



The NASA Mass Change Designated Observable Study AGU 2020 Town Hall

December 11, 2020

Presented by Lucia Tsaoussi⁴, Bernie Bienstock¹, Matt Rodell², Bryant Loomis², David Wiese¹, Jon Chrono³


¹California Institute of Technology/Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA, United States,

²NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, United States,

³NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA, United States,

⁴NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC, United States

© 2020. All rights reserved.




The cost information contained in this document is of a budgetary and planning nature and is intended for informational purposes only. It does not constitute a commitment on the part of JPL and/or Caltech.



Introduction

Lucia Tsaoussi, NASA HQ

Mass Change Program Scientist



NASA Mass Change Designated Observable Study

AGU 2020

The Committee on the Decadal Survey for Earth Science and Applications from Space (ESAS) of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) released the Decadal Survey, [“Thriving on Our Changing Planet: A Decadal Strategy for Earth Observations from Space.”](#) in January 2018.

- A “new” program element for cost-capped medium- and large-size missions/observing systems to address observables essential to the overall program
- Addresses five of the highest-priority Earth observation needs, suggested to be implemented among three large missions and two medium missions. Elements of this program are considered foundational elements of the decade’s observations.
- **Mass Change** observations included among five *Designated Observables*
- Climate, Hydrology, and Solid Earth panels recommended **Mass Change Mission**
 - NASA Initiated 4 multi-center studies in 2018 to investigate observing system architectures, considering synergies with other obs, accelerating research and applications and partnerships.



NASA DS Implementation Status

AGU 2020

NASA continual posting of programmatic updates and Decadal Survey Implementation

<https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/decadal-surveys/>

- **Decadal Designated Observable Studies**
- [Aerosol and Cloud, Convection and Precipitation \(ACCP\)](#)
- [Mass Change \(MC\)](#)
- [Surface Biology and Geology \(SBG\)](#)
- [Surface Deformation and Change \(SDC\)](#)
- **Incubation Study Teams**
- [Planetary Boundary Layer \(PBL\)](#)
- [Surface Topography and Vegetation \(STV\)](#)


NASA community forum presentations available:

- [Send us your questions about the Decadal.](#)
- [Decadal Survey Questions](#)
- [Decadal Survey Community Forums](#)
- [Presentations and Other Materials](#)
- [ESD Directive on Project Applications Program](#)



Opening Remarks

Bernie Bienstock, Caltech/JPL
Mass Change Study Coordinator




Agenda

AGU 2020

Start	Duration	Topic	Presenter
7:00 AM	0:10	Introduction and Opening Remarks	Lucia Tsaoussi, NASA HQ Bernie Bienstock, Caltech/JPL
7:10 AM	0:05	Science and Applications Traceability Matrix	Matt Rodell, NASA GSFC
7:15 AM	0:10	Architectures and Technology	Bryant Loomis, NASA GSFC
7:25 AM	0:05	Science Value Methodology	David Wiese, Caltech/JPL
7:30 AM	0:10	Value Framework Process	Jon Chrone, NASA LaRC
7:40 AM	0:20	Feedback and Community Discussion	
8:00 AM		Adjourn	

Mass Change Org Chart

AGU 2020



Mass Change Working Groups

Phase 2 WG

- Kelley Case, Lead
- Dave Bearden
- Jon Chrone
- Scott Horner
- Bryant Loomis
- Scott Luthcke
- Frank Webb
- David Wiese

Applications

- Matt Rodell, Lead
- Rosemary Baize
- Carmen Boening
- Brad Doorn
- JT Reager
- Jeanne Sauber
- Margaret Srinivasan

Science & Community Engagement

- Carmen Boening, Lead
- Rosemary Baize
- Bernie Bienstock
- Bryant Loomis
- Matt Rodell
- David Wiese
- Victor Zlotnicki

Phase 3 WG


- Michael Gross, Lead
- Rosemary Baize
- Jon Chrone
- Scott Horner
- Bryant Loomis
- Scott Luthcke
- Frank Webb
- David Wiese
- Victor Zlotnicki

Communications

- Victor Zlotnicki, Lead
- Bernie Bienstock
- Donna Wu


MC Study Phases

AGU 2020



Mass Change Overall Schedule

AGU 2020



Mass Change Phase 2 Milestones

AGU 2020


- HQ meetings
 - Periodic DO study and MC-specific reviews
- Community meetings
 - Multiple opportunities for community engagement during scheduled public forms
- Concurrent engineering
 - JPL's Team X, GSFC's IDL
- Architecture evaluation
 - Conducted via the Aerospace Corporation's AoA
- Engagement with potential international partners
 - Multiple meetings with ESA, CNES, and DLR/GFZ



Science and Applications Traceability Matrix

Matt Rodell, NASA GSFC


Mass Change R&A Co-Coordinator



Mass Change SATM Development

AGU 2020

The development of the Mass Change Science and Applications Traceability Matrix was driven by the 2017 Decadal Survey with significant input from the community: <https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/decadal-mc>



Mass Change Applications Overview

AGU 2020

- Mass change observations have the potential to support numerous practical applications:

Already contributing (with room to improve)	Areas of future contribution
Water resources assessments	Earthquake hazard assessment
Drought monitoring and forecasting	Weather services
Agricultural planning and yield forecasting	Forestry
Flood vulnerability	Fire risk
Local sea level rise	


- Past community engagement
 - 2019: MC workshop, MC applications survey, telecons, AGU Town Hall
- Ongoing MC applied sciences activities
 - Collaborating with NASA-hired contractor, RTI, to increase number of applications and broaden community
 - Working on a Community Assessment Report to be delivered next spring
 - MC applications survey: <https://tinyurl.com/MassChangeSurvey>



Architectures and Technology


Bryant Loomis, NASA GSFC

Mass Change Phase 3 Deputy Lead



Architectures & Technology: Trade Space

AGU 2020









Highlighted boxes = Orbit & technology trade space

Architectures & Technology: Trade Space

AGU 2020

SST Satellite-to-satellite tracking



Highlighted boxes = Orbit & technology trade space


Precise Orbit Determination (POD)

AGU 2020

Key takeaway:

POD is not a replacement for GRACE-type missions and is not capable of meeting the MC SATM needs

- Simulations assumed overly optimistic accelerometer performance, orbit altitude, and instrument noise specifications
- Single and multi-plane configurations with increasing number of satellites
- Observed ~25% improvement in science value as number of constellation elements doubles. Unclear if this trend continues as constellation grows to 1000s of elements, but due to low science value of 100 elements, this was not pursued.
- MC DO team science and applications assessment validated the community assessment that POD is not a viable MC candidate architecture



Atomic Interferometer Gravity Gradiometer (AIGG)

AGU 2020

Key takeaways:


High science performance but long/uncertain path to TRL 6

AOSense lab instrument in collaboration with NASA GSFC:


- Currently TRL 4; path to TRL 6 TBD

GSFC Instrument Design Lab (IDL) conducted June 1st – 5th


- First AIGG flight instrument design
- Identified challenges
 - Laser components will likely need development to reduce power
 - Some lab components (RF and laser) lack spaceflight equivalents
 - Challenging to test instrument flight performance in a terrestrial environment
- Instrument Accommodation: 947 kg; 1049 W
- Continue engineering design refinement (follow-up MDL study at GSFC in early CY21)




High sensitivity interferometer fringe measurements for gravity observations



AIGG at AOSense



Flight Design



SST SmallSats: Summary of Engineering Design Study GU 2020

- JPL Team X is a “cross-functional multidisciplinary team of engineers that utilizes concurrent engineering methodologies to complete rapid design, analysis and evaluation of mission concept designs” – conducted May 2020 over four days
- Team X study goals
 - Determine if a sub-\$300M SST exists that meets baseline objectives and seeks to minimize size, weight, and power
 - Leverage smaller, less mature accelerometer (ONERA CubStar) and inter-satellite ranging technologies (GeoOptics KVR)
- Team X architectures:

Option 1: Dual string with heritage bus components

Redundancy: Dual string

Mass: ~430 kg

Phase A-E cost: ~\$500M FY18

Option 2: Single string with SmallSat bus components

Redundancy: Single string

Mass: ~190 kg

Phase A-E cost: ~\$420M FY18

- Team X major conclusions (**key takeaways**)
 - The benefit of reduced technical footprint of the ranging/accelerometer technologies on the spacecraft bus is limited due to stringent center of mass, structural stability, thermal, attitude, and pointing requirements
 - The single string option reduced cost, but was unable to meet the cost target: Leveraging less mature, potentially lower reliability components in a single string configuration is not recommended and is only shown to identify the cost ‘floor’
 - A fully domestic implementation that meets the baseline objectives may not be feasible within the \$300M FY18 cost target

Technology summary

AGU 2020

- SATM baseline objectives can be met with flight-proven technology
- SATM goal objectives require advanced technologies and/or additional satellites
- Development efforts have been prioritized by MC team with input from the community:

- Relevant to SST architectures
- Redundant laser ranging interferometer (LRI) as primary instrument *
 - LRI enhancements *
 - Advanced accelerometer *
 - Miniaturization of relevant technologies *
 - Drag compensation
 - Attitude control
 - Gravity gradiometer *

* Focus of MC study team through community white papers and funded efforts (some details on following charts)
Accelerometer & LRI white papers on website: <https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/decadal-mc>
Gravity gradiometer white paper available on website soon

SST technologies: Accelerometers

AGU 2020

Key takeaways:

- Current technology meets baseline objectives
- Advanced technology either improves measurement accuracy, reduces SWaP, and/or supports low altitude implementation
- Approximate budget and schedule to achieve TRL 6 has been delivered to MC study team

		Accelerometer technology	Performance vs. GRACE-FO	SWaP vs. GRACE-FO	Current TRL (lowest component)
SmallSats Improvements	Improvements	ONERA GRACE-FO electrostatic	1×	1×	9
		ONERA MicroSTAR electrostatic	30×	1×	4
		ONERA HybridSTAR ES + cold atom	60×	10×	3
		Simplified LISA Pathfinder Gravitational Reference Sensor (GRS)*†	20×	1×	2
	SmallSats	ONERA CubSTAR electrostatic	1×	0.3×	3
		Compact optomechanical*†	0.05×	0.01×	2

Color legend:

- Current tech (meets baseline objectives)
- U.S. tech development
- Potential vendor tech development

Footnotes:

- *Community white paper delivered to MC team
- †Selected for Category 3 funding
- ‡MC study supporting development

Acronyms:

- ES Electrostatic
- SWaP Size, Weight, and Power

SST technologies: Inter-satellite Ranging

AGU 2020

Key takeaways:

- Current technology meets baseline objectives
- Advanced technology either improves measurement accuracy, reduces SWaP, and/or enables pendulum architecture
- Approximate budget and schedule to achieve TRL 6 has been delivered to MC study team

SmallSats Improvements	Inter-satellite ranging technology	Performance vs. GRACE-FO LRI	SWaP vs. LRI	Current TRL (lowest component)
	GRACE-FO MWI	0.01×	1×	9
	GRACE-FO LRI	1×	1×	9
	Ball optical frequency comb*†	1× (increased dynamic range for pendulum)	1×	5
	LRI cavity improvements*	Reduces noise	N/A	N/A
	LRI/accelerometer test mass interface*	Improved center of mass	N/A	N/A
	GeoOptics KVR†	0.01×	0.1× (SW) 0.5× (P)	6
	GSFC μ NPRO*	0.5×	0.4× (SW) 0.6× (P)	5
	LMI transponder (ESA)	1×	1×	4
	LMI retroreflector (ESA)	1×	1×	4
	Laser chronometer (CNES)	0.01× (gimbaled instrument for pendulum)	0.5× (SW) 1.5× (P)	4

Color legend:

- Current tech (meets baseline objectives)
- U.S. tech development
- Potential international partner tech development

Footnotes:

*Community white paper delivered to MC team

†Selected for Category 3 funding

Acronyms:

KVR K-/V-band ranging
LMI Laser metrology instrument
LRI Laser ranging interferometer

MWI Microwave interferometer
NPRO Non-planar ring oscillator
SWaP Size, Weight, and Power




Image Credits Clockwise from Top Left: (c) jukree, (c) johnnorth, (c) EcoPicture, (c) SeanPavonePhoto
(c) Scrofula, (c) releon8211, (c) Scrofula, (c) Pancaketom all @ fotosearch.com

Science Value Methodology

David Wiese, JPL/Caltech

Mass Change Deputy Study Coordinator



Relating Observing System Capability to the DS


AGU 2020

Decadal Survey

Science and Applications Traceability Matrix Measurement Parameters


Climate Variability and Change		Global Hydrological Cycles and Water Resources				Earth Surface and Interior			
1	C-1a: H (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly	1	C-1c: H (300 km) ² ; 40 mm Monthly	1	H-1a: H (1000 km) ² ; 10 mm Monthly	1	S-1b: H (300 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly	.67	S-4a: M (300 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly
1	C-1b: H (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly	.11	C-7d: L (300 km) ² ; 15 mm; Monthly	1	H-2c: H (450 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly	1	S-3a: H (300 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly	.07	S-5a: VL (20,000 km) ² ; 1 mm Monthly
.67	C-1d: H (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly	.11	C-7e: L (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly	.33	H-3b: H (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly	.22	H-4c: M (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly	.22	S-6b: M (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly

Science value metrics directly relate the capability of an observing system architecture to achieving science and application targets relevant to MC in the Decadal Survey





Science Value

Architecture Tree



OSSE Overview: Science Value

Overview of Observing System Simulation Experiment




Science Value provides the best estimate of science return of the mission given the current state of the art in data processing and geophysical model error

	Truth Model	Nominal Model
Static Gravity Field	gif48	gif48
Ocean Tides	GOT4.8	FES2004
Atmosphere/Ocean (AOD)	AOD RL05	AOerr + DEAL (Dobslaw et al., 2016)
Hydrology + ICE	ESA Earth System Model	

OSSE Overview: Measurement System Value

Overview of Observing System Simulation Experiment



A Quantitative Assessment of Science Value

AGU 2020

Science Value (SV)


$$SV(a) = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{15} (W_n) P_n^{OS}}{\sum_{n=1}^{15} (W_n)} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{15} (W_n) \frac{SR_n}{SR(a)} \frac{TR_n}{TR(a)} \frac{ACC_n}{ACC(a)}}{\sum_{n=1}^{15} (W_n)}$$

Key Variable: **Spatial Resolution**

.67 C-1d: **H**
(300 km)²; 15 mm
C Monthly **O**

$$SV_{C-1d} = 0.67 * (300/225)^2 = 1.2$$

$W_n = Importance_n \times Utility_n$
 $P_n^{OS} = Performance\ of\ the\ Observing\ System$
 $SR = Spatial\ Resolution$
 $TR = Temporal\ Resolution$
 $ACC = Accuracy$



Key Variable: **Accuracy**

1 H-1a: **H**
(1000 km)²; **10 mm**
Monthly **L**

$$SV_{H-1a} = 1 * 10/4 = 2.5$$


SATM Measurement Parameters for Baseline

Climate Variability and Change			Global Hydrological Cycles and Water Resources			Earth Surface and Interior		
1 C-1a: (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly C	H O		1 C-1c: (300 km) ² ; 40 mm Monthly C	H O		1 H-1a: (1000 km) ² ; 10 mm Monthly L	H L	
1 C-1b: (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly C	H O		.11 C-1e: (300 km) ² ; 15 mm; Monthly C	L O		1 H-2c: (450 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly L	H L	
.67 C-1d: (300 km) ² ; 15 mm Monthly C	H O		.11 C-7e: (300 km) ² ; 15 mm; Monthly C	L O		.33 H-3b: (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly L	H L	
						.22 H-4c: (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly L	M L	
								.22 S-6b: (450 km) ² ; 25 mm; Monthly L
								.67 S-4a: (300 km) ² ; 25 mm Monthly G
								.07 S-5a: (20,000 km) ² ; 1 mm Monthly G

Hauk and Wiese, Earth and Space Science, 2020.


Results: Science Value

AGU 2020



Measurement System Value Results: A Secondary Discriminator

AGU 2020



Measurement System Value is quantified using same process as Science Value except temporal aliasing errors are not included in the numerical simulation


Measurement System Value becomes a discriminator among architectures with similar Science Value.



Value Framework Process

Jon Chrono, NASA LaRC

Mass Change Phase 2 Deputy Lead



Architecture Evaluation Objectives

AGU 2020

- Identify architectures that support the Mass Change Science and Applications objectives
 - Traceable to Decadal Survey
- Assess the cost effectiveness of each of the studied architectures
 - Performance (Science and Applications), Risk, Cost, Schedule
- Provide a transparent and traceable mechanism for providing a observing system recommendation to NASA Earth Science Division of one or more candidate architectures
 - Justification for eliminating candidate architectures that are not recommended

Assessment Ground Rules/Assumptions




AGU 2020

- Architecture Performance based on science and applications metric
- Spacecraft/Instrument sizing
 - Combination of concurrent engineering studies and engineering models
 - Implementation with minimum 3 year design lifetime and 5 years of consumables
- Cost estimation
 - Leveraging Aerospace Corporation for independent cost estimates
 - Combination of parametric and analogy based cost models process for cost risk including design uncertainty
- Schedule estimates
 - Phase durations developed based on mission analogies
 - Includes estimated time to mature technologies
- Risks considerations
 - Performance/Science risks based on heritage of components, measurement techniques, and technology maturity
 - Schedule risks assessed against Program of Record and timelines with international partner opportunities

Continuity with GRACE Follow On (GFO)

AGU 2020


- GFO lifetime estimated based on reliability and orbit lifetime
- Stochastic analysis provides a range of dates for GFO lifetime based on variation in solar flux predictions and historical spacecraft reliability
- Schedule estimates (“S” curves) generated for the MC candidate observing system architectures
 - Phase durations based on mission analogies
- Inputs from GFO team regarding planned spacecraft operations are combined with MC Orbit lifetime analysis to define the likely MC observing system need date for continuity and compared with architecture readiness dates from MC schedule estimates



Phase 2 Tradespace

AGU 2020


- Preliminary results for SST architectures in various configurations
 - Single pair in-line (GRACE-like)
 - Single pair pendulum (in different planes)
 - Two pair Bender (pairs with different orbit inclination)
 - Hybrids (combined in-line, pendulum)
- Within each configuration are different altitudes (350 km – 500 km), instruments, and formations
- Cost estimates for domestic only implementation are above cost target
- Remaining trade space includes options that are compatible with international interests
 - Reduced cost to NASA may be enabled through strategic partnerships
 - Costs shown do not include workshare with potential international partners





Summary

Bernie Bienstock, JPL/Caltech
Mass Change Study Coordinator



MC is on track to deliver the following to NASA HQ in January 2021

- Description of high-value, affordable architectures with recommendation on
 - Science value and applications performance
 - Cost estimate and cost risk assessment
 - Schedule estimate and schedule risk assessment including continuity with GRACE-FO
 - Technology readiness levels, risks, and maturation plans
 - International partnership concepts
 - Background and supporting material
- After decision from NASA HQ, Mass Change will enter Phase 3 of the study focused on a detailed design of one or more high-value architectures

- MC Website
 - <https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/decadal-mc>
- ESD website for Decadal Survey Community Forums
 - <https://science.nasa.gov/earth-science/decadal-survey-community-forum>
- Email address for MC questions/comments
 - masschange@jpl.nasa.gov

Feedback and Community Discussion