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Why You’re Receiving this Briefing

• Since inception, CARA has required owner/operator predicted ephemerides, at least for maneuverable satellites
• Around 2012, CARA began requesting predicted covariance as well
  – If/as possible for existing missions
  – Included in ICD/OA for new missions
• CARA recently received two actions
  – MOWG Action Item 1309-05
  – ESMO Maneuver Process Review RFA-02
• Primary objectives of actions
  – Why is CARA asking for predicted covariance from o/o
  – Any implementation recommendations
• This briefing is in response to those actions
• Right table indicates which ESC missions are currently providing predicted covariance to CARA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aura</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIPSO</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CloudSat</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO-1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCOM-W1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat-7</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat-8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCO-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OD Solutions

• **Purpose of OD**
  – Generate estimate of the object’s state at a given time (called the *epoch time*)
  – Generate additional parameters and constructs to allow object’s future states to be predicted (accomplished through orbit *propagation*)
  – Generate a statement of the estimation error, both at epoch and for any predicted state (usually accomplished by means of a *covariance matrix*)

• **Error types**
  – OD approaches (either batch or filter) presume that they solve for all significant systematic errors
  – Remaining solution error is thus presumed to be random (Gaussian) error
  – Sometimes this error can be intentionally inflated to try to improve the fidelity of the error modeling
  – Nonetheless, presumed to be Gaussian in form and unbiased
• **Solved for: State parameters**
  – Six parameters needed to determine 3-d state fully
  – Cartesian: three position and three velocity parameters in orthogonal system
  – Element: six orbital elements that describe the geometry of the orbit

• **Solved for: Non-conservative force parameters**
  – Ballistic coefficient \( (C_D A/m) \); describes vulnerability of spacecraft state to atmospheric drag
  – Solar radiation pressure (SRP) coefficient \( (C_R A/m) \); describes vulnerability of spacecraft state to visible light momentum from sun

• **Considered: ballistic coefficient and SRP consider parameter**
  – Not solved for but “considered” as part of the solution
  – Derived from information outside of the OD itself
  – Discussed later
OD Uncertainty Modeling

• Characterizes the overall uncertainty of the OD epoch and/or propagated state
  – Uncertainty of each estimated parameter and their interactions
• This is a characterization of a multivariate statistical distribution
• In general, need the four cumulants to characterize the distribution
  – Mean, variance, skewness, and kurtosis; and their mutual interactions
  – Requires higher-order tensors to do this for a multivariate distribution
• Assumptions about error distribution can simplify situation substantially
  – Presuming the solution is unbiased places the mean error values at zero
  – Presuming the error distribution is Gaussian eliminates the need for the third and fourth cumulants
  – Error distribution can thus be expressed by means of variances of each solved-for component and their cross-correlations
  – Thus, error can be fully represented by means of a covariance matrix
Covariance Matrix Construction: Symbolic Example

- Three estimated parameters (a, b, and c)
- Variances of each along diagonal
- Off-diagonal terms the product of two standard deviations and the correlation coefficient ($\rho$); matrix is symmetric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>$\sigma_a^2$</td>
<td>$\rho_{ab}\sigma_a\sigma_b$</td>
<td>$\rho_{ac}\sigma_a\sigma_c$</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>$\rho_{ab}\sigma_a\sigma_b$</td>
<td>$\sigma_b^2$</td>
<td>$\rho_{bc}\sigma_a\sigma_c$</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>$\rho_{ac}\sigma_a\sigma_c$</td>
<td>$\rho_{bc}\sigma_a\sigma_c$</td>
<td>$\sigma_c^2$</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Covariance from CDM

- 8 x 8 matrix typical of most ASW updates
  - Some orbit regimes not suited to solution for both drag and SRP; these covariances 7 x 7
- Mix of different units often creates poorly conditioned matrices
  - Condition number of matrix at right is 9.8E+11—terrible!
- Often better numerically (and more intuitive) to separate matrix into sections
- First 3 x 3 portion (amber) is *position* covariance—often considered separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Udot</th>
<th>Vdot</th>
<th>Wdot</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>AGOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>6.84E+01</td>
<td>-2.73E+02</td>
<td>6.38E+00</td>
<td>2.76E-01</td>
<td>-7.14E-02</td>
<td>8.75E-03</td>
<td>-3.83E-02</td>
<td>-3.83E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-2.73E+02</td>
<td>1.10E+05</td>
<td>3.23E+01</td>
<td>-1.17E+02</td>
<td>-8.99E-02</td>
<td>2.51E-02</td>
<td>-1.28E-01</td>
<td>-1.28E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6.38E+00</td>
<td>3.23E+01</td>
<td>4.47E+00</td>
<td>-3.26E-02</td>
<td>-6.83E-03</td>
<td>1.81E-03</td>
<td>-3.73E-03</td>
<td>-3.73E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udot</td>
<td>2.76E-01</td>
<td>-1.17E+02</td>
<td>-3.26E-02</td>
<td>1.24E-01</td>
<td>1.10E-04</td>
<td>-2.47E-05</td>
<td>1.46E-04</td>
<td>1.46E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wdot</td>
<td>8.75E-03</td>
<td>2.51E-02</td>
<td>1.81E-03</td>
<td>-2.47E-05</td>
<td>-9.39E-06</td>
<td>2.06E-05</td>
<td>-4.39E-06</td>
<td>-4.39E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-5.07E-03</td>
<td>1.30E+00</td>
<td>4.34E-05</td>
<td>-1.38E-03</td>
<td>7.97E-07</td>
<td>7.26E-07</td>
<td>1.64E-05</td>
<td>-6.28E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGOM</td>
<td>-3.83E-02</td>
<td>-1.28E-01</td>
<td>-3.73E-03</td>
<td>1.46E-04</td>
<td>4.10E-05</td>
<td>-4.39E-06</td>
<td>-6.28E-07</td>
<td>2.31E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Position Covariance Ellipse

- Position covariance defines an “error ellipsoid”
  - Placed at predicted satellite position
  - Square root of variance in each direction defines each semi-major axis (UVW system used here)
  - Off-diagonal terms rotate the ellipse from the nominal position shown

- Ellipse of a certain “sigma” value contains a given percentage of the expected data points
  - 1-σ: 19.9%
  - 2-σ: 73.9%
  - 3-σ: 97.1%
  - Note how much lower these are than the univariate normal percentage points
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Covariance in Calculation of Probability of Collision (Pc)

- Primary and secondary covariances combined and projected into conjunction plane (plane perpendicular to relative velocity vector at TCA)
- Primary placed on x-axis at (miss distance, 0) and represented by circle of radius equal to sum of both spacecraft circumscribing radii
- Z-axis perpendicular to x-axis in conjunction plane
- Pc is portion of combined error ellipsoid hard-body radius circle

\[
P_C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^2|C^*|}} \int \int_A \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{r}^T C^{-1} \mathbf{r}\right) dXdZ
\]

Covariance essential to Pc calculation, which is the most important factor in collision risk assessment.
Pc vs Miss Distance Calculations

- Pc is the best single-parameter encapsulation of the risk
- Without Pc, have only the miss distance
- Correlation between miss distance and Pc very poor
  - Four Pc bands shown below; correlation with miss distance poor in all cases
- Important to have Pc, and covariance necessary for its calculation
Pc Sensitivity to Scaling of Primary Covariance

• If covariance of primary inadequately sized, Pc affected
• Graph below shows Pc differences between nominal value and recalculation with primary covariance rescaled (SF 0.5 – 2)
• ~2-5% of cases show differences greater than an order of magnitude—can affect operational conclusions
• Important to get primary covariance right
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Batch Epoch Covariance Generation (1 of 2)

• Batch least-squares update (ASW method) uses the following minimization equation
  \[ dx = (A^TWA)^{-1}A^Tb \]
  - \( dx \) is the vector of corrections to the state estimate
  - \( A \) is the time-enabled partial derivative matrix, used to map the residuals into state-space
  - \( W \) is the “weighting” matrix that provides relative weights of observation quality (usually \( 1/\sigma \), where \( \sigma \) is the standard deviation generated by the sensor calibration process)
  - \( b \) is the vector of residuals (observations – predictions from existing state estimate)

• Covariance is the collected term \((A^TWA)^{-1}\)
  - \( A \) the product of two partial derivative matrices:
    \[ A = \frac{\partial (obs)}{\partial x_0} = \frac{\partial (obs)}{\partial X} \frac{\partial X}{\partial x_0} \]
    - First term: partial derivatives of observations with respect to state at obs time
    - Second term: partial derivatives of state at obs time with respect to epoch state
• Formulated this way, this covariance matrix is called an *a priori* covariance
  – A does not contain actual residuals, only transformational partial derivatives
  – So \((ATWA)^{-1}\) is a function only of the amount of tracking, times of tracks, and sensor calibration relative weights among those tracks
    • Not a function of the actual residuals from the correction

• Limitations of *a priori* covariance
  – Does not account well for unmodeled errors, such as transient atmospheric density prediction errors
    • Because not examining actual fit residuals
  – W-matrix only as good as sensor calibration process
    • Principal weakness of present process, but expected to be improved eventually with JSpOC Mission System (JMS) upgrades
Covariance Propagation Methods

• Full Monte Carlo
  – Perturb state at epoch (using covariance), propagate each point forward to $t_n$ with full non-linear dynamics, and summarize distribution at $t_n$

• Sigma point propagation
  – Define small number of states to represent covariance statistically, propagate set forward by time-steps, reformulate sigma point set at each time-step, and use sigma point set at $t_n$ to formulate covariance at $t_n$

• Linear mapping
  – Create a state-transition matrix by linearization of the dynamics and use it to propagate the covariance to $t_n$ by pre- and post-multiplication

• All three of above methods legitimate
  – List moves from highest to lowest fidelity and computational intensity
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Covariance Tuning

• For CA, position covariance needs to be a realistic representation of the state uncertainty volume at the propagation point of interest

• Two aspects to this requirement
  – Does the position error volume conform to a trivariate Gaussian distribution?
  – If so, is it of the proper dimensions and orientation?

• Regarding the first item, extensive study has confirmed that this is not an issue for high-PC events (Pc>1E-04)
  – Ghrist and Plakalovic (2012)
  – 248 cases examined in different orbit regimes, with prop times of 2 to 7 days
  – 2-d Pc calculation compared to Monte Carlo (with 4E+07 trials)
  – Only one case of more than 10% deviation between 2-d and MC calculation
    • And 10% deviation not considered operationally significant
  – Explanation: high Pc requires covariance overlap near the centers of the covariances—a part that is not affected by non-Gaussian alterations

• Second item is area of legitimate concern
Covariance Tuning: Covariance Realism Evaluation Method

- Presume reference orbit (or precision observation) available for a satellite
- Position differences between predicted ephemeris and precision position (from reference orbit or observation) are $dU$, $dV$, and $dW$
  - Can be collected into vector $\varepsilon$
- Mahalanobis distance ($\varepsilon * C^{-1} * \varepsilon^T$) represents the ratio of the difference to the covariance’s prediction
  - For a trivariate distribution, expected value is 3
- A group of such calculations should conform to a chi-squared distribution with three degrees of freedom
- This method (distribution testing of groups of such calculations) used to determine if covariance properly sized
Covariance Tuning: Covariance Irrealism Remediation

• Examine individual component performance of covariance modeling to determine principal sources of the irrealism
  – Deviation probably stems from non-conservative force modeling (drag and/or solar radiation pressure)

• If using process noise, tune/modify process noise matrix to attempt to compensate
  – Originally directed at geopotential mismodeling; but with common use of higher-order theories, no longer the principal source of errors

• If using batch methods, include consider parameters
  – Additive value applied to either the drag or solar radiation pressure variances (or both) in order to make them larger
    • Poor modeling of these phenomena requires larger uncertainty estimate
  – Through cross-correlation terms, these variances will affect the other covariance parameters through the linear state transition

• Continue tuning process until proper distribution of calculated Mahalanobis distances achieved
Agenda

• Covariance basics
• Use of covariance in probability of collision (Pc) calculation
• Covariance generation and propagation methods
• Covariance tuning
• Covariance theory compatibility
• CARA O/O covariance needs
• Conclusions
Covariance Theory Compatibility

• Batch covariance is governed by the amount and quality of tracking data used in the OD
• Propagated covariance is a product of the particular propagation technique used and tuning applied
  – Tuning itself a function of the adequacy of the OD force modeling
• Thus, important that covariance be generated from same OD basis that produced the state estimate
• This is not possible for O/O ephemerides that lack a covariance
  – Forced to use O/O state estimate and ASW covariance (or, worse, a synthesized covariance when no ASW covariance exists)
  – Such a covariance a questionable representation of O/O ephemeris error
    • $\sigma_{\text{O/O}}^2 = \sigma_{\text{ASW}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{Diff}}^2$
    • The difference variance is unknown, so using an ASW covariance with an O/O ephemeris underestimates the uncertainty but by an unknown amount
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CARA O/O Covariance Needs

• O/O ephemerides need to contain accompanying covariances
  – Especially true for ephemerides that contain planned maneuvers
    • No parallel ASW solution from which to “borrow” covariance for primary
  – One covariance entry for each ephemeris point is standard
    • Could possibly accommodate less frequent spacing, but would not conform to CCSDS standard and probably more difficult than the default approach
  – Full covariance (8 x 8) preferred; 3 x 3 (position covariance) usable with certain assumptions

• Delivery of covariance can form basis for including maneuver execution error in maneuver trade-space analyses
  – Open area for collaborative analysis with O/Os

• Daily delivery of ephemerides desirable
  – Propagation error can effect large changes in the Pc
  – This error minimized for both states and covariances through daily updates
    • Propagation time to TCA reduced
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Conclusions

• Properly tuned O/O covariance very important to CA
  – Incorporation into daily deliveries of O/O ephemerides highly desirable

• Covariance theory compatibility very important
  – Applaud recent efforts (e.g., ESMO) to develop covariance generation capabilities

• Variety of methods for covariance production, propagation, and tuning
  – CARA ready to assist with advice for production and tuning implementation

• Can incorporate O/O covariances into CARA operational software and processes as soon as such products are ready
BACK-UP SLIDES
Calculating Probability of Collision (Pc): Situation at Time of Closest Approach (TCA)
Calculating Pc: 2-D Approximation (1 of 3)
Relative Position Covariance

• Assumptions
  – Covariances of primary and secondary objects are uncorrelated

• Result
  – All of the relative position error can be centered at one of the two satellite positions
    • Position of the secondary is typically used
  – Relative position error can be expressed as the additive combination of the two position covariances (proof given in Chan 2008)
    • $C_a + C_b = C_c$
    • Both covariances must be transformed into a common coordinate frame before combination
Calculating Pc: 2-D Approximation (2 of 3) 
Projection to Conjunction Plane

- Combined covariance centered at position of secondary at TCA
- Primary path shown as curved “soda straw”
- If conjunction duration is very short
  - Motion can be considered to be rectilinear—soda straw is straight
  - Conjunction will take place in 2-d plane normal to the relative velocity vector and containing the secondary position
  - Problem can thus be reduced in dimensionality from 3 to 2
- Need to project covariance and primary path into “conjunction plane”
Calculating Pc: 2-D Approximation (3 of 3)
Conjunction Plane Construction

- Combined covariance projected into plane normal to the relative velocity vector and placed at origin
- Primary placed on x-axis at (miss distance, 0) and represented by circle of radius equal to sum of both spacecraft circumscribing radii
- Z-axis perpendicular to x-axis in conjunction plane
Probability of Collision Computation

• \( P_c \) is the portion of the density that falls within the HBR circle (\( r \) is \([x \ z]\) and \( C^* \) is the projected covariance)

\[
P_c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^2|C^*|}} \int \int_A \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \vec{r}^T C^*^{-1} \vec{r}\right) dX dZ
\]

Conclusion: covariance essential to \( P_c \) calculation, which is the most important factor in collision risk assessment
• Creates $n$ state (position and velocity) perturbations at epoch
  – Covariance at epoch describes uncertainty of state at epoch
  – Can use this to create set of $n$ possible realizations of the epoch state,
    conforming to the distribution parameters specified by the covariance

• Propagates each of these forward to the time of interest
  – Use the full non-linear dynamics of the propagator
  – Thus produce $n$ states at TCA (for CA application)

• Summarizes set of $n$ states statistically
  – Usually empirically, through non-parametric techniques (e.g., percentiles,
    empirical distribution functions)
Covariance Propagation
Method 1: Full Monte Carlo (2 of 2)

• Advantages
  – Most accurate method of characterizing uncertainty, as there are no inherent simplifying assumptions or activities (such as linearization)

• Disadvantages
  – Very large number of samples required to characterize tails of distribution
  – Far more computationally intensive than other methods
Covariance Propagation
Method 2: Sigma Point Propagation (1 of 2)

• Usually applied to unscented Kalman filter (UKF) OD processes
• Generates a (relatively small) set of sample states (called \textit{sigma points}) about the nominal state, which represent the uncertainty
  – Sample covariance of sigma points should approximate covariance from state estimate
  – Theory says 2L+1 sigma points needed, where L is state degrees of freedom
    • Can increase this somewhat if prior information available; will improve accuracy of uncertainty volume reconstruction

• Propagates \textit{sigma points} to next time step
• Constructs covariance (and state) at this future state from sigma points
  – Weighting functions often assembled to assist in reconstruction
Covariance Propagation

Method 2: Sigma Point Propagation (2 of 2)

• Advantages
  – Greatly reduces number of non-linear propagations
    • However, has to perform sigma-point construction at each time-step

• Disadvantages
  – Makes (and imposes) *a priori* determination of future uncertainty volume distribution
  – Still requires multiple non-linear propagations
Covariance Propagation
Method 3: Linear Mapping (1 of 2)

• Non-linear dynamics of orbit propagation can be linearized
  – These linear approximations valid for “short” periods about epoch state

• State transition matrix (Φ) the encapsulation of this linearization
  – Can be used for state propagations (but often is not)
  – Can also be used for propagation of covariance $[Φ(t,t_o)∗C(t_o)∗Φ^T(t,t_o)]$

• Covariance propagation can also be augmented via the addition of “process noise”
  – Process noise matrix (Q) formulated, which specifies acceleration uncertainty in each coordinate principal direction
    • Intent is to compensate for unmodeled and inadequately-modeled perturbations
    • Can potentially remediate some of the limitations introduced by the linearization
  – Process noise matrix propagated through use of a process noise transition matrix, in a manner similar to state transition: $[Γ(t,t_o)∗Q(t_o)∗Γ^T(t,t_o)]$
Covariance Propagation
Method 3: Linear Mapping (2 of 2)

• Advantages
  – Much faster and less computationally intensive than other methods
  – Process noise provides mechanism for covariance tuning/realism adjustments

• Disadvantages
  – Least accurate, especially for long propagations
  – Imposes a priori statistical structure upon uncertainty volume
  – Use of process noise requires careful tuning process
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