

NASA CA Operations Devolution to Individual Missions

Lauri K. Newman NASA Conjunction Assessment Risk Analysis

> Matthew D. Hejduk The Aerospace Corporation

> > May 2, 2018

NASA CARA

www.nasa.gov



Agenda



- Definition of devolution
- HQ/Science Mission Directorate (SMD) decision on devolution
- •CARA devolution-related preparation activities
- Devolution current notional schedule information
- Mission devolution checklist
- Mission devolution survey

What is **Devolution**?



- •CARA met with Greg Robinson/Deputy Associate Administrator for Programs in NASA SMD on 22 FEB 2018 meeting as follow-up to an action taken at 2017 PPBE
 - As part of response, CARA proposed options for devolving CARA operations to missions
- Devolution is a spreading of CA operations responsibilities to mission FOTs
 - Permits efficiencies in handling the increased workload caused by Space Fence and large constellations
 - Missions given more flexibility in choosing specific approach to CA requirements that resonates best with their particular needs
 - -CARA retains Agency oversight through an established NASA Standard (e.g. training and tool certification)
 - -CARA retains SME expertise for Agency support

Agency CA Ops Conduct: Options



- Centralized CA operations
 - Status quo approach: data receipt, risk assessment, reporting, High Interest Event management, and maneuver recommendations all by CARA
- Partial devolution
 - Ops devolution the standard, but CARA ops retained where devolution imprudent, undesirable, or not possible
 - Missions approaching end of life
 - Joint missions where CARA CA part of international agreement
- Full ops devolution, but with muster capability
 - Routine operations fully devolved to missions, but CARA retains operational hardware and skeleton ops personnel as cold backup
 - Hedge against changes in data availability/releasability or withdraw of industry capability
- Full ops devolution
 - CARA activities refocused to analysis, tech development, policy, and DoD/Classified interface management roles

Summary of SMD Devolution Decision



- •SMD decision: to pursue partial devolution now
 - -Plan for CARA to be ready for devolution by FY20
- •SMD will have multiple opportunities to revisit/update this decision
 - -Following Users Forum survey results
 - -Following Pilot program(s)
 - -At each year's PPBE
- •Considerations that may impact full devolution option
 - -Foreign partners may require CA support under international agreements
 - -Missions close to end-of-life may not be well equipped for indigenous CA
 - -Missions may simply not wish to take on CA activities

Continuity of Key CARA Functions



- •CARA as SME to Agency for SSA
 - -Tech development for new methodologies/procedures
 - -General policy formation
 - -Engaging with external organizations to further Agency goals
- •Orbital Safety Analysts (OSAs) to be retained as part of CARA
 - -VAFB-resident NASA employees that expedite CA and provide services
 - -OSA role codified in interim CA guidance letter (June 2016)
- •CARA as liaison manager to 18 SPCS/JSpOC (per NPR 8715.6b 2.7.1)
 - Missions to have direct access to OSAs in support of regular ops CA functions per CARA-provided procedures
 - -CARA will oversee routine and conduct classified communications

Devolution Preparation Activities



- •Preparing for devolution requires preparation of many items:
 - -Development and coordination of CA Standard
 - -Development and coordination of CA Handbook
 - Development of CONOPS for devolution, for both CARA and Missions (standard template tailored to each mission's situation)
 - -CA training for missions
 - -Transfer of CARA stand-alone CA tools to missions that desire them
 - Placement of essential CA algorithms and test cases into publiclyaccessible Software Development Kits (SDKs)
 - Permits benchmarking of non-CARA CA tools
 - •Enables industry by making key CA algorithms publicly available
 - -RFI for commercially-available CA tools/services
 - -Execution of a Pilot program(s) for beta testing of the above items

CA Standards/Guidelines



 In order to enable orbit regime protection under devolution, NASA Standard for CA operational conduct is needed

- Outlines roles and responsibilities, data flow, training requirements, tool validation approaches, risk assessment activities, and reporting requirements
- -Written at conceptual level
 - •CA Handbook to provide actual compliance methods and threshold values—easier to modify as industry matures

•Goal is for Standard to be mission- and industry-friendly

•Presently in draft form (with accompanying handbook commentary)

-Under review and reformatting by GSFC Code 300 (SMA)

•Next step is to obtain CARA Management Advisory Board (CMAB) approval and enter formal staffing and notice process

-Hope is to have Standard approved close to beginning of FY19

CA Handbook



•To facilitate responsible CA, collective wisdom of ten years of CA activities needs to be documented and transitioned to users

- •NASA Handbook proper vehicle for this; topics include
 - -Introduction to and history of CA
 - Review and technical explanation of major CA methods/algorithms, along with operational lessons learned and cautions
 - -Amplification of each section of CA Standard
 - -Actual CA required performance methods, levels, and thresholds
 - -Mission pre-launch, launch, and end-of-life activities/responsibilities
 - -Treatment of advanced concepts
- •Draft version of Handbook planned for SEP 18
- •Plan is to circulate technical portion publicly, to broader industry, to help new and established actors improve safety of flight

CONOPS Development



CONOPS for CARA

- -Requires update for interaction with devolved missions
- -Expected completion by 1 JUN, including OSA procedure updates
- CONOPS for missions
 - Each devolving mission will require a CONOPS detailing implementation of the CA Standard for the particular mission
 - -To be written jointly between mission and CARA
 - -Includes the following items:
 - Data flow, including reporting requirements
 - Methodology/protocols for direct contact with OSAs at 18th SPCS
 - Internal decision process and approach for Standard requirements compliance
 - •Selection of CA toolset or service and (if necessary) tool certification
 - Training approach

CA Training for Missions



•Updating CARA internal training program to be appropriate to missions

- -Concept- rather than tool-based
- -Distanced-learning paradigms
- -Oral and written exam service available to missions for certification
- •Beginner Training Program
 - -Being offered as a trial run to ESMO (3 FOT participants) this June/July
 - 4 class times of 4 hours each
 - •Students read the material and take a quiz prior to attending class
 - Class involves group discussion of quiz (to review any weak areas) and a group project
 - -Material available in SATERN June 2018; annual updates planned

Advanced Training Program

- -To be offered as part of bi-monthly Users' Forum meetings
- -Material will also be available in SATERN within the next year and will become part of formal training baseline

NASA CARA

CARA Tools to Missions



•CARA possesses a number of stand-alone tools that can be helpful to missions performing their own CA

- -Maneuver Trade-Space (MTS) helpful in selecting maneuvers
- Sensor Coverage predicts future SSN tracking opportunities of objects, both theoretically and empirically
- Monte Carlo Workbench performs Monte Carlo Pc calculation (from TCA) in equinoctial space, along with covariance repair
- Pc Uncertainty produces PDF of Pc values to compare against threshold, modeling covariance and HBR uncertainty
- •Presently being packaged and made available for circulation
- •Effort underway to move CARA to GovCloud environment
 - Possible deployment mechanism for difficult-to-circulate but potentially desirable services, such as Brute Force Monte Carlo

CA Software Development Kits (SDKs)



•Method for packaging and distributing established CA algorithms for distribution to missions and industry

- Allows more rapid development of tools and thus more choices for missions; also seeds better safety of flight for industry
- -Publicly available kits contain a reference conference paper, relevant test and validation cases, and MATLAB source code for main algorithm with simple driver
- •Planned SDKs include 2-D Pc, 3-D Pc, OD Quality, Monte Carlo from TCA (equinoctial conversions), collision consequence, single-covariance Pc, and Pc Uncertainty
 - -Other functions seen as too basic to require SDK
- •SDKs will be rolled out as ready, with first appearing early summer
 - -Must be fully coordinated with GSFC tech transfer office
 - -Routine updates envisioned for bug fixes and enhancements

Commercial Tools RFI



- Released industry RFI in January 2017 for commercial CA tools and services
 - -Wanted to assess industry maturity and range of possibilities
- •Evaluated seven vendors against essential and elaborate functions
 - More vendors exist than chose to respond to RFI, but formal evaluation restricted to those choosing to respond
- •Detailed evaluation results proprietary but can be discussed with mission civil servants or FFRDC support
- •Bottom line: multiple reasonable choices expected to be available by fall 2018
 - -Allows one year of tool/service selection, installation, and checkout before FY20 devolution preparation goal

Pilot Program



- •Pilot program will be run to beta test devolution paradigm, including:
 - -Ensuring all necessary procedures and tools are in place
 - -Identification, training, and certification of mission CA personnel
 - -Parallel operations (both tabletop and live ops conduct)
- •Success criteria (to be spelled out specifically, but at high level):
 - Presence of all above items (any CARA/mission disagreements resolved through dissenting opinion process)
 - "Substantially equivalent" ops decisions (during parallel operations) from perspective of orbital regime protection
 - -Pilot results to be evaluated by CMAB for readiness to devolve
- •Currently working with ESMO to execute a pilot
- Another mission that has not already begun its own CA operations will be selected for a follow-on pilot

Devolution Schedule: FY 2018



| | Task Name | Q1 | | Q2 | | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | | | |
|----|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|------|
| | | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Мау | Jun | Jul |
| 1 | CA Standard Development | | | | | | | | | | CA S | Standar | d Develo | pment | | | | | | |
| 2 | Draft Standard comment resolution | | | | Dr | aft Star | dard co | mment | resolut | ion | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Staffing of Standard through Agency process | | | | • | | | | | | 🛛 Staf | fing of : | standaro | d throug | gh Ager | cy proce | ess | | | |
| 4 | CA Handbook development | | | | | | | | | | | | CA Ha | andbool | k devel | opment | | | | |
| 5 | Draft Handbook generated | | | | | | | | | | Draft | Handbo | ok gene | rated | | | | | | |
| 6 | CMAB approval of Handbook (with LL from pilot) | | | | | | | | | | + | | СМАВ | approv | al of H | andbool | < (with l | L from | pilot) | |
| 7 | SDK Generation | | | | | | | | SDK | Generat | ion | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Distribution of CARA tools to missions | | | | | | | Di: | stributio | on of CA | RA tool | ls to mis | sions | | | | | | | |
| 9 | ESMO Pilot Program | | | | | | | | | | _ | ESMO Pi | lot Prog | ram | | | | | | |
| 10 | ESMO-CARA CONOPS development | | | | | ESMO- | CARA | CONOPS | develo | pment | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | CARA devolution CONOPS development | | | | | CARA | devolut | ion COM | IOPS de | velopm | ent | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | ESMO CA Training | | | | | | | ES | мо са | Training | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | SpaceNav tool validation | | | | | | | | Space | Nav tool | validat | tion | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Tabletop case studies joint review | | | | | | | | Tabl | etop ca: | e studi | ies joint | review | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Active parallel ops | | | | | | | | | A(| tive pa | rallel op | s | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Pilot program evaluation / reconciliation with approved Standard | | | | | | | | | | | Pilot pro | gram ev | valuatio | n / rec | onciliati | on with | approve | ed Stan | dard |

•ESMO pilot parallel ops period shortened somewhat due to extensive experience with present tool

•Certification for actual devolution contingent on draft Standard emerging from coordination without substantive changes that affect pilot

Devolution Schedule: FY 2019



| | Task Name | | Q4 | | | Q1 | | | Q2 | | Q3 | | | Q4 | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----|---------------------|---------|----------|-------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| | | | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan |
| 1 | CARA Training | CARA Training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Fall course | | | _n Fall c | ourse | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 [| Spring course | Spring course | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Wave 1 Mission Preparation | Wave 1 Mission Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Tool selection | | | | Tool se | election | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Tool validation | | | | | | Tool | valida | tion | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | CONOPS/MoU generation | | | + | | | , CON | OPS/N | 10U gene | ration | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Tabletop cases | | | | | | t | Tab | letop ca: | ses | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Parallel operations | | | | | | + | | | Paralle | lopera | tions | | | | | |
| 10 | Wave 2 Mission Preparation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Wave 3 | 2 Missio | on Prep | aration |
| 11 | Tool selection | | | | | | | | To | ol select | tion | | | | | | |
| 12 | Tool validation | | | | | | | | | | Т | ool valid | ation | | | | |
| 13 | CONOPS/MoU generation | | | | | | | | | | C | :onops/ | MoU ge | neratior | 1 | | |
| 14 | Tabletop cases | | | | | | | | | | | Ta | bletop | ases | | | |
| 15 | Parallel operations | | | | | | | | | | | | | Paralle | el opera | tions | |

•Presumes reasonable guidance in place (Standard, Handbook) to begin these processes in FY19

 Presumes missions can arrange themselves in groups that result in similar documents and activities

•Amount of actual workload required variable based on mission choices, so difficult to estimate number of missions devolvable in a given timeframe NASA CARA

Next Steps



- Complete mission devolution survey (next slide)
- •Feel free to send additional comments via email to CARA or your HQ PE
- •Economies of scale can be realized if missions participate as groups
 - -Gets more missions into a devolved status in the fastest way possible
 - -Cheaper for all if use same tools/procedures
 - Negotiations are needed but take time, so may be beneficial to initiate discussions now
- •CARA will need to limit number of missions/groups of similar missions that can be devolved at a time due to limited resources

-Prioritization can be accomplished by SMD

Mission Devolution Survey



•Survey will be circulated following this meeting seeking mission views on and response to devolution

- -Desired by SMD in tendering future devolution-related decisions
- •Online version crafted to receive basic information in standardized way
 - -However, amplifying comments, sent by e-mail, would be very helpful for process; please respond in this way if desired
- •CARA devolution PoC is Joe Rosa (joseph.d.rosa@nasa.gov)