Simulations of VLBI observations to satellites enabling co-location in space

N. Mammadaliyev¹, P. Schreiner², S. Glaser², R. Koenig², K.H. Neumayer², R. Heinkelmann², H. Schuh^{2,1}

¹Technische Universität Berlin, Chair of Satellite Geodesy, Str. des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin, Germany (nicat@gfzpotsdam.de), ²Helmholtz Centre Potsdam, GFZ German Research Centre for Geosciences, Potsdam, Germany

> EGU General Assembly May 2020











Methodology

Scheduling of VLBI sessions

Simulation of the scheduled observations

Estimation of the classical VLBI parameters based on the simulated observations





Schedule and simulation inputs

Observations are scheduled for:

- 15 globally distributed stations
- Observing one LEO satellite
- Experiment duration is one week (7 x 24h sessions)
- Only VLBI to spacecraft observations are scheduled

Simulations:

- Computed delays are generated based on the reference orbit (no error)
- Different orbit variations are employed to obtain simulated observed delay





Network stations and satellite's ground track



- Size of the red points represents number of observations (station/per day)
- Blue dots represents ground track of the satellite





Reference orbit

Initial state:

	Perigee [km]	Apogee [km]	Inclination [o]	Eccentricity
LEO satellite	762	7472	63.4	0.32

Perturbation forces investigated within this study:

- Solar radiation pressure
- Atmospheric drag
- Gravity field of the Earth





Solar radiation pressure

acceleration of a near-Earth satellite due to the solar radiation pressure

$$\ddot{r}_{sol} = \kappa \left[\frac{A}{R}\right]^2 C_R \frac{a}{m} \frac{\vec{R}}{R}$$

 $\kappa = Solar constant$

- A = Astronomical unit
- R = Heliocentric radius vector to the satellite
- a = Cross-sectional area of the satellite perpendicular to \vec{R}
- m = Satellite mass
- C_R = reflectivity coefficient





Atmospheric drag

(de)acceleration of a near-Earth satellite due to the atmospheric drag

$$\ddot{r}_{atm} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_D a}{m} \rho v^2$$

 C_D = Drag coefficient a = Cross-sectional area of the satellite m = Mass ρ = Atmospheric mass density* v = velocity w.r.t atmosphere

* Atmosphere mass density is calculated based on the NRLMSISE-00 empirical atmosphere density model (For further reading see [3])





Gravity field of the Earth

acceleration of a near-Earth satellite due to the gravity field of the Earth

$$\ddot{r}_{grv} = \frac{GM}{r} f(C_{nm}, S_{nm})$$

G = gravitational constant M = Mass of the Earth r = Distance between center of the Earth and satellite C_{nm}, S_{nm} = Geopotential coefficients (60x60)*

* The Earth's potential is calculated here based on:

- 1. GRACE Gravity Model 05S (GGM05S)
 - Grace only model (For further reading see [4])
- 2. European Improved Gravity model of the Earth by New techniques(EIGEN-6C)
 - combination of the different satellite and surface data sets (For further reading see [5])





Orbital variations

Simulated observed delays are obtained based on the following orbital variation scenarios







Variations in the atmospheric drag







Variations in the solar radiation model







Initial state elements biased by 8 microseconds







Initial state elements biased by 10 microseconds







GGM05S instead of EIGEN-6C as a-priori gravity field model







Conclusion

In this study, the impact of orbital errors on the stations position derived by VLBI to satellite observations has been investigated

Biased orbits have been generated based on gravitational and non-gravitational perturbations

Station positions are represented in weekly RMS up, east and north components

Remote network stations represent large errors

Position of more observed stations are better estimated than less observed stations

Large errors in the north component is due to the correlation between ZWD and the station height

Orbital errors in

- along-track mainly degrade up component
- cross-track degrades east component of the stations position





References

- 1. IERS Conventions (1996), McCarthy, Dennis D, ITN, vol:21, 1996
- NRLMSISE-00 empirical model of the atmosphere: Statistical comparisons and scientific issues, Picone, JM and Hedin, AE and Drob, D Pj and Aikin, AC, Journal of Geophysical Research: Space Physics, Vol:107, num:A12, 2002
- 3. Spacecraft formation flying: Dynamics, control and navigation, Alfriend, Kyle and Vadali, Srinivas Rao and Gurfil, Pini and How, Jonathan and Breger, Louis, vol:2, 2009
- 4. J. Ries, S. Bettadpur, R. Eanes, Z. Kang, U. Ko, C. McCullough, P. Nagel, N. Pie, S. Poole, T. Richter, H. Save, and B. Tapley (2016) Development and Evaluation of the Global Gravity Model GGM05
- 5. Shako, R., Förste, C., Abrykosov, O., Bruinsma, S., Marty, J.-C., Lemoine, J.-M., Flechtner, F., Neumayer, K.-H., Dahle, C. (2014): EIGEN-6C: A High-Resolution Global Gravity Combination Model Including GOCE Data

Thanks for your interest!

nicat@gfz-potsdam.de



