THE LUNAR ICECUBE MISSION CHALLENGE: ATTEAINING SCIENCE ORBIT PARAMETERS FROM A CONSTRAINED APPROACH TRAJECTORY

David C. Folta*, Natasha Bosanac†, Andrew Cox‡, and Kathleen C. Howell§

The challenges of targeting specific lunar science orbit parameters from a concomitant Sun-Earth/Moon system trajectory are examined. While the concept of ballistic lunar capture is well-studied, achieving and controlling the time evolution of the orbital elements to satisfy mission constraints is especially problematic when the spacecraft is equipped with a low-thrust propulsion system. Satisfying these requirements on the lunar approach and capture segments is critical to the success of the Lunar IceCube mission, a 6U CubeSat that will prospect for water in solid (ice), liquid, and vapor forms and other lunar volatiles from a low-periapsis, highly inclined elliptical lunar orbit.

INTRODUCTION

Injected into a direct lunar transfer as a payload onboard Exploration Mission-1 (EM-1) on the initial flight of NASA’s Space Launch System (SLS), Lunar IceCube will employ a lunar gravity assisted multi-body transfer trajectory with an innovative RF Ion engine to return to the moon and attain a specific lunar science orbit. Constraints on the translunar trajectory limit the types of feasible Sun-Earth/Moon transfers which encounter the Moon with the necessary ballistic capture energy and orbit orientation. For Lunar IceCube, key dynamical parameter values must be attained to enable the ballistically captured trajectory to evolve into the desired science orbit. If these parameter values are not achieved during this lunar approach phase, gravitational perturbations may result either in lunar impact or in a captured orbit that does not meet mission requirements and cannot be amended given the limitations of the propulsion system. However, dynamical systems analysis demonstrates that capture dynamics can lead to stable trajectories that remain bounded about the Moon. This paper addresses the subsequent challenge of achieving a desired set of orbital elements prior to the science phase of the mission.

In this investigation, trajectory design strategies are offered for achieving and maintaining a lunar orbit that satisfies the mission requirements, subject to significant propulsive limitations. Development of these procedures leverages analyses of the Earth-Moon dynamics via mapping techniques, orbital evolution predictions, and numerical simulations. The resulting strategies reveal that the geometry and availability of feasible lunar approach and capture arcs is impacted by: 1) the
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evolution of low lunar orbits subject to gravitational and other perturbations, as well as 2) constraints on the EM-1 deployment conditions and, therefore, the lunar arrival trajectory. To perform this analysis, Purdue University’s Adaptive Trajectory Design (ATD) dynamical systems software, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center’s General Mission Analysis Tool (GMAT) and AGI’s STK Astrogator tool are employed. While the proposed strategy for designing a capture and approach trajectory is demonstrated for the Lunar IceCube mission, the general procedure is also applicable to other lunar missions that possess similar limitations on the maneuver control authority

**CubeSats and Constrained Transfer Trajectories**

The miniaturization of spacecraft technologies and launch availability as secondary payloads offer a significantly reduced cost and development time over conventional, larger spacecraft. These small spacecraft, such as CubeSats, benefit public and private entities as well as educational institutions. Currently, thirteen CubeSats are intended to launch onboard the second stage of the Exploration Mission-1 vehicle (EM-1). Following injection into a translunar trajectory, each secondary payload is deployed and then must navigate to various destinations by leveraging natural dynamics along with the use of onboard propulsion. These missions will achieve various scientific and technology demonstration objectives, such as testing solar sail technology, investigating near-Earth asteroids, surveying the Moon for water ice, and measuring the effects of deep-space radiation on living organisms.

Missions involving spacecraft that are contingent upon an independent launch opportunity to attain a desired transfer trajectory or science orbit face numerous trajectory design challenges, particularly in attaining a desired final orbit. For these spacecraft, a fixed departure asymptote and translunar energy value limit the design space for transfer trajectories and achievable science orbits. Furthermore, CubeSats typically incorporate small propulsion systems that possess limited thrusting capabilities. The inherent uncertainty associated with both the launch date and the deployment state for secondary payloads, as well as low thrust levels, can affect both the scope and capability of a CubeSat mission, and pose significant challenges for trajectory design.

Trajectory design challenges are not unique to CubeSats; many other spacecraft face similar constraints during extended mission phases when propellant reserves are low or following subsystem failures that affect a vehicle’s ability to maneuver. Consider, for example, the Acceleration, Reconnection, Turbulence and Electrodynamics of the Moon's Interaction with the Sun (ARTEMIS) mission, which repurposed two Time History of Events and Macroscale Interactions during Substorms (THEMIS) vehicles for an extended mission to the Earth-Moon L₁ and L₂ regions. Since neither spacecraft possessed sufficient propellant to implement a direct injection, a series of gravity assists were leveraged to reach transfer paths identified via dynamical systems theory. In addition to identifying low-cost transfer options, dynamical systems analysis affords insight into the flow near a particular solution, which provides alternative options and facilitates design flexibility to deal with uncertainties and operational errors.

Designing attainable trajectories that can achieve complex scientific goals for CubeSats with limited propulsive capability is challenging and requires an understanding of the dynamical structure to determine the overall bounding conditions and the natural (predictable) motion. In this investigation, dynamical models of varying levels of fidelity are leveraged to construct a preliminary trajectory design framework for the attainment of specific lunar orbit parameter values. These parameter values are then employed in higher fidelity operational tools to complete the design process and are applied to the upcoming Lunar IceCube mission, which must reach a lunar orbit for scientific observation of the Moon’s equatorial regions. Despite an energetic initial deployment state as a secondary payload, Lunar IceCube can achieve the desired final science orbit by exploiting the dynamics of the Sun–Earth and Earth-Moon system. The Circular Restricted Three-Body Problem (CR3BP) is employed to quickly assess the process. In this autonomous
dynamical model, approximate bounds on the motion are established and capture geometries can be understood via manifolds associated with libration point orbits, gateway dynamics and the Jacobi constant. This analysis is then transitioned to a higher fidelity of an ephemeris model that also includes the additional contribution of a low-thrust engine. Boundary conditions such as the initial deployment state and the final science orbit parameters are incorporated into this trajectory design framework to identify lunar arrival regions and geometries that correspond to feasible transfer trajectories for the Lunar IceCube mission.

THE LUNAR ICECUBE MISSION

Lunar IceCube, a 6U CubeSat, has been selected for participation in the Next Space Technologies for Exploration Partnerships, which leverages partnerships between public and private entities to develop the deep space exploration capabilities necessary for the next steps in human spaceflight. The Lunar IceCube mission is led by the Space Science Center at Morehead State University (MSU) and is supported by scientists and engineers from NASA Goddard Spaceflight Center (GSFC), Busek Co., JPL, and Catholic University of America (CUA). Specifically, GSFC is providing the trajectory design, maneuver planning, navigation and tracking support, and attitude support.

The primary objective for the Lunar IceCube mission is to prospect for water in solid, liquid and vapor forms, while also detecting other lunar volatiles. Accordingly, this mission is designed to address existing strategic knowledge gaps related to lunar volatile distribution, focusing on the abundance, location and transportation physics of water ice on the lunar surface at a variety of latitudes. The required scientific observations will be performed from a highly-inclined, low-periapsis, elliptical lunar orbit using the Broadband InfraRed Compact High Resolution Exploration Spectrometer (BIRCHES). The BIRCHES instrument is designed specifically for CubeSats by GSFC as a compact version of the Origins, Spectral Interpretation, Resource Identification, Security - Regolith Explorer (OSIRIS-REx) Visible and Infrared Spectrometer as well as the Ralph spectrometer that was successfully used onboard the New Horizons mission. The design of the Lunar IceCube spacecraft, illustrated in Figure 1, also includes radiation-hardened subsystems, a JPL Iris transceiver, a high power solar panel/actuator system and a robust multiple-processor based payload processor. These systems will enable the spacecraft to perform scientific observations for approximately six months, enabling sufficient collection of systematic volatile measurements to derive volatile cycle models. Science data and telemetry will be transmitted from the lunar vicinity at a rate of 14 kps (tbd) to the controlling 21-meter ground station at MSU. The MSU antenna will also be used as the primary command and tracking station during the propulsion phase of the mission and will be used for ranging and tracking.

Figure 1. Lunar IceCube spacecraft design.

Lunar IceCube will ride onboard the EM-1 vehicle, currently scheduled for launch in late 2018. Each of the secondary payloads are deployed after Orion is injected and the Interim Cryogenic Propulsion Stage (ICPS) disposal maneuver is completed. Due to uncertainties in the ejection mechanism, Lunar IceCube’s exact deployment state is not known in advance. However, with no additional maneuvers, the highly energetic nominal deployment state would result in the spacecraft
quickly departing the Earth-Moon system. To decrease the spacecraft energy and achieve a transfer that approaches a low-periapsis lunar orbit, the Lunar IceCube spacecraft is equipped with a low-thrust propulsion system. This iodine-fueled engine is a Busek Ion Thruster 3-cm (BIT-3) system, which is currently designed to deliver a maximum 1.2mN of thrust with an Isp of 2500s and a fuel mass of approximately 1.5 kg. For the Lunar IceCube mission, the BIT-3 system enables finite duration low-thrust arcs to be introduced along the transfer trajectory.

The final lunar science orbit is constrained to meet requirements imposed by the science instruments. The BIRCHES instrument requires that observations be performed from an elliptical orbit to minimize thermal exposure, with an equatorial perilune altitude of 100 to 105 km. This science orbit is designed to be inertially-locked to allow measurement of lunar volatiles for the same set of representative features (by latitude, composition and age of regolith) at various times during the day. In this science orbit, the BIRCHES adjustable iris allows the instrument to act as a point spectrometer with constant footprint dimensions that are independent of the distance from the lunar surface, as the spacecraft altitude varies in orbit from 100 to 250 km, i.e., from periapsis to the terminator. The spacecraft ACS system will allow the BIRCHES instrument to maintain lunar nadir-pointing during science passes.

DYNAMICAL MODELS AND TECHNIQUES

To explore the design space for low-thrust enabled transfers that link an arrival trajectory with the lunar science orbit, dynamical models of varying levels of fidelity are employed: from the CR3BP to an operational modeling environment. The CR3BP offers an autonomous model of the Earth-Moon system, while also enabling the development of a general itinerary for the Lunar IceCube spacecraft, the visualization of solutions of interest, and guidance of the process to locate science orbit approach paths. This insight, in combination with techniques from dynamical systems theory, is incorporated into a general procedure for generating feasible trajectories that reach the desired science orbit in a low-thrust-enabled point mass ephemeris model. This analysis is performed using ATD, GMAT, and STK. Circular Restricted Three-Body Problem

Motion within the Earth-Moon system can be approximated via the autonomous dynamics of the CR3BP. In this dynamical environment, the motion of a massless spacecraft is modeled under the influence of the point-mass gravitational attractions of two primaries: the Earth and the Moon. To enable clear visualization and identification of particular solutions, the motion of the spacecraft is represented in a rotating coordinate system as depicted in Figure 2. This frame, ($\hat{x}\hat{y}\hat{z}$), rotates with the primaries as they encircle their mutual barycenter. In addition, position and velocity states locating the spacecraft are nondimensionalized. By convention, both the normalized distance between the Earth and the Moon and the mean motion of the primaries are unity. Mass quantities are nondimensionalized such that the masses of the Earth and Moon are equal to 1-$\mu$ and $\mu$, respectively. Using these nondimensionalized quantities, the equations of motion of the spacecraft, located at $(x, y, z)$ in the rotating frame, are compactly written as

$$
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} - 2\dot{y} &= \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} \\
\dot{y} + 2\dot{x} &= \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} \\
\dot{z} &= \frac{\partial U}{\partial z}
\end{align*}
$$

where $U$ is the pseudo-potential function, $U = \frac{1}{2} (x^2 + y^2) + \frac{1-\mu}{r} + \frac{\mu}{d}$ and the distances between the primaries and the spacecraft are $d = \sqrt{(x + \mu)^2 + y^2 + z^2}$, and $r = \sqrt{(x - 1 + \mu)^2 + y^2 + z^2}$. When formulated in the rotating frame, this autonomous dynamical environment admits a constant, energy-like integral labeled the Jacobi constant, $C = 2U - \dot{x}^2 - \dot{y}^2 - \dot{z}^2$. At a fixed value of this integral, an infinite number of trajectories are possible within the Earth-Moon system. Any state along a time-varying solution is defined as prograde if the
corresponding angular momentum vector at that instant possesses a +z component, i.e., the spacecraft is traveling in a counterclockwise direction as viewed in the rotating frame of the CR3BP. Correspondingly, a state along a path that possesses a -z component of the angular momentum vector is labeled retrograde. Regardless of the direction of motion, these particular solutions exhibit one of four types of behavior: equilibrium points, periodic orbits, quasi-periodic orbits, and chaotic motion.

![Figure 2. System configuration for a spacecraft within the Earth-Moon CR3BP.](image)

**Ephemeris Model**

To incorporate the true, noncircular motion of the Sun, Earth and Moon, as well as the additional acceleration of the thruster, a low-thrust-enabled point mass ephemeris model is employed to generate accurate end-to-end trajectories. In this model, the low-thrust engine is parameterized using a constant thrust magnitude, equal to 0.9 mN and a specific impulse of 2500 s. When the low-thrust engine is activated, the spacecraft mass decrements and an additional acceleration is added to a point mass ephemeris model of the Earth, Moon and Sun. This additional acceleration is constrained by the thrust vector as well as the thrust magnitude, engine power and instantaneous spacecraft mass. In this investigation, the resulting equations of motion are formulated relative to the Moon, with the position coordinates of the Moon, Earth and Sun retrieved from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory DE421 ephemerides. Relative nondimensional coordinates are then used to integrate the motion of a spacecraft relative to the Moon in the low-thrust-enabled four-body point mass ephemeris model.

**TRAJECTORY DESIGN CHALLENGES**

Additional analysis by the authors has demonstrated a process that permits an analyst to design a transfer trajectory from a constrained outbound asymptote to return to the lunar vicinity months later and capture into a lunar orbit. This trajectory design framework leverages information from the EM-1 mission that will test the SLS performance and the Orion trajectory. The post deployment EM-1 trajectory, augmented by the low-thrust engine of the Lunar IceCube spacecraft, results in a trailing edge lunar gravity assist. By leveraging knowledge of the dynamical systems properties of both Sun-Earth and Earth-Moon systems, the post-deployment conditions are targeted to ensure that the spacecraft returns to the lunar vicinity. In this investigation, this previously-developed transfer design process is implemented into a high fidelity model to produce an operationally feasible trajectory.

Given a trajectory that returns to the lunar vicinity, a significant challenge in the design process is obtaining a specific, increasingly stable polar lunar orbit via a low-thrust-enabled path that evolves under the gravitational acceleration of the Earth, Moon, and Sun. The available thrust magnitude is approximately 0.9 mN with a spacecraft mass at lunar arrival between 13 kg and 14 kg, depending on the total thrust time along the reference path as well as the impact of launch error corrections on propellant usage. Upon arriving into the lunar vicinity, a feasible trajectory should deliver the Lunar IceCube spacecraft into a stable elliptical orbit ($a = 4287$ km, $e = 0.5714$) with a near polar inclination and periapsis located over the equator. In the chaotic and nonlinear dynamical
environment of the Earth, Moon and Sun, there may be infinite possibilities for achieving the desired science orbit upon arriving into the lunar vicinity. However, the goal of this investigation is to provide guidelines for one possible trajectory design strategy that delivers the spacecraft to the desired orbit subject to the associated operational constraints.

**Sample Lunar IceCube Transfer**

One of the primary Lunar IceCube design challenges is demonstrated in this section using a point solution, as depicted in Figures 3-6. Figure 3 depicts the design of a trajectory transfer from the EM-1 upper stage deployment to lunar capture in a Sun-Earth rotating frame, while Figure 4 portrays a zoomed-in view of the capture phase of the trajectory in an Earth-Moon rotating frame. Figures 5 and 6 display three-dimensional views of the achieved lunar orbit in an inertial moon centered frame from two different perspectives. This transfer leverages a combination of natural (blue) and low-thrust-enabled (red) arcs to produce motion that is captured around the Moon. For the Lunar IceCube mission, no maneuver can occur during the first lunar periapsis to allow tracking for a navigation solution during that event since the spacecraft does not have the power capability to both maneuver and use the IRIS-V2 transponder simultaneously. Accordingly, the low-thrust engine is activated after the first lunar flyby. The capture phase of this transfer results in a moderately inclined orbit of approximately 45 deg. Given the limit on the thrust magnitude and, therefore, the capability to adjust the inclination and argument of periapsis, this design does not meet the mission requirements and requires months of maneuvering, potentially exceeding the available propellant mass.

In addition to the offset inclination, this sample transfer is particularly sensitive to uncertainty in the incoming lunar arrival conditions and the time at which the low-thrust engine is activated.
The sensitivity of this sample path is explored using a measure of the energy: the lunar C3. Consider Figure 7, which displays the lunar C3 as a function of the epoch along the reference path in black, and a perturbed solution in green. This perturbed solution resembles the reference path during the incoming lunar flyby. However, the first thrusting arc is delayed by 2 days. Following this perturbation, subsequent lunar flybys are impacted. Due to the chaotic nature of the multi-body cis-lunar gravitational environment, this small error results in two distinctly different paths for the remainder of the reference trajectory (red) and perturbed trajectory (blue), as displayed in an Earth-Moon rotating frame in Figure 8. This difference is straightforwardly represented using the lunar C3. In fact, this figure reveals that the sample point solution is contingent on the use of a short duration low-thrust maneuver after entering the Earth-moon dynamical region to reduce the arrival C3 energy with respect to the Moon. Simultaneously, the Jacobi constant, as computed in the Earth-Moon CR3BP, is also increased. Following a small deviation in the time at which the low-thrust engine is activated, the green curve in figure 7 demonstrates that such uncertainty can result in the C3 increasing over time to a positive value, indicating that the spacecraft is not captured to the lunar vicinity along the perturbed solution. Such sensitivity in the trajectory following lunar arrival creates significant challenges throughout the trajectory design process. These challenges include obtaining motion that is quickly captured to the lunar vicinity and eventually evolves to an elliptical orbit with the desired orbital elements.

Figure 7. Comparison of the lunar C3 for two trajectories, a reference path (black) and perturbed solution (green), that differ in the start of the low-thrust maneuver by two days.

Figure 8. Sensitivity of arrival energy on a capture trajectory
DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS OF SCIENCE ORBIT APPROACH PATHS

To explore the existence and characteristics of paths that approach the desired lunar science orbit subject to mission constraints on the Keplerian elements, dynamical systems techniques are employed. Given the chaotic nature of the multi-body gravitational environment in cislunar space, such techniques facilitate visualization and identification of candidate motions. In particular, this analysis leverages concepts typically employed in the CR3BP, including the Jacobi constant, libration point gateway analysis, and manifold computation. The resulting insight enables the design of trajectories that reach the desired lunar science orbit given the significant limitations on the propulsive capability of the spacecraft and the incoming path. This analysis is verified using existing point solutions constructed in a high fidelity ephemeris models.

The general behavior of trajectories that approach the desired science orbit with a combination of low-thrust-enabled and natural motion can be split into two phases: a short segment where the multi-body gravitational environment of the Earth-Moon system influences the path; and a longer segment where the lunar gravity serves as the dominant acceleration contribution. In the first segment, concepts from the CR3BP are valuable in exploring the behavior of motion that reaches the lunar vicinity prior to activating the low-thrust engine. This engine is activated throughout the entirety of the second lunar approach segment to provide additional deceleration for the spacecraft to capture into a stable trajectory around the Moon. Throughout both phases of the mission, analysis of feasible capture trajectories is achieved by leveraging a concept similar to manifold computation. In particular, feasible science orbits are discretized and integrated backwards in time using a combination of low-thrust and natural arcs. In a chaotic system, limiting the trajectories of interest to those that are known to capture directly into the desired lunar science orbit in forward time or, equivalently, depart the science orbit in backwards time, reduces the search space. Then, to capture these trajectories, mapping strategies supply a straightforward visualization of a large set of data while also enabling the detection of general trends in the flow. Characterization of the paths that enter the lunar vicinity and evolve into the desired lunar orbit support the development of trajectory design guidelines. To achieve this goal, several aspects of the trajectory design process must be addressed, including: the evolution of the science orbit backwards in time with the low-thrust engine activated close the Moon; determination of the conditions under which the low-thrust engine should be turned off to ensure natural departure through the Earth-Moon L2 gateway in backwards time; and the formulation of guidelines to translate insight from a backwards time analysis to a set of parameters that can be targeted in forward in time from a constrained lunar approach path.

Generation of Science Orbit Approach Paths

Paths that approach the science orbit in forward time with the low-thrust engine activated or, equivalently, depart the science orbit in backwards time are computed. Predictions of a lunar orbit have been investigated previously and may be visualized by the rates of Kelperian elements such as the argument of periapsis and eccentricity for initial inclinations. To approximate the Lunar IceCube mission science orbit, the orbital elements are set to \( a = 4287 \text{ km}, e = 0.5714, i = 89 \text{ deg}, \omega = 0 \text{ deg} \) (i.e. periapsis located over the equator), each fixed by the mission constraints. Feasible science orbits are then generated by varying the right ascension of the ascending node (RAAN) within the range \( \Omega = [0, 360] \) deg, thereby rotating the orbital plane in inertial space. Next, feasible science orbits are discretized by sampling values of the true anomaly, \( \theta^* \), within the range \( [0, 360] \) degrees. Finally, each state along the orbit supplies an initial condition that can be integrated backwards in time with the low-thrust engine activated.

Although the low-thrust engine could follow an infinite number of possible thrust profiles, some straightforward constraints can reduce the dimensionality of the problem and, thus, the complexity of the design space. In addition to the low-thrust engine possessing a limited thrust magnitude and propellant mass, the total time required to reach the desired science orbit impacts the ability to begin performing scientific observations. Accordingly, possible thrust profiles for arcs that capture
into the desired science orbit in forward time or, equivalently, depart the science orbit in backward time, can be limited heuristically by the total required thrust time. To define this approximate constraint on the thrust profiles modeled in this investigation, consider a Moon-centered Velocity, Normal, Co-Normal (VNC) frame\textsuperscript{11}. In this frame, the velocity direction, denoted by the $\hat{V}$ unit vector is parallel to the inertial velocity vector of the spacecraft relative to the Moon. The co-normal direction, $\hat{C}$, is defined normal to the path of the spacecraft, while lying within the orbital plane. Finally, the normal unit vector, $\hat{N}$, is perpendicular to the orbital plane and completes the righthanded coordinate system. The engine thrust direction, $\hat{u}$, is projected into the VNC coordinates to enable a right-handed physical interpretation. For a thrust vector aligned with the $\hat{N}$ direction, the primary effect of the additional acceleration is to alter the orientation of the orbital plane. However, the semi-major axis and eccentricity of the orbit are not significantly impacted. Accordingly, it may take an excessively long time for the spacecraft motion to evolve to a low lunar science orbit under the perturbations of the Earth, Moon and Sun gravity as well as the low-thrust engine. Alternatively, orienting the thrust vector solely in the anti-velocity direction, i.e. $-\hat{V}$, reduces the velocity magnitude without impacting the direction relative to the Moon. This direct reduction in the velocity magnitude enables the orbit size to be reduced as quickly as possible, essentially reducing the total thrust time. Thus, the reference thrust direction considered within this investigation is aligned with the anti-velocity direction. This constraint on the thrust direction limits the set of feasible capture paths, while also simplifying the trajectory generation and visualization process.

To produce trajectories that capture into the science orbit in forwards time, feasible states that lie along several values of the true anomaly for orbits with several values of the RAAN are leveraged as initial conditions in a backwards time integration process. In particular, each state that lies along a feasible science orbit is integrated backwards in time with the low-thrust engine activated in the anti-velocity direction relative the Moon. This long duration maneuver increases the semi-major axis while also impacting the inclination and eccentricity. Such behavior is demonstrated using Figure 9(a), which portrays the natural evolution of an initial condition located at periapsis along a science orbit with a RAAN of 0 degrees at a Modified Julian date (MJD) epoch of 28610 for a spacecraft mass of 13.5 kg. This path, colored blue, closely resembles the original science orbit in size, with the periapsis direction rotating over time. Eventually, after 88 days, the spacecraft impacts the surface of the Moon. However, when the low-thrust engine is activated, as depicted by the red path in Figure 9(b), with the thrust aligned with the anti-velocity direction for 90 days, the orbit grows in size. In addition, the orbital plane slowly shifts with the inclination oscillation about 89 degrees over time. As the trajectory slowly spirals away from the Moon in backward time, the influence of the Earth’s gravity increases. Once the spacecraft is sufficiently far from the Moon, the multi-body dynamical environment of the Earth-Moon system dominates the motion of the spacecraft and can supply significant insight into the existence of transfers that depart the lunar vicinity in backwards time, as well as a guideline for when to turn off the low-thrust engine.

Due to the chaotic nature of the Earth-Moon system, two slightly perturbed solutions can evolve distinctly differently in backwards time. To demonstrate this concept, consider Figure 10(a) and (b) which depict the path a spacecraft integrated backward in time with the low-thrust vector aligned with the anti-velocity direction from an initial condition along a science orbit at a true anomaly of 40 degrees at an epoch of 28610 MJD. Figure 10(a) begins with a science orbit with RAAN=160 degrees, while Figure 10(b) begins with an orbit at RAAN=180 deg. The chaotic nature of the Earth-Moon system is evident via a comparison between these two figures. Close to the Moon, both trajectories evolve similarly. The semi-major increases over time with oscillations with a 13-14 day period, while the eccentricity increases to above 0.5. With the thrust oriented in the anti-velocity direction, the RAAN does not change by more than 10 deg over the span of six months. Between these two cases, there is only a small deviation in these results over the course of
a month, but the results are generally epoch independent due to several reasons including: 1) the orientation of the orbit plane, 2) the instantaneous direction of the angular momentum vector, and 3) the Moon to Earth vector in inertial space. In addition, the Earth acceleration on the spacecraft interacts with the orbital velocity like a maneuver increasing or decreasing the velocity when the orbital plane is parallel to the Moon-Earth direction. These effects impact the eccentricity, thereby altering the rates of the other orbital elements. Once the gravity of the Earth contributes significantly to the motion of the spacecraft, a distinct difference between the two trajectories is apparent: while the trajectory in Figure 10(a) impacts the Moon, the orbit in Figure 10(b) continues to grow in size for 180 days when integrated backward in time.

Figure 9 (a) The natural motion of a spacecraft backwards in time for 88 days from an initial condition located at periapsis along a feasible science orbit with a RAAN equal to 0 degrees at an epoch of 28610 MJD, and (b) low-thrust-enabled motion for 90 days backwards in time from the same initial condition.

Figure 10 (a) Low-thrust-enabled trajectory of a spacecraft integrated backwards in time for nearly six months from an initial condition located at TA=40 degrees along a feasible science orbit with a RAAN equal to 160 degrees at an epoch of 28610 MJD, and (b) similar trajectory for a RAAN equal to 180 degrees.

Lunar Capture Dynamics

Following deployment and an outbound lunar flyby, feasible transfers for the Lunar IceCube spacecraft typically leverage the gravity of the Sun for phasing and energy adjustment to approach a feasible science orbit. Analysis of these trajectories, which connect a state that lies far beyond the lunar radius to a low lunar science orbit, is supported by concepts from multi-body dynamics. In particular, a CR3BP approximation of the Earth-Moon system is valuable. In the CR3BP, the Jacobi constant offers a measure of the energy of the spacecraft, while also placing bounds on the motion.\textsuperscript{14}
To demonstrate such insight, consider Figure 11, which depicts a zoomed-in view of the Moon in a dimensional Earth-Moon rotating frame. The Moon is located by a cyan-filled circle, while the L\textsubscript{1} and L\textsubscript{2} libration points are depicted as red diamonds. At a value of the Jacobi constant just below that of the L\textsubscript{1} and L\textsubscript{2} libration points, the gray areas depict forbidden regions bound by the zero velocity curves. The white regions then portray regions in the lunar vicinity where a spacecraft can feasibly travel. For motion that begins outside of the zero velocity curves, a spacecraft can enter the lunar vicinity through the L\textsubscript{2} gateway. Furthermore, for a spacecraft to remain within the lunar vicinity, it must avoid departing through either the L\textsubscript{1} or L\textsubscript{2} gateways. In designing a path for the Lunar IceCube spacecraft, the value of the Jacobi constant for a trajectory entering through the L\textsubscript{2} gateway is constrained by the deployment and post-deployment lunar flyby conditions.

![Figure 11. Earth-Moon gateways and zero velocity curves separating forbidden and allowable regions of motion for a given Jacobi constant.](image)

A gateway analysis in the Earth-Moon CR3BP enables an exploration of the behavior of the Lunar IceCube spacecraft as it approaches the desired lunar science orbit from beyond the lunar radius. As an example, consider the process described earlier for generating a science orbit approach path: an initial condition along a feasible science orbit is integrated backwards in time with the low-thrust engine activated and thrust direction aligned with the anti-velocity direction. In a CR3BP analysis of this scenario, the value of the Jacobi constant along the science orbit is approximately 4.1. At this Jacobi constant, the L\textsubscript{1} and L\textsubscript{2} gateways are closed and motion cannot escape from the lunar vicinity. When the initial condition is integrated backward in time and the low-thrust engine is activated in the anti-velocity direction, the velocity of the spacecraft increases over time. Simultaneously, the Jacobi constant decreases. In order for the spacecraft to depart through the L\textsubscript{2} gateway and connect to the post-deployment trajectory, the Jacobi constant must be decreased to below that of L\textsubscript{2}, i.e. C(L\textsubscript{2}) = 3.172. This scenario is depicted in Figure 12 (a)-(c) with the Jacobi constant decreasing from left to right. In Figure 12(a), the spacecraft cannot depart from the lunar vicinity in backward time. In Figure 12(c), however, the spacecraft trajectory is energetic enough to connect the lunar science orbit to the post-deployment state. In forward time, the situation can be reversed. To enter the lunar vicinity, the Jacobi constant of the spacecraft in an Earth-Moon system, when located outside the L\textsubscript{1} gateway, must be below C(L\textsubscript{2}) such that the Zero Velocity Curves (ZVCs) resemble Figure 12(c). The spacecraft can naturally pass through the L\textsubscript{2} gateway to perform at least one lunar flyby while orbit determination is performed. Once an accurate navigation solution is obtained, the low-thrust engine may be activated in the anti-velocity direction to decrease spacecraft velocity and increase the Jacobi constant, thereby closing the L\textsubscript{2} gateway. This scenario is depicted in Figure 12(b). As the low-thrust engine remains activate and the Jacobi constant increases even further, the L\textsubscript{1} gateway closes, effectively rendering the spacecraft captured in the lunar vicinity. With the Jacobi constant continuing to increase to a value of 4.1, the allowable region in the vicinity of the Moon reduces in size and the spacecraft orbit shrinks. Such insight into
the desired energy profile, based on a multi-body dynamical analysis, provides a general itinerary for the science orbit approach path.

![Figure 12](image.png)

Figure 12: Evolution of the zero velocity curves and opening of the L2 gateway as the Jacobi constant is decreased.

To search the design space for operationally feasible science orbit approach paths via backwards time integration, the Earth-Moon CR3BP gateway analysis is leveraged to guide the construction of the trajectory generation process. Specifically, each initial condition located at a given true anomaly along a feasible science orbit is integrated backwards in time in a point mass ephemeris model with the thruster activated in the anti-velocity direction until a Jacobi constant equivalent to that of L1 is achieved. With the thruster still active, the trajectory is integrated further until the subsequent apse (periapsis or apoapsis). From this state, the spacecraft is propagated backwards in time naturally (inactive thruster) until it reaches the L1 or L2 gateways, impacts the Earth or until a maximum integration time. The parameters describing this trajectory are stored and considered operationally feasible if they pass through the L2 gateway and encounter an apogee beyond the lunar radius within 50 days. This process is then repeated by integrating backwards in time with the low-thrust engine activated to the next apse until the trajectory impacts or departs the Earth vicinity. A sample trajectory sequence is displayed in Figure 13 for the prescribed values of $a$, $e$, and $i$, a final epoch of 28601 MJD, a final mass of 13.5 kg, a RAAN of 150 degrees and a true anomaly of 135 degrees. This sample trajectory is visualized in (a) a Moon-centered inertial J2000 equatorial frame and (b) a Moon-centered Earth-Moon rotating frame. In both plots, green indicates thrusting segments while blue curves identify natural coasting arcs. In this example, the low-thrust engine causes the orbit to increase in size until the gravity of the Earth contributes significantly to the total acceleration acting on the spacecraft. Then, the trajectory follows a path predicted by the Earth-Moon CR3BP to depart through the L2 gateway in backward time. In forward time, this path presents a feasible trajectory for the spacecraft from a post-deployment state to the lunar science orbit.
For feasible science approach paths, each of the apses at which the low-thrust engine is activated must lie close to the unstable manifold of an L₂ libration point orbit as predicted by the CR3BP. States that lie within these manifolds pass through the L₂ gateway prior to evolving towards the lunar vicinity. Since a wide variety of periodic and quasi-periodic orbits exist within the L₂ vicinity, computing the set of all unstable manifolds corresponding to L₂ libration point orbits may be cumbersome and computationally expensive. Alternatively, a surface of section may be defined just beyond the x-coordinate of L₂. Then, position coordinates in the y- and z-directions are seeded on this hyperplane. To complete the definition of states that produce trajectories passing through the L₂ gateway, a velocity vector is defined. For each combination of position variables, (x,y,z), several velocities are defined to possess a negative x-component, with the relative values of the y- and z-components then varied. Only the magnitude of the velocity vector is constrained to ensure a fixed value of the Jacobi constant across the set of initial conditions. Then, these states are integrated forward to their first periapsis; any trajectories that impact the Moon are discarded. Figure 14(a) depicts a sample set of periapses, in purple, corresponding to trajectories that pass through the L₂ gateway, i.e., the unstable manifolds of L₂ periodic and quasi-periodic orbits at a Jacobi constant of C = 3.138. The Moon is located by a cyan circle. In backward time, any trajectory with a periapsis that falls within the unstable manifold immediately departs through the L₂ gateway. For values of the Jacobi constant below that of L₂, these periapses tend to lie in the top left quadrant of the Earth-Moon rotating frame. Accordingly, trajectories that do not possess a periapsis within the top left quadrant of the Moon-centered Earth-Moon rotating frame do not naturally depart through the L₂ gateway in backward time. Of course, the location of periapses or apoapses for subsequent crossings of the L₂ periodic and quasi-periodic orbit unstable manifolds tend to stretch in the phase space, complicating visualization and the development of any heuristic guidelines for shutting off the thruster in backward time. Nevertheless, such insight from the CR3BP is valuable in exploring the existence of trajectories that enter naturally through the L₂ gateway prior to evolving towards the desired lunar science orbit under the influence of the low-thrust engine. In fact, in backward time, the low-thrust engine is shut off at a periapsis or apoapsis that lies within the unstable manifold of an L₂ periodic or quasi-periodic orbit and, therefore, the subsequent motion naturally passes through the L₂ gateway. An example of a science orbit approach trajectory, generated in a point mass ephemeris model, which follows this itinerary within the lunar vicinity, appears in Figure 14(b). The red arcs along this transfer indicate low-thrust-enabled motion while the blue arcs correspond to natural motion. A red diamond locates L₂ while a cyan circle indicates the location of the Moon. The low-thrust engine is activated, in forward time, at the first periapse following entrance to the lunar vicinity from the L₂ gateway. This natural leg over the science approach trajectory is overlaid on the first periapses of the unstable manifolds of the L₂ periodic
and quasi-periodic orbits in Figure 14(c). The first perilune is depicted as a blue-filled circle, and lies within the unstable manifold region in the top left quadrant of the Earth-Moon rotating frame.

Figure 14: Demonstration of natural manifold structures enabling flow towards the lunar vicinity through (a) the first periapses of the unstable manifolds of the L$_2$ periodic and quasi-periodic orbits, (b) a sample science orbit approach trajectory where the low-thrust engine is activated at the first perilune, and (c) the location of this perilune overlaid on the unstable manifold periapses.

Visualization of Science Orbit Approach Paths

To visualize the set of trajectories which approach the desired science orbit in forward time or, equivalently, depart the orbit in backward time with the low-thrust engine activated prior to passing through the L$_2$ gateway naturally, mapping strategies are employed. In particular, a surface of section is defined using an $x$-coordinate that lies just beyond the L$_2$ libration point. This surface of section is depicted in the planar projection in Figure 15, with the Moon indicated by a cyan circle and the libration points located via red diamonds. The surface of section is displayed with a blue dashed line. Given this surface of section definition, each of the science orbit approach paths are integrated backward in time from the initial condition along the low lunar orbit with the low-thrust engine activated. At each periapsis or apoapsis with a Jacobi constant below that of L$_2$, the spacecraft is naturally propagated until it reaches the defined surface of section. The crossing of each trajectory with this surface of section is recorded and plotted on a map. Additional information such as the spacecraft mass, epoch and Jacobi constant at the crossing of the hyperplane are also useful. The Jacobi constant is employed as the energy measurement of the Earth-Moon three body system (or in some cases the lunar centered C3 orbital energy) and the velocity magnitude and direction help define target regions of interest that may achieve a polar orbit.
Figure 15: Definition of the surface of section used to construct an L₂ gateway map

As an example of an L₂ gateway map that captures motion that evolves towards the desired lunar orbit, consider the developed procedure for generating science orbit approach paths. This procedure is implemented for orbits with a RAAN in the range [0, 360] in increments of 20 degrees, and initial conditions seeded along each orbit in increments of 20 degrees. The final spacecraft mass along the science orbit is set equal to 13.5 kg, while the final epoch is varied between 28610 MJD and 28630 MJD in increments of a day. Science orbit approach arcs are generated using a combination of low-thrust-enabled and natural motion, with each crossing of the surface of section recorded and plotted on the L₂ gateway map. Of course, the information describing each state is multi-dimensional. However, to simplify visualization, only a subset of the state information is represented on a planar map. Sample maps appear in Figure 16(a) and (b). In each figure, the crossing of each feasible science orbit approach arc with the surface of section is represented by its y- and z-coordinates in an Earth-Moon rotating frame. Then, each point is colored in Figure 16(a) by the Jacobi constant as measured in the Earth-Moon rotating frame and in Figure 16(b) by the time of flight to the L₂ gateway crossing in days. Each of the crossings of these maps tends to possess a velocity that is directed in the negative x direction and the negative y direction. Analysis of these two figures reveals that there are two types of trajectories that approach the desired polar science orbit: one set that possesses a low Jacobi constant (blue points in Figure 16(a)) and longer time of flight (cyan to red points in Figure 16(b)), and one set of trajectories that possesses a higher Jacobi constant (red points in Figure 16(a)) and a shorter time of flight (blue points in Figure 16(b)) to the L₂ gateway. An example of each of these trajectories appears in Figure 17(a) and (b), respectively, in an Earth-Moon rotating frame with blue arcs indicating natural motion and red curves locating low-thrust-enabled segments.
Figure 16: L_2 gateway map depicting the crossings of trajectories that arrive at the lunar science orbit in forward time with the assistance of a low-thrust engine at epochs between 28610 MJD and 28630 MJD, colored by (a) the Jacobi constant in the Earth-Moon CR3BP and (b) the time of flight to the crossing of the hyperplane.

Figure 17: Sample science orbit approach trajectories with (a) low Jacobi constant value and long time of flight, and (b) high Jacobi constant value and short time of flight.
The constructed maps offer $L_2$ gateway crossing conditions that may be used in the trajectory design process to guide the targeting process to achieve a trajectory that will evolve to a lunar polar orbit with the assistance of the low-thrust engine. Note that the selection of feasible state components from this map is dependent on the arrival Jacobi constant. Specifically, the final phase of the Lunar IceCube transfer trajectory is dependent on the outgoing EM-1 launch and deployment parameters that yield an overall lunar arrival energy level, thereby constraining the Jacobi constants of feasible map crossings of trajectories that reach the desired lunar orbit. Recall, however, that each crossing of the map occurs at a specific epoch and for a specific mass of the spacecraft. Rather than iteratively constructing additional maps for the desired epoch at the map crossing, the single map in Figure 16 may be useful. Consider a fixed incoming approach path which passes through the $L_2$ gateway close to one of the crossings on the map in Figure 16. However, the epoch of this map crossing and the epoch of the point solution at its intersection with the $L_2$ gateway hyperplane differ by 2 days. The state information for this nearby crossing can be used to find a similar trajectory that results in nearly polar motion about the Moon by leveraging a multiple shooting corrections scheme. This corrections scheme uses as an initial guess the trajectory and thrust profile corresponding to a given map crossing, and iteratively updates a sequence of states distributed along the trajectory as well as the corresponding epochs and, if applicable, thrust directions. With each update in the corrections scheme this information is varied until a similar trajectory is found with a map crossing at the same position coordinates, as expressed in an Earth-Moon rotating frame, but a new epoch. To demonstrate the persistence of these transfers for alternate epochs and, therefore, the value in using a mapping strategy to capture the general trends of the flow through the $L_2$ gateway, consider the sample transfer in Figure 18(a). Recall that blue arcs indicate natural motion while red curves indicate low-thrust-enable arcs. This trajectory appears in a Moon-centered Earth-Moon rotating frame. The map crossing corresponding to this trajectory occurs at an epoch of 28433 MJD, with a Jacobi constant of 3.13, eventually evolving into a science orbit with a RAAN of 20 degrees and reaching the orbit at apoapsis. At the map crossing, the mass of the spacecraft is equal to 13.7 kg. A corrections algorithm is applied to this path to find a similar trajectory at an $L_2$ gateway arrival epoch 2 days later, i.e. 28435 MJD. The reference path in Figure 18(a) is discretized into 150 nodes along the first 80 days of the 130-day trajectory – subsequent analyses with higher fidelity models of the Moon can determine a complete science orbit approach path. The goal in this investigation is simply to find a nearby trajectory with nearly polar motion towards the end of the 80-day transfer. The corrections process yields the trajectory depicted in Figure 18(b) and resembles the original reference path. These trajectories possess identical position components of the $L_2$ gateway map crossing, while the velocity differs by approximately 33 m/s in magnitude. Note that the velocity components of the state at the $L_2$ gateway crossing were not constrained. Furthermore, without directly constraining the orbital elements along the first 80 days along this path, the inclination only varies by five degrees. Higher fidelity modeling and subsequent corrections of the entire path along the science orbit approach arc can be used in future analyses to recover exact polar motion. Nevertheless, the produced map supports the identification of general trends in the flow and, in combination with a corrections algorithm, the location of science orbit approach paths at a variety of epochs, even those not directly represented on the map.
Figure 18: Recovery of lunar approach paths from the L2 gateway map at (a) an epoch of 28433 MJD and (b) two days later at an epoch of 28435 MJD. Trajectories appear in an Earth-Moon rotating frame with blue arcs indicating natural motion and red arcs indicating low-thrust-enabled motion.

COMPARISON TO EXISTING POINT SOLUTIONS

Visualization of the natural flow through the Earth-Moon L₂ gateway and subsequent low-thrust-enabled capture via dynamical systems techniques is also useful in analysis of existing point solutions. These point solutions, constructed in an operational high-fidelity model include transfers that reach a polar orbit and those that do not. First, consider a path that reaches a 93 degree inclination low altitude lunar orbit, as portrayed in Figures 19-22 from deployment to
lunar capture. Figure 19 portrays the cruise segment in a Sun-Earth rotating coordinate frame where the trailing edge lunar flyby is augmented to permit the one-loop design using the solar influence to change the periapsis radius to the lunar orbit radius. Figure 20 presents the arrival and capture trajectory in an Earth-Moon rotating frame and shows the inbound surface of section crossings. Figures 21 and 22 displays the captured orbit in a Moon centered inertial frame. Note that, even with the identification of arrival or gateway surface of section location, directional maneuvers with the low thrust system to alter the acceleration profile may be required to attain the precise orbital element requirements. This directional input will result in both the attainment of a stable, two-body like lunar orbit, and the proper orientation of the Keplerian elements. A trajectory that is evolving into a stable lunar orbit, but with a small error in inclination or argument of periapsis can be modified by biasing the low-thrust system’s thrust vector with respect to the velocity vector and the low-thrust magnitude. Nevertheless, this point solution results in motion that is captured into the lunar vicinity, with a 93 degree inclination. Accordingly, the lunar approach segment along this solution can be compared to the L2 gateway map for verification.

To confirm the observations produced via an analysis of the lunar approach dynamics, a sample trajectory simulated using operational high fidelity tools, is compared to the L2 gateway map. Figure 23 depicts the map crossings for trajectories that achieve near polar orbits for a selected set of epoch values, colored by their Jacobi constant using the guidelines established earlier. The map crossing marked by a light blue filled square represents the existing point solution, generated in a high fidelity operational modeling environment, which yields a stable lunar orbit with an inclination of 93 degrees. Although the epoch of the map crossings may differ, this simulated trajectory is described by a Jacobi constant at the crossing of the hyperplane in the L2 gateway that is similar to the Jacobi constant of nearby map crossings. Furthermore, blue vectors are added to map crossings that possess a value of the Jacobi constant that is close to that of the sample transfers, i.e. map crossings that are colored light blue. These vectors represent the y- and z- components of the velocity vector in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. Nearby the sample point solution, in position and Jacobi constant, the velocity vectors are pointed in a similar direction. However, the y-component of the velocity vector, colored black, for the crossing of the point solution with the hyperplane possesses a larger value. Of course, an exact match in the velocity direction is not required due to the difference in the fidelity of the models used to produce the gateway map and the resulting fate of the point solution in terms of the inclination. Nevertheless, the map crossing associated with the sample solution, producing nearly polar motion, falls in a region of the map where crossings occur and possesses a similar energy and velocity direction.

Figure 23. Comparison of L2 gateway map, colored by Jacobi constant measured in the Earth-Moon system, and a sample point solution that reaches a 93 degree inclination lunar orbit. Vectors indicated y- and z- velocity components.
The L\textsubscript{2} gateway maps constructed in this investigation also support the analysis of problematic lunar approach arcs, i.e. those that do not reach a polar lunar orbit. Consider, for instance a point solution that results in captured motion described by an inclination of 45 degrees. A zoomed-in view of this trajectory in the lunar vicinity appears in Figure 24, relative to an Earth-Moon rotating frame. Upon reaching a low lunar orbit, the thrust vector could be oriented in the direction of the orbit normal to shift the orbital plane. However, due to the limited thrust magnitude of the BIT-3 engine, this orbital maneuver would require an excessively long thrust time and, potentially, exceed the available propellant mass. Figure 25 depicts the map crossings for trajectories that achieve near polar orbits for a selected set of epoch values, colored by their Jacobi constant using the guidelines established earlier. The map crossing marked by a cyan-filled square represents the existing point solution, generated in a high fidelity operational modeling environment, which yields a stable lunar orbit with an inclination of 45 degrees. Recall that the vectors attached to each map crossing indicate the y- and z-component of velocity. Comparison of the map crossing associated with this point solution to the nearby map crossings reveals that the hyperplane crossing occurs in a region where there are few cyan points, but a large grouping of red and orange points, corresponding to a significantly higher value of the Jacobi constant. The scarcity of map crossings at a similar energy level in the vicinity of this point solution may indicate increased difficulty or sensitivity in attaining a polar orbit from the white region in the L\textsubscript{2} gateway map. In fact, it appears that in the vicinity of the point solution on the L\textsubscript{2} gateway map, feasible transfers occur for a lower energy or higher Jacobi constant. Using this information, the trajectory designer may employ the low-thrust engine prior to lunar approach to shift the crossing of the L\textsubscript{2} gateway hyperplane closer to the x-axis of the Earth-Moon rotating frame near the cyan map crossings. Alternatively, adjustments to the energy and velocity produce a point solution with a similar crossing of the L\textsubscript{2} hyperplane in position coordinates, but with a lower velocity such that the Jacobi constant is above approximately 3.05.

Figure 24. Sample point solution that reaches a 45 degree inclination lunar orbit, viewed in Earth-Moon rotating frame.
CONCLUSIONS

A process is described that leverages dynamical system theory to identify transfers from a Moon-centered multibody trajectory to a stable, polar lunar orbit. This process leverages both CR3BP and high fidelity models and incorporates a surface of section to identify useful position states and Jacobi Constant values. CR3BP natural motion and Moon-centered manifolds guide efforts to identify these states and energies. Furthermore, the application of low-thrust acceleration enables transfers from a stable lunar orbit to the hyperplane using backward integration. This process is verified with operational software using forward integration and differential correction targeting. This investigation addresses the challenges involved in designing such types of multibody transfers into stable lunar orbits limited by a low thrust system. By leveraging CR3BP information, such as the Jacobi Constant and mapping techniques, several lunar arrival conditions that link to high energy deployment trajectories are identified and are successfully employed in a Lunar IceCube mission design process.
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