



IN-FLIGHT CALIBRATION OF THE MICROSCOPE SPACE MISSION INSTRUMENT: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SIMULATOR

Emilie Hardy, Agnes Levy, Gilles Metris, Alain Robert, Manuel Rodrigues,
Pierre Touboul

► To cite this version:

Emilie Hardy, Agnes Levy, Gilles Metris, Alain Robert, Manuel Rodrigues, et al.. IN-FLIGHT CALIBRATION OF THE MICROSCOPE SPACE MISSION INSTRUMENT: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SIMULATOR. Semaine de l'Astrophysique, Jun 2011, Paris, France. hal-04417779

HAL Id: hal-04417779

<https://hal.science/hal-04417779>

Submitted on 25 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

IN-FLIGHT CALIBRATION OF THE MICROSCOPE SPACE MISSION INSTRUMENT: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SIMULATOR

E. Hardy¹, A. Levy¹, G. Métris², A. Robert³, M. Rodrigues¹ and P. Touboul¹

Abstract. The space mission MICROSCOPE aims at testing the Equivalence Principle (EP) with an accuracy of 10^{-15} . The test is based on the precise measurement delivered by a differential electrostatic accelerometer onboard a drag-free microsatellite which includes two cylindrical test masses submitted to the same gravitational field and made of different materials. The accuracy of the measurement exploited for the EP test is limited by our knowledge of the physical parameters of the instrument. The on-ground evaluation of these parameters is not precise enough. An in-orbit calibration is therefore needed to finely characterize these instrumental parameters in order to correct the measurements. The calibration procedures have been determined and their analytical performances have been evaluated. In addition, a software simulator including models of the instrument and the satellite drag-free system has been developed. After an overall presentation of the MICROSCOPE mission, this paper will focus on the description of the simulator used to validate the specific procedures which are planned to determine in-orbit the exact values of the driving parameters of the instrument.

Keywords: MICROSCOPE, test of the Equivalence Principle, space accelerometer, calibration, simulator

1 Introduction

The MICROSCOPE space mission aims at testing the Equivalence Principle (EP), which states the Universality of Free Fall: ‘the acceleration of an object in a gravitational field is independent of its composition’. This is equivalent to the proportionality between the inertial mass, which quantifies the resistance to a modification of the motion by any force, and the gravitational mass, which quantifies the gravitational force. The Universality of Free Fall has been tested throughout the centuries with an improving accuracy. Sophisticated torsion-balances, and more recently the Lunar Laser Ranging method, have lead to an accuracy of a few 10^{-13} (Will (2006)). However, the unification theories which try to merge gravitation with the three other fundamental interactions expect a violation of the EP below 10^{-14} . That is why the MICROSCOPE mission will test this principle with an accuracy of 10^{-15} . To achieve this goal, the payload of the MICROSCOPE satellite is a differential electrostatic accelerometer which includes two cylindrical test masses made of different materials. The test is based on the precise measurement of the difference of gravitational acceleration between the two test masses while they are submitted to the same gravitational field. The accuracy of the measurement exploited for the EP test is limited by our knowledge of the physical parameters of the instrument. These parameters are partially estimated by means of ground tests or during the integration of the instrument in the satellite. However, these evaluations are not sufficient and an in-orbit calibration is needed in order to correct the measurements of the effects of these parameters. We have designed calibration procedures and evaluated their analytical performances: they are compatible with the accuracy objectives. We have developed a software simulator including models of the instrument and the satellite drag-free system in order to validate numerically these procedures.

After an overall presentation of the MICROSCOPE mission, the interest of an in-flight calibration and the corresponding procedures will be explained. The structure of the calibration simulator used to validate them will then be described.

¹ ONERA, 29 avenue de la Division Leclerc F-92322 Châtillon, France

² Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (UMR 6526), Observatoire de la Côte d’Azur, Géoazur, Avenue Copernic 06130 Grasse, France

³ CNES, 18 avenue Edouard Belin 31401 Toulouse, France

2 Overview of the MICROSCOPE project

2.1 The space mission

MICROSCOPE is a 200 kg microsatellite developed by CNES to orbit around the Earth for a one year mission. The onboard payload is constituted of two differential electrostatic accelerometers developed by ONERA, each one being composed of two concentric cylindrical test masses controlled to be on the same orbit by the accelerometer thanks to a capacitive detection method. For the first accelerometer, the two masses have different compositions. A difference measured between the forces applied to maintain them on the same trajectory will therefore indicate a violation of the EP. The second accelerometer, constituted of two masses with the same composition, will provide the measurement accuracy.

There are several advantages to perform the experiment in space; contrary to ground-based experiments, MICROSCOPE accuracy is not limited by the free fall duration: the experiment can last for several orbits. Moreover, the environment is much less disturbed and a drag-free system (SCAA) allows compensating perturbations to maintain the satellite on a geodesic trajectory. An other important advantage is to be able to use the Earth instead of the Sun as source of the gravity field, allowing increasing the signal by more than three orders of magnitude. Lastly, the frequency and the phase of the signal to be detected are very well known.

2.2 Principle of an electrostatic accelerometer

An electrostatic accelerometer is composed of a cylindrical mass surrounded by electrodes. The mass is free to move in its cage, the only physical contact being a gold wire which controls its electrical potential. A control loop maintains the mass motionless and centred in the cage.

The electrodes allow both measurement of the mass position and control of the six degrees of freedom of this mass with electrostatic forces. Thus, the electrical potential is composed of a constant part used to apply the actuation force and a sinusoidal part used to detect the position of the proof mass. This position is known thanks to the measurement of the capacitance variation due to the variation of the recovering surface between the proof mass and the electrode which appears when the mass is moving.

3 The in-orbit instrument calibration

3.1 The measurement principle

The ideal measurement of the accelerometer would be the acceleration $\vec{\Gamma}_{App,k}$ applied to the proof mass k to keep it at the centre of the electrostatic cage. This applied acceleration corresponds to the difference between the acceleration of the satellite and the acceleration of the mass, since the purpose is to maintain it motionless. The accelerations can be decomposed into a gravitational part and non-gravitational parts applied on the satellite and the mass k , respectively $\frac{\vec{F}_{NGsat}}{M_{Isat}}$ and $\frac{\vec{F}_{NGk}}{m_{Ik}}$:

$$\vec{\Gamma}_{App,k} = \left(\frac{M_{gsat}}{M_{Isat}} - \frac{m_{gk}}{m_{Ik}} \right) \vec{g}(O_{sat}) + (T - I) \overrightarrow{O_k O_{sat}} + \frac{\vec{F}_{NGsat}}{M_{Isat}} - \frac{\vec{F}_{NGk}}{m_{Ik}}$$

where M_{gsat} and m_{gk} are the gravitational masses of the satellite and the proof mass k , M_{Isat} and m_{Ik} their inertial masses, O_{sat} and O_k their centres of mass, T is the Earth gradient gravity tensor and I the inertia tensor.

The instrument is not perfect, therefore the measured acceleration is not exactly equal to the applied acceleration. Some parameters of the instrument limit the measurement accuracy: the bias $\vec{B}_{0,k}$, the noise $\vec{\Gamma}_{n,k}$, the sensitivity matrix $[M_k]$ and the quadratic diagonal matrix $[K_{2,k}]$:

$$\vec{\Gamma}_{mes,k} = \vec{B}_{0,k} + [M_k] \vec{\Gamma}_{App,k} + [K_{2,k}] \vec{\Gamma}_{App,k}^2 + \vec{\Gamma}_{n,k}$$

The components of $\vec{\Gamma}_{App,k}^2$ are defined as the square values of the components of $\vec{\Gamma}_{App,k}$.

The EP violation parameter, $\delta = \frac{m_{g2}}{m_{I2}} - \frac{m_{g1}}{m_{I1}}$, appears in the differential mode measurement along \vec{X} , the ultrasensitive axis of the cylinder; $\Gamma_{mes,dx}$ is the half difference between the accelerations measured for the two proof masses:

$$\Gamma_{mes,dx} = \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_{mes,1x} - \Gamma_{mes,2x})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} K_{1cx} \delta g_x(O_{sat}) + \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} K_{1cx} \\ \eta_{cz} + \theta_{cz} \\ \eta_{cy} - \theta_{cy} \end{bmatrix}^t [T - I] \begin{bmatrix} \Delta_x \\ \Delta_y \\ \Delta_z \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} K_{1dx} \\ \eta_{dz} + \theta_{dz} \\ \eta_{dy} - \theta_{dy} \end{bmatrix}^t (\vec{\Gamma}_{res_{df}} + \vec{C}) \\
&\quad + 2K_{2cxx}(\Gamma_{app,d} + b_{1dx})(\Gamma_{res_{df},x} + C_x - b_{0cx}) + K_{2dxx}((\Gamma_{app,d} + b_{1dx})^2 + (\Gamma_{res_{df},x} + C_x - b_{0cx})^2)
\end{aligned}$$

The parameters arising in this equation are those of the sensitivity matrix: the scale factor K_1 , the coupling parameter η and the misalignment parameter θ , the off-centring between the two proof masses Δ and the quadratic factor K_2 ; the indices c and d referring respectively to the common (half sum) and differential (half difference) parameters. b_{0c} is the common read-out bias, and $-b_{1d}$ gathers the differential parasitic forces. We define $\Gamma_{app,d}$ so that $\Gamma_{app,d} = \Gamma_{app,d} + b_{1d}$. C is the drag-free command and $\Gamma_{res_{df}}$ the drag-free loop residue. In first approximation, $\Gamma_{app,cx}$ is equal to $\Gamma_{mes,cx} - b_{0cx}$. Since $\Gamma_{mes,c}$ is the input of the SCAA, $\Gamma_{app,cx}$ can be approximated by $\Gamma_{res_{df},x} + C_x - b_{0cx}$.

3.2 The calibration process

In a previous work, 40 groups of error sources which limit the measurement accuracy were identified, such as mechanical defects, magnetic effects, thermal effects or effects of the gravity gradient. The accuracy objective is $4 \times 10^{-15} \text{ ms}^{-2}$ for the differential mode measurement, and we assume an equi-repartition of the error sources. Each of the 40 groups is therefore specified to be inferior to 10^{-16} ms^{-2} .

In the previous expression of the differential measurement, three groups of errors explicitly appear: the defects between the satellite and the instrument, encompassing the off-centring and common parameters, the defects between the two sensors, encompassing the differential parameters, and quadratic non linearities. The contributions of the 10 parameters included in these three groups have been evaluated, corresponding to the best possible performances for the realisation of the instrument. The results clearly exceed the specifications (Levy et al. (2010) and Guiu (2007)). That is why in-orbit calibration sessions are necessary.

These calibration sessions will allow to estimate the driving parameters with a better accuracy and thus to correct the measurement. The idea is to create a signal which amplifies the effect of the parameter, so that the corresponding term in the measurement equation becomes predominant. For example, to calibrate the off-centring parameter $K_{1cx}\Delta_y$, the oscillation of the satellite around its Z axis is forced through the drag-free command; the resulting angular acceleration amplifies the term we are interested in. To reduce the noise which limits the accuracy of the calibration, the calibration duration for each parameter will be 10 orbits.

The analytical evaluation of the accuracy reached by means of these calibration procedures is compatible with the specifications (Levy et al. (2010)). These procedures were therefore implemented in a simulator including a model of the satellite and its payload in order to validate them numerically.

4 The calibration simulator

The calibration simulator has been developed with Simulink. The parameters we want to calibrate are set to initial realistic random values. The calibration sessions correspond to movements of the satellite imposed by the calibration procedures: angular or linear oscillation of the satellite, oscillation of the proof-masses, or a combination of several of these movements. The structure of the simulator, as shown in figure 1, will now be detailed.

First of all, the ‘dynamics of the satellite’ block outputs the acceleration of the satellite, which corresponds to the thrust delivered by the propulsion system added to the non-gravitational external forces, mainly the atmospheric drag and the solar pressure. These accelerations come from a data file provided by OCA and representing the non gravitational accelerations for a specific trajectory and orientation of the satellite.

The acceleration at the centre of the cage of the instrument is then deduced from the acceleration of the satellite centre of mass by the ‘dynamics of the frame’ block. This process accounts for effects of the Earth gravity gradient and the rotation of the satellite, which arise due to the offset between the centres of mass of the satellite and of the sensor cage.

For the model of the instrument, only one of the two differential accelerometers is represented, constituted of an external and an internal proof mass. In a first stage, the applied acceleration on each mass is calculated. To this end, the acceleration at the centre of the cage of the accelerometer is expressed as the acceleration at the centre of mass of the proof mass by accounting for the Earth gravity gradient and inertia effects induced by the offset between the centres of mass of the sensor cage and the proof mass. Moreover, for some calibration procedures the masses have to move, which results in an additional Coriolis effect. In a second stage, the




Fig. 1. Scheme of the calibration simulator

measurement error due to the instrument defects is simulated, with a bias, a sensibility matrix, quadratic terms and noise.

The output of the ‘instrument’ block is the common mode acceleration, which becomes the input of the ‘Attitude and Altitude Control System’ (SCAA) block. This system computes the acceleration to be applied to the satellite to compensate for surface perturbations and thereby minimizes the non-gravitational acceleration measured by the inertial sensors. The angular and linear compensating accelerations are computed thanks to transfer functions provided by CNES and whose input is the common acceleration measured by the instrument. The computation of the angular compensating acceleration uses the attitude of the satellite measured by the stellar sensor in addition to the angular acceleration measured by the instrument in order to reach a better accuracy at low frequencies. For the calibration procedures, additional input can be involved, such as linear or angular oscillating accelerations of the satellite. The computed compensating acceleration is then applied by the propulsion system. Thanks to cold gas thrusters, the six degrees-of-freedom of the satellite are controlled.

5 Conclusions

Prior to any calibration of the MICROSCOPE instrument, the measurement accuracy is not compatible with the accuracy objectives for the EP test. To correct the measurement, an in-flight calibration has to be performed. The relevant parameters to be calibrated have been determined and an appropriate calibration method has been proposed for each of them. The numerical results of the analytical error budget for the calibration process are compatible with the mission specifications. A simulator was therefore developed to validate these procedures. It includes a model of the instrument and of the drag-free system.

The next step is the comparison of the results of the simulator with the analytical evaluation. An appropriate data processing protocol will thus be needed. Moreover, a simulator dedicated to the sessions for the EP test has been developed at OCA. We aim to simulate the entire mission scenario thanks to the association of these two simulators.

The authors wish to thank the MICROSCOPE teams at CNES, OCA and ZARM for the technical exchanges. This activity has received the financial support of Onera.

References

- Guiu, E. 2007, PhD Thesis, University of Nantes
- Levy, A., Touboul, P., Rodrigues, M., Métris, G., & Robert, A. 2010, SF2A-2010: Proceedings of the annual Meeting of the French Society of Astronomy and Astrophysics
- Will, C. 2006, Living Reviews Relativity, 9