s} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s} Z_E = \sqrt{X_E^2 + Y_E^2} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_s}$$

(13)

The effect of earth’s oblateness and aerodynamic drag is given as follows (Tamer, 2011).

2.1. Perturbation models

2.1.1. The earth oblateness

The gravity field affecting the motion of a spacecraft in a two-body Keplerian orbit assumes a perfectly spheroid shape of the earth. However, for higher accuracies of spacecraft position the ellipsoidal shape of the earth must be used instead. The gravitational potential function of the earth could be expanded in a spherical harmonic form as

$$U = \frac{\mu E}{r_s^3} \sum_{i=2}^{l} \sum_{m=0}^{\max(0,m)} \left( \frac{R_m}{r_s} \cdot \frac{C_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \cos(m\phi_s) + \frac{S_{lm}}{C_{0m}} \cdot \sin(m\phi_s) \right)$$

(2)
where $X_E$, $Y_E$, and $Z_E$ are the spacecraft position vector components in the earth centered earth fixed (ECEF) coordinate system.

The accelerations resulting from oblateness of the earth could be transformed from the ECEF frame of reference to the inertial frame (ECI) through the relation

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_{XI} \\ a_{YI} \\ a_{ZI} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \alpha_g & -\sin \alpha_g & 0 \\ \sin \alpha_g & \cos \alpha_g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{XE} \\ a_{YE} \\ a_{ZE} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\alpha_g$ is the Greenwich right ascension determined from Tamer (2011).

$$\alpha_g = \alpha_{g0} + 1.002737903 \times 2\pi \times D$$

where $\alpha_{g0}$ is the 1.74933340 rad at 1/1/1970 0h:0m:0s and $D$ is the time in day fraction elapsed since 1/1/1970 0h:0m:0s.

2.1.2. Aerodynamic drag

The aerodynamic force, $df_{aero}$ on a satellite surface element $dA$, is given by Tamer (2011).

$$df_{aero} = -\frac{1}{2} C_D \rho V^2 dA$$

where $V$ is the translational velocity of the satellite relative to the incident stream, $\rho$ is the atmospheric density, and $C_D$ is the drag coefficient. For practical applications $C_D$ may be set in the range of 2.0.

The atmospheric density is modeled based on interpolation between the values given in Larson and Wertz (1999).

3. Spacecraft orbit control

The control laws are given by Tamer (2011)

$$a_{XIc} = k_x (X_{I \text{commanded}} - X_{IE}) + k_{xd} (V_{I \text{commanded}} - V_{IE})$$

$$a_{YIc} = k_y (Y_{I \text{commanded}} - Y_{IE}) + k_{yd} (V_{I \text{commanded}} - V_{IE})$$

$$a_{ZIc} = k_z (Z_{I \text{commanded}} - Z_{IE}) + k_{zd} (V_{I \text{commanded}} - V_{IE})$$

where $a_{Ic} = [a_{XIc} \ a_{YIc} \ a_{ZIc}]^T$ are the control accelerations provided to the spacecraft expressed in the inertial frame of reference, $[k_x \ k_{xd} \ k_y \ k_{yd} \ k_z \ k_{zd}]^T$ are the controller
gains in the $X$, $Y$, and $Z$ directions and $(\cdot)_E$ denotes that the variable is provided by the estimator.

4. Spacecraft orbit estimation

Spacecraft orbit estimation process is done throughout the extended Kalman filter. Measurements are provided to the filter by a GPS receiver. The basic structure of the extended Kalman filter is given in Tamer (2011) as

$$
\hat{X}_k = f(\hat{X}_{k-1})
$$

(20)

$$
P_k = A_{k-1}P_{k-1}A_{k-1}^T + Q_{k-1}
$$

(21)

$$
K_k = P_k H_k^T (H_k P_k H_k^T + R_k)^{-1}
$$

(22)

$$
\tilde{X}_k = \hat{X}_k + K_k [z_k - \bar{z}_k]
$$

(23)

$$
P_k = [I - K_k H_k] P_k [I - K_k H_k]^T + K_k R_k K_k^T
$$

(24)

5. Controllability and observability analysis

Controllability analysis is based mainly on the two matrices $F_k$ and $G$ where the matrix $G$ is given by

$$
G = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(29)

The controllability matrix is computed from the relation

$$
CO = \begin{bmatrix}
F_k & F_k^2 & F_k^3 & F_k^4 & F_k^5 & F_k^6 \\
F_k^2 & F_k^4 & F_k^6 & F_k^8 & F_k^{10} & F_k^{12} \\
F_k^3 & F_k^6 & F_k^9 & F_k^{12} & F_k^{15} & F_k^{18} \\
F_k^4 & F_k^8 & F_k^{12} & F_k^{16} & F_k^{20} & F_k^{24} \\
F_k^5 & F_k^{10} & F_k^{15} & F_k^{20} & F_k^{25} & F_k^{30} \\
F_k^6 & F_k^{12} & F_k^{18} & F_k^{24} & F_k^{30} & F_k^{36}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(30)

The controllability matrix given in Eq. (30) must have a full rank (i.e., 6).

Similarly, the observability matrix, $OB$, defined in Eq. (31) must have a rank of 6.

$$
OB = \begin{bmatrix}
H_k \\
H_k F_k \\
H_k F_k^2 \\
H_k F_k^3 \\
H_k F_k^4 \\
H_k F_k^5
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(31)

6. Simulation case study and testing

The initial orbital parameters are chosen exactly as those found in Tamer (2011). The estimator initial conditions are: $a$ (semi major axis) = 73,71,200 m, $e$ (orbit eccentricity) = 0.002, $i$ (orbit inclination) = 98°, $\Omega$ (right ascension of ascending node) = 102°, $\varphi$ (argument of perigee) = 0°, and $\nu$ (true anomaly) = 16°. Fig. 1 displays the behavior of the classical orbital elements of the satellite over 30,000 s. As shown in Fig. 1, the satellite had successfully completed its orbital maneuver after about 10,000 s.

Fig. 2 represents the rank of the observability matrix defined earlier. And Fig. 3 shows the rank of the controllability. The rank of both of the matrices is equal to six which indicate a full rank. Fig. 4 displays the required thrust force for execution of the orbital maneuver. As clear in this figure, the
maximum thrust level is 890 N in all directions. The spacecraft mass under consideration is 50 kg. As clear from Fig. 4, in the beginning of the orbital maneuver, thrusters went into saturation. During the saturation period the rank of the controllability matrix is six, indicating full controllability during the saturation period. The rank of the controllability matrix will not be the only indicator for existence of control as the control channel might exist but the required control value is not available. To alleviate this difficulty, global optimum values of the controller gains are selected (taking into account the maximum available thrust force) using real coded genetic algorithms (RCGA) found in Tamer (2011). The system is designed (using RCGA) to have a time constant of 213.4516 s and a damping ratio of 0.9621. Fig. 5 represents the satellite altitude which is used only to check that the satellite did not hit the earth surface during the execution of the orbital maneuver. Fig. 6 shows the satellite position estimation error. The quick convergence of the error (typically within 10 s) from about 760 to about 0.5 km indicates the success of the estimation process. Note that, the sinusoidal behavior of the semi-major axis and the altitude is due to oblateness of the earth, as mentioned in Section 2. We should note that a successful orbital maneuver is achieved after approximately less than 500 s.

7. Conclusion

The orbit estimation and orbit control processes had worked successfully with each other. The orbit estimation algorithm provided state estimates of the spacecraft position and velocity to the orbit control algorithm. The extended Kalman filter showed a fast convergence of the estimation error. Nonlinearities of the actual spacecraft behavior resulted from aerodynamic drag, earth oblateness, and bounded thrust budget are taken into consideration during the controller design process. The rank of the controllability and observability matrices indicated a full rank. This means that the plant is fully controllable and observable. The resulting control and estimation algorithms are characterized by simplicity, which is considered to be a surplus advantage that enables their execution onboard the spacecraft computer.
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