ern numerical methods. Among these methods are efficient Kepler’s-eqution time-of-flight solutions and self-starting numerical integration with time as the independent variable. Self-starting numerical integration satisfies the require-ments for accuracy, reproducibility, and efficiency (and, hence, speed). Self-starting numerical integration also supports fully analytic regulation of integration step sizes, thereby further increasing speed while maintaining accuracy.

An Augmentation of G-Guidance Algorithms

This augmented algorithm can be used in small-body proximity operations utilizing model predictive control with a need for safety from surface-constraint uncertainty.

NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California

The original G-Guidance algorithm provided an autonomous guidance and control policy for small-body proximity operations that took into account uncertainty and dynamics disturbances. However, there was a lack of robustness in regards to object proximity while in autonomous mode. The modified G-Guidance algorithm was augmented with a second operational mode that allows switching into a safety hover mode. This will cause a spacecraft to hover in place until a mission-planning algorithm can compute a safe new trajectory. No state or control constraints are violated. When a new, feasible state trajectory is calculated, the spacecraft will return to standard mode and maneuver toward the target. The main goal of this augmentation is to protect the spacecraft in the event that a landing surface or obstacle is closer or further than anticipated. The algorithm can be used for the mitigation of any unexpected trajectory or state changes that occur during standard mode operations.

In order to have the G-Guidance algorithm detect an unsafe condition, it required some modification. This modification provides a policy to safely maneuver the spacecraft between its current state and a desired target state while ensuring satisfaction of thruster and trajectory constraints, along with safety constraints. In standard mode, this modification brings the spacecraft from its current position closer to its target state. In safety mode, the algorithm maintains the spacecraft’s current state at zero velocity. Since the safety mode is designed to be temporary, the destination location in this mode is also temporary, and once a new destination location is provided, the spacecraft returns to standard mode.

The G-Guidance algorithm uses both a planned trajectory (feedforward) and a control policy (feedback), along with sensors to monitor actual spacecraft state. The feedback is designed to ensure that the spacecraft stays within a specified proximity to the feedforward. The feedforward is designed to achieve the goals of each mode: hover for safety mode and maneuver toward target for standard mode. By giving the spacecraft the ability to re-compute its trajectory on-the-fly in response to local conditions, minimization of fuel usage is provided. The original G-Guidance algorithm provides robustness to uncertainty affecting the dynamics. The safety augmentation provides a form of state-constraint robustness, which further mitigates risk.

This work was done by John M. Carson III and Behcet Acmee of Caltech for NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory. For more information, contact iaoffice@jpl.nasa.gov. NPO-46452

Comparison of Aircraft Icing Growth Assessment Software

The goal is to provide software that can predict ice growth under any condition for any aircraft surface.

John H. Glenn Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio

A research project is underway to produce computer software that can accurately predict ice growth under any meteorological conditions for any aircraft surface. An extensive comparison of the results in a quantifiable manner against the database of ice shapes that have been generated in the NASA Glenn Icing Research Tunnel (IRT) has been performed, including additional data taken to extend the database in the Super-cooled Large Drop (SLD) regime. The project shows the differences in ice shape between LEWICE 3.2.2, GlennICE, and experimental data.

The Icing Branch at NASA Glenn has produced several computer codes over the last 20 years for performing icing simulation. While some of these tools have been collaborative projects, most have been developed primarily by one person, with some assistance by others. The state of computing has also changed dramatically in that time period. As these codes have grown in complexity and have been accepted by users as production icing tools, there has arisen a need for the developers to adhere to standard software practices used to develop commercial software.

The project addresses the validation of the software against a recent set of ice-shape data in the SLD regime. This validation effort mirrors a similar effort undertaken for previous validations of LEWICE. Those reports quantified the ice accretion prediction capabilities of the LEWICE software. Several ice geometry features were proposed for comparing ice shapes in a quantitative manner. The resulting analysis showed that LEWICE compared well to the available experimental data.

The effects of super-cooled large droplets in icing have been researched
extensively since 1994. Since then, several experimental efforts have been made to document SLD ice shapes and to investigate the underlying physics. While this project provides comparisons to standard icing conditions, the emphasis was placed on the newer data, which is predominately SLD.

This work was done by William Wright, Mark G. Potapczuk, and Laurie H. Levinson of Glenn Research Center. Further information is contained in a TSP (see page 1).

Inquiries concerning rights for the commercial use of this invention should be addressed to NASA Glenn Research Center, Innovative Partnerships Office, Attn: Steve Fedor, Mail Stop 4-8, 21000 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44135. Refer to LEW-18451-1.