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Abstract—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is currently considering an Asteroid Redirect Mission (ARM), the goal of which is to bring a near-Earth asteroid into lunar orbit for inspection by a team of human astronauts. In this paper we present the results of a simulation study that focuses on the challenge of capturing a target asteroid using a robotic spacecraft. This simulation study was conducted in parallel with an ongoing mechanical design process, with the goal of providing feedback on specific design concepts, deriving high-level design targets via optimization, and exploring the trade space of the capture problem independently. We present and discuss several simulation models, the results of which have influenced the evolution of the ARM project to date.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is currently considering an Asteroid Redirect Mission (ARM), the goal of which is to bring a small near-Earth asteroid (NEA) into lunar orbit for inspection by a team of human astronauts. A robotic Asteroid Retrieval Vehicle (ARV) would be responsible for capturing the asteroid—measuring up to 13 m in diameter with a mass of up to 1,000,000 kg—and bringing it into lunar orbit, while a separately launched crew vehicle would carry the astronauts to and from the asteroid. The Asteroid Redirect Mission would enhance our understanding of NEAs, demonstrate new technologies, and lay the groundwork for future missions, for purposes such as resource mining and planetary defense.

The ARV must be capable of rendezvousing with, capturing, and de-spinning the target asteroid before transporting it into lunar orbit. This process is subject to significant uncertainties related to the composition, shape, and mass of the asteroid. A further complicating factor is the spin state of the asteroid: it is likely to be tumbling rather than spinning around a well-defined axis, and may exhibit instantaneous spin rates of as much as 2 rpm. The design of a capture system that is robust against these uncertainties is a challenging task involving a number of competing demands and tradeoffs in the areas of mechanical design and guidance, navigation, and control.

While the capture system could be constructed in a number of different ways, a study by the Keck Institute for Space Studies at Caltech [1] concluded that the most promising design is a flexible bagging mechanism attached to the spacecraft, which would fully envelop and cinch down on the asteroid. Such a mechanism would be suitable both for a solid rock and a rubble pile, and would thus ensure robustness against uncertainty in the asteroid composition. The complex motion of the asteroid places high demands on the capture mechanism, which is responsible for maintaining adequate separation between the asteroid and the spacecraft throughout the capture event, while also cushioning the spacecraft against excessive loads. Of particular concern in this context are the solar array drive assemblies (SADAS), which are expected to tolerate a maximum bending moment equivalent to an acceleration of approximately 0.1 g at the middle of each deployed solar panel.

Topics of This Paper

In this paper we describe the results of a simulation study into the dynamics of an asteroid capture event. This study has been conducted in parallel with an ongoing mechanical design process at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), with the goal of providing feedback on specific design concepts, deriving target design parameters via optimization, and exploring the trade space of the capture problem independently.

The simulation team worked closely with the mechanical design team that was responsible for developing the capture mechanism. Since the device was new and quite unlike that in any conventional spacecraft or robotic device, both teams were forced into exploratory spirals of concept development and feasibility assessment, with the results from each team informing the activities of the other. The teams also had to develop and refine the methodologies associated with the design process itself, such as defining the appropriate performance metrics to design to and monitor in the simulation (e.g., monitoring key structural loads and geometric clearances), determining the level of simulation fidelity that was most appropriate for a design at a particular level of maturity (e.g., the modeling of the compliance provided by the capture device as a generalized spring-damper system), establishing the kinds of information that needed to be exchanged between the teams (e.g., mathematical abstractions of specific bag-
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to-line friction interactions or pneumatic structure stiffness), and specifying the cross-validation that was necessary at each step of the process (e.g., comparing the simulation loads for a capture scenario that was particularly simple and therefore amenable to being modeled in a tool such as Adams).

**Background and Capture Phases**—We begin in Section 2 by presenting some basic background information on the rotational dynamics of rigid objects in general and NEAs in particular. In Section 3 we summarize the different phases of the capture problem and address the topic of how to approach a tumbling asteroid in preparation for capture. Although it is theoretically possible for a spacecraft equipped with sufficiently large thrusters to match the tumbling motion of the asteroid, such a solution is not considered feasible because of the associated fuel requirements. Thus, it is instead assumed that the spacecraft will approach the asteroid along a well-defined inertial vector while spinning about its symmetry axis, and that the capture event itself is passive from a GN&C standpoint. The choice of approach vector, spin rate, and capture epoch all have major influences on the transient dynamics of the capture event and the eventual steady-state motion regime of the combined spacecraft-asteroid system.

**Simulation models**—Due to the many unique and unexplored aspects of the asteroid capture problem, some of the trades involved in designing a viable capture system have only become apparent in the course of the simulation study. Our presentation in this paper mirrors the evolving nature of the work that has been conducted, in that we study several different models with different objectives in mind.

In Section 4 we focus on a model representing a design in which robotic limbs extend from the spacecraft bus to form a large barrel. A drawstring bag inside this barrel is attached to the limbs via flexible winch-controlled cinch lines. A central idea of this design is that, after the initial short-duration cinching event, enough flexibility should be left in the system to facilitate passive damping of the tumbling motion toward major-axis spin. This design concept, which we refer to as the spider-web capture mechanism, was abandoned due to mechanical design and packaging considerations; however, we discuss it here for the sake of completeness.

In Section 5 we focus on a model created as a rough representation of an alternative design, where the robotic limbs have been replaced by an inflatable exoskeleton attached directly to the spacecraft bus. In this design, the bag collapses around the asteroid with the help of actively controlled winches, while additional inflatable members help keep the spacecraft and the asteroid separated.

In Section 6 we focus on a model that does not represent a particular design, but rather an abstract representation of a capture mechanism with an isolation device represented by a 6-DOF joint. This model allows us to explore, in a general way, the requirements that must be imposed on such an isolation device in order to ensure robustness against various uncertainties.

Each of the three simulation models is based on the same basic building blocks of rigid bodies connected via translational and rotational spring-dampers. The result is clearly a simplification of a complex physical system; we stress, however, that the goal here is not to investigate specific designs at a detail level, but to gain a high-level understanding of the interplay between various factors such as capture geometry, flexibility and damping of the capture mechanism, the tumbling motion of the asteroid, and the relative state of the spacecraft at the time of capture.

**Implementation**—The simulations were based on the Darts/D-shell architecture for spacecraft dynamics simulation, developed at JPL (see, e.g., [2]). In addition to point simulations for particular configurations, large-scale parametric sweeps were conducted to cover a wide range of asteroid masses, shapes, and rotational states. Moreover, the simulation models were used as components of an optimization algorithm in order to synthesize a set of desirable parameters for a capture mechanism. These topics are discussed in Sections 7 and 8.

## 2. Background

For a rigid body subject to no external torques, the angular velocity \( \omega \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) around the center of mass (decomposed in body-fixed coordinates) is governed by the Euler equations

\[
J \ddot{\omega} = -\omega \times J \omega, \tag{1}
\]

where \( J \) is the inertia around the center of mass. By aligning the body-fixed frame with the principal axes of the body, the inertia matrix can be written as \( J = \text{diag}(I_1, I_2, I_3) \), where \( I_1, I_2, \) and \( I_3 \) are the principal-axis inertias. From (1) it is easy to see that \( \omega \) is constant if and only if \( \omega \) and \( J \omega \) are parallel. This is always the case when the principal-axis inertias are identical, but in general \( \omega \) remains constant only if it is aligned with one of the principal axes. When this is not the case, both the direction and magnitude of \( \omega \) may vary over time, and the body is said to tumble.

A body with three distinct inertias is called a tri-inertial body, whereas a body with two identical inertias is called an inertially axi-symmetrical body. For tri-inertial bodies, the analytical solution of (1) follows elliptical curves that lie on the surface of two ellipsoids defined by the requirements that the kinetic energy and the angular momentum of the system are both preserved. For axi-symmetrical bodies, the motion can be more conveniently described by representing the attitude using Euler angles labeled precession, nutation, and spin, of which the nutation angle remains constant and the precession and spin angles change at constant rates.

If the rotating body is augmented with damped flexible modes, then these will tend to be excited by the tumbling motion, resulting in a loss of rotational energy. This energy loss eventually leads to convergence toward constant spin around the principal axis with the largest inertia (i.e., major-axis spin). For further details, see [3].

### Near-Earth Asteroids

Due to the energy loss associated with flexible modes, celestial objects tend to stabilize toward major-axis spin over time. The relaxation (or characteristic) time, defined as the time required for a tumbling object to achieve a principal axis spin, for an asteroid of radius \( r \) and spin period \( T \), is proportional to \( T^3 \) and inversely proportional to \( r^2 \) [4]. Thus, slow rotating spinners take a long time to achieve principal axis spin, as do small asteroids. For small objects such as near-Earth asteroids in the 10-m class, the convergence is thought to occur on a significantly longer time scale than the average time since last collision. Consequently, it is expected that the ARM target asteroid may tumble.

The instantaneous spin rates for large objects is bounded by the rubble pile limit spin barrier at which centrifugal forces
disaggregate bodies composed of a loose collection of smaller objects (i.e., rubble) held together by gravity. Smaller objects, being more solid, are not constrained by this limit, and at the extreme end are seen to approach or slightly exceed spin rates of as much as 2 RPM. We therefore take 2 RPM, un-relaxed objects as the design point for our analysis and simulations. For a number of bounding analysis cases, we consider simply nutated axi-symmetrical bodies; however, we also consider fully tumbling tri-inertial objects.

Coordinate Frames

In each of the simulations presented in this paper, the initial angular momentum vector of the asteroid is aligned with the z axis of the inertial reference coordinate frame. When discussing inertially axi-symmetrical asteroids, we align the symmetry axis with the asteroid’s z axis; for tri-inertial asteroids (modeled as ellipsoids), we align the smallest semi-axis with the z axis. We define the axes of the spacecraft according the convention illustrated in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Spacecraft axes convention](image)

3. Capture Phases

The asteroid capture problem is composed of the following phases:

- **Approach phase**, in which the spacecraft gets in close proximity of the asteroid, and spins up to match the asteroid rate. The objective of this phase is to characterize the asteroid properties and to set up for the close proximity operations.
- **Grapple phase**, in which the capture bag is cinched down, and the motion of the spacecraft catches up with the motion of the asteroid. The asteroid’s tumbling motion may be damped by passive energy bleeding.
- **Despin phase**, in which the bag is further tightened around the asteroid, and the asteroid is detumbled and despin using active thrusting. In this phase the system mass properties are managed and the despin state is achieved.
- **Departure phase**, in which the entire asteroid/spacecraft system is placed into a trajectory for transportation to lunar orbit.

GN&C Sequence

The GN&C sequence to achieve these goals includes:

- **Far-field rendezvous and loose station-keeping phase**. This phase is Ground-directed to get safely within a few kilometers, maintain station to within approximately 100 m, and initiate relative position estimation.
- **Spin state and shape characterization phase**. In this phase, closed-loop proximity motions (e.g., circumnavigation) are required. Asteroid characterization is not required to be real-time and can be conducted on the ground.
- **Pre-capture positioning phase**. This phase includes the final approach along an inertially-fixed direction, and translation to the final stand-off point (approximately 50 m) on the approach vector.
- **Synchronize spin phase**, in which the spacecraft is spun up to an appropriate rate to best match the motion of the asteroid.
- **Final translation phase**, closing at constant rate (approximately 0.1 m/s) along the approach vector.
- **Capture phase**, which detects entry of the asteroid into the capture mechanism, controlled stop of translational motion, disable control, and initiate capture.
- **Despin phase**, where closed-loop GN&C is engaged to remove any remaining tumbling-loop motion and to despin the combined system.

Table 1 lists some of the functionality that may need to be considered in the design of the GN&C system.

![Figure 2. Illustration of the angular momentum approach for a prolate asteroid with an 80° nutation angle. The spacecraft is lined up with the angular momentum vector while matching the precession rate of the asteroid. The time-varying angular velocity traces a cone around the angular momentum vector, but appears constant in the spacecraft frame. The outline of the capture bag (before closing) is shown as a transparent cylinder.](image)

Approach Strategy

Our focus in this paper is on the grapple phase; in particular, we are interested in the dynamics of the combined asteroid-spacecraft system from the time that contact is first made until the start of the despin phase. The capture dynamics is fundamentally affected by the state of the spacecraft relative to the asteroid at the start of the grapple phase, and it is therefore intrinsically linked to the choice of approach strategy.
Matching of asteroid precession + relative spin rate. By matching the precession rate, the motion of the asteroid relative to the spacecraft is canceled except for the relative spin rate. Thus, the asteroid as seen from the spacecraft appears to stand still, except for a constant spin rate around the symmetry axis of the asteroid. Matching the precession rate may be a good choice for approaching a prolate asteroid, since, if it is rotating close to major-axis spin, the relative spin rate will be much smaller than the total spin rate (i.e., the norm of the angular velocity). An illustration of this situation, produced by the Darts/Dshell visualization engine, is shown in Figure 2.

Angular-Velocity Match Approach—Another way to generalize the approach strategy for simple spinners is by matching the angular velocity precisely at a particular epoch. Based on the close observation of the spin state and shape characterization of the target asteroid from the ARV, the future motion of the asteroid is precisely predicted to select an exact future epoch at which to grab it. The approach vector is chosen as the predicted angular velocity vector at this epoch, and the spacecraft spin rate is chosen to match the predicted instantaneous spin rate of the asteroid. The result is that the relative motion between the asteroid and the spacecraft is canceled at the time of capture. A fast-closing capture mechanism is a prerequisite for this strategy, since the relative motion is only canceled for an instant. The freedom in the choice of capture epoch (and thus approach vector and spin rate) can be used, for example, to make the grapple phase more gentle on the spacecraft or to reduce the fuel requirements for the subsequent de-spin. When applying the angular-velocity match approach in this paper, the capture epoch is chosen to minimize the derivative of the angular velocity at the time of capture. Figure 3 illustrates the angular-velocity match approach.

Sideways Grab Approach—Another approach strategy considered in this paper involves approaching along a vector normal to the angular momentum vector, without matching any of the rotation of the asteroid. While this strategy may seem counterintuitive, we study it for two primary reasons:

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Sensing</th>
<th>Estimation</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Actuators</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Models</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach: spacecraft translate</td>
<td>Cameras; laser ranging; closeup illumination; IMU; star tracker</td>
<td>Stereo depth maps; spin-state estimation; attitude filter</td>
<td>Staged approach; best viewing direction; preferred axis</td>
<td>RCS, RWA</td>
<td>3-axis station keep; track approach waypoints; SEP deltaV</td>
<td>Shape; angular momentum; rigid body mass properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach: spacecraft spin-up</td>
<td>IMU; camera; star tracker; LiDAR</td>
<td>Relative state prediction; visual confirmation</td>
<td>Achieve best match to spin</td>
<td>RCS; RWA</td>
<td>3-axis control</td>
<td>Spacecraft mass properties; fuel slosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapple: bag cinch-down</td>
<td>IMU; grapple force/torque sensing</td>
<td>Cinch confirmation</td>
<td>Cinch tension setpoints</td>
<td>Winch line tensioner</td>
<td>Pre-stress to setpoint</td>
<td>Off-line Monte-Carlo analysis of bag/asteroid interaction on multibody system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapple: asteroid nutation damping</td>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>Rotational state observer</td>
<td>Track predicted system rotation profile</td>
<td>Winch line tensioner</td>
<td>Tension modulation; winch</td>
<td>Line/bag friction; line viscoelastic damping; fuel slosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despin: bag cinch tighten</td>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>Cinch tighten confirm; CM and inertial properties estimation</td>
<td>Cinch tension setpoint; CM adjust; cinch line adjust</td>
<td>Winch line tensioner</td>
<td>Servo tension to setpoint; reposition cinch plane center for system CM adjust</td>
<td>Composite mass properties; fuel slosh; possible thruster articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despin: system detumble/despin</td>
<td>IMU; force/torque sensing at grapple; star tracker</td>
<td>Spin state; spacecraft structure excitation state</td>
<td>Despin profile</td>
<td>RCS; RWA</td>
<td>Minimum-disturbance and minimum-fuel control</td>
<td>Structure flexibility; fuel slosh; thrust allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure</td>
<td>IMU; star tracker</td>
<td>Spacecraft state; CM and inertia state</td>
<td>Final CM adjust; departure trajectory</td>
<td>Winch line tensioner; SEP; RCS; RWA</td>
<td>Fine position CM; SEP deltaV control</td>
<td>Thrust allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One may generalize this approach strategy for a tumbling asteroid by again approaching along the angular momentum vector. In this case, one cannot match the motion of the asteroid precisely, since the angular velocity is not aligned with the angular momentum vector. Instead, one may choose a spin rate that in some sense minimizes the average relative motion. In this project, the angular-momentum approach was considered in the context of inertially axi-symmetrical asteroids, with the spacecraft spin rate chosen according to one of the following strategies:

- **Matching of asteroid precession rate.** By matching the precession rate, the motion of the asteroid relative to the spacecraft is canceled except for the relative spin rate. Thus, the asteroid as seen from the spacecraft appears to stand still, except for a constant spin rate around the symmetry axis of the asteroid. Matching the precession rate may be a good choice for approaching a prolate asteroid, since, if it is rotating close to major-axis spin, the relative spin rate will be much smaller than the total spin rate (i.e., the norm of the angular velocity). An illustration of this situation, produced by the Darts/Dshell visualization engine, is shown in Figure 2.

- **Matching of asteroid precession + relative spin rate.** This choice leads to a more complex relative motion between the spacecraft and asteroid, but it may be a good choice for approaching an oblate asteroid. If the asteroid is rotating close to major-axis spin, the symmetry axis of the asteroid, as seen from the spacecraft, will trace a cone, while the transverse axes will oscillate with relatively small amplitudes, leading to a “nodding” appearance.
As mentioned in Section 2, the motion of a rotating body with damped flexible modes will tend to converge toward major-axis spin over time, due to energy loss. In the spider-web capture system, sources of energy dissipation are the following:

1. **Viscoelastic damping in the cinch lines.** The cinch lines are designed to be flexible, in order to isolate the spacecraft from the motion of the asteroid and in order to maximize energy dissipation.
2. **Friction between the cinch lines and the capture bag.** The cinch lines are free to slide through the sleeves on the capture bag, opposed only by friction forces contributing toward energy dissipation.
3. **Friction between the bag and the asteroid.** As the bag is closing down on the asteroid, there will be a short period during which the asteroid is scuffing against the inside of the bag.
4. **Hysteretic damping in the robotic limbs.** As the robotic limbs flex due to changing tensions in the cinch lines, hysteretic damping contributes toward energy dissipation.
5. **Other flexible modes.** Examples include fuel slosh and solar panel flexing.

**Model Description**

Here we describe a simulation model built with the primary goal of gaining a qualitative understanding of the damping properties that might be achieved with the spider-web capture mechanism. Among the sources of energy dissipation mentioned above, we focus only on items 1 and 2, since these are thought to be most significant. Here and in subsequent simulations, it is assumed that the closing of the bag around the asteroid happens instantaneously, so that no scuffing occurs between the asteroid and the bag. This choice is made deliberately, for the following reasons:

- Accurate modeling of the friction between the asteroid and the bag is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.
- A design driver for the system is to have only engineered surfaces undergo sliding friction, since it is believed that any significant sliding friction with the asteroid increases mission risk and the required analysis.
- When simple friction models are included between the asteroid and the bag, the result is generally a more desirable behavior (due to increased energy dissipation and easing of the impact of the initial grab). The omission of bag-asteroid friction is therefore thought of as a bounding case.

Figure 4 shows an annotated overview of the model produced by the Darts/Dshell visualization engine. The spacecraft bus is represented by a solid cylinder, with six robotic limbs attached. Although each limb is modeled by a sequence of seven cylindrical elements, the connecting joints are frozen for the simulations presented here, thereby turning the spacecraft bus and the limbs into a single rigid body. The asteroid is also modeled by a solid cylinder, meaning that for this case we are considering only inertially axi-symmetrical asteroids.

The interaction between the spacecraft and the asteroid is modeled by a set of 18 cinch lines, each of which is attached to two robotic limbs (spaced 120° apart) and runs via a virtual hoop attached to the asteroid. The virtual hoop acts like a physical hoop, in that it allows the cinch line to slide freely in one degree of freedom, opposed only by Coulomb-type friction forces, while the motion is restricted in the other two degrees of freedom. Cinch line tension is modeled by a spring-damper, with restoring forces proportional to the total length of the cinch line (minus the nominal, or unsprung, tension.

**4. SPIDER-WEB CAPTURE MECHANISM**

In this section we discuss a design concept considered early on in the project, which we refer to as the spider-web capture mechanism. As described in the introduction, this concept is based around a set of six winch-controlled robotic limbs extending from the spacecraft bus to form a large barrel surrounding the asteroid. Inside the barrel is a drawstring bagging mechanism, similar to a conventional garbage bag, with a number of cinch lines in multiple planes running between the robotic limbs via sleeves on the bag. By tightening the cinch lines using winches on the robotic limbs, the bag closes down on the asteroid, leading to a configuration similar to a cocoon caught in a spider web. The entire capture mechanism is stored in a stowed configuration during launch and while en route to the asteroid, and is deployed prior to capture.

The spider-web design is formed around the idea of using the spacecraft and capture mechanism as a passive damper, to reduce the motion of the combined spacecraft-asteroid system to principal-axis spin without having to fire thrusters.

![Illustration of angular velocity matching](image-url)
length), and viscoelastic damping forces proportional to the derivative of this length. Figure 5, which shows the asteroid and capture mechanism as seen from the spacecraft point of view, gives a better picture of how a single cinch line attaches to the limbs and to the asteroid.

Figure 4. An overview of the Darts/Dshell simulation model for the spider-web capture mechanism, illustrating the spacecraft, asteroid, robotic limbs, and the cinch line-hoop interaction model

Figure 5. The asteroid and capture system as seen from the spacecraft point of view

The approach strategy considered at this stage is the angular-momentum approach.

Results

The adjustable parameters for the capture mechanism are the stiffness and damping constants, as well as the nominal length (or, equivalently, the pre-stress), of the cinch lines, together with the friction coefficient (the ratio of friction force to normal force) for the cinch line-hoop interaction. A number of point simulations were conducted with selected parameterizations for the capture mechanism, combined with different asteroid inertial properties and initial states. The main conclusions from these simulations are the following:

- For the limited number of cases studied, the simulations confirmed that the tumbling motion of the asteroid was asymptotically damped out, so that the overall system converged toward major-axis spin.
- In order to achieve damping on a time scale of a few days, the cinch lines were chosen to be very flexible, thus allowing for a large amount of relative motion. It is not clear whether the resulting system would be physically realizable with space-qualified materials.
- In the simulation model used, the energy dissipation is dominated by viscoelastic damping; changes in the friction coefficient have a more limited effect on the outcome.
- The combined spacecraft-asteroid system tends to converge toward a flat spin, where the axis of rotation is close to normal to the symmetry axis of the spacecraft bus. This is considered desirable, since it increases the thruster lever arm for subsequent de-spin.²

As an example to illustrate these points, we present simulation results for a specific case defined by the parameters listed in Table 2. In this example, the angular momentum vector points directly along the inertial z axis. Figure 6 shows the angular velocity of the asteroid, in inertial coordinates, over a 48-h period after the capture. It can be seen that the angular velocity starts with both a z component and a smaller component in the x-y plane. Over time, the x and y components are damped due to energy loss, and the angular velocity will eventually converge toward simple spin around the inertial z axis. Figure 7 similarly shows the angular velocity of the spacecraft. Because the spacecraft has

²Note that this is a function of the mass geometry of the combined spacecraft-asteroid system—by adding the mass of the spacecraft to the asteroid, the major axis of the combined system may be shifted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation parameters, spider-web example</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asteroid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin rate</td>
<td>1 deg/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutation angle</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spacecraft</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus height</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus radius</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of CM to asteroid CM</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capture mechanism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinch line stiffness constant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinch line damping constant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/(m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinch line pre-stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinch line-hoop friction coefficient</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
approached the asteroid along the angular momentum vector, it starts out with simple z axis spin. It gains an x and y component through the interaction with the asteroid, before slowly converging toward simple z-axis spin as the tumbling motion dies out.

Figure 8 shows the total energy of the system, including the kinetic energy of the asteroid and spacecraft and the potential energy of the cinch lines. As expected, the energy is strictly decreasing. Finally, Figure 9 shows the angle between the asteroid symmetry axis and the angular momentum axis, and the angle between the spacecraft symmetry axis and the angular momentum axis. From this plot it can be seen that the system is settling close to a flat spin.

From Figures 6–9 it looks as though the motion stabilizes after only a few hours. Indeed, most of the initial relative motion has been damped out at this point, but the system is spinning in an unstable pattern close to a minor axis of the combined system. This instability eventually leads to further excitation of the capture mechanism and convergence toward major-axis spin.

5. INFLATABLE CAPTURE MECHANISM
The spider-web capture design was set aside early in the project due to mechanical design and packaging considerations, related in part to the complexity introduced by the large number of robotic limbs and cinch lines. In this section, we consider a different design, in which the robotic limbs have been replaced by an inflatable exoskeleton with a built-in capture bag.

The inflatable mechanism is to be deployed shortly before initiating the asteroid capture, and takes a form similar to the robotic limbs, consisting of a conical section and a barrel section. The bag and the inflatable members supporting it are designed to rapidly collapse around the asteroid with the help of circumferential and axial winch cords sown into the fabric. Once the bag is closed up, the spacecraft and asteroid are kept apart by collapsed fabric and inflatable members that act as an isolation device between the asteroid and the spacecraft.
Model Description

The inflatable capture mechanism is modeled by attaching two sets of linear spring-dampers directly between the spacecraft bus and the asteroid, as illustrated in Figure 10. There are six attachment points around the lower perimeter of the spacecraft bus, and six corresponding attachment points on the asteroid, located on a circle around the asteroid center of mass (CM) in a plane normal to the vector between the asteroid and spacecraft CMs. Twelve spring-dampers are criss-crossed between the attachment points on the spacecraft and the attachment points on the asteroid. Another six spring-dampers are attached directly between the attachment points on the spacecraft and the corresponding attachment points on the asteroid. The two sets of spring-dampers are illustrated by the red and blue lines in Figure 11.

Figure 10. An overview of the Darts/Dshell simulation model for the inflatable capture mechanism, illustrating the spacecraft, asteroid, solar panels, and the spring-dampers. The inset shows the asteroid and capture mechanism as seen from the spacecraft point of view.

Figure 11. Inflatable capture mechanism model

Simulation parameters, inflatable example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value(s)</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asteroid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-axes</td>
<td>6, 6, and 3</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin rate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutation angle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacecraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus height</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus radius</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of CM to asteroid CM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness, criss-crossed lines</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damping, criss-crossed lines</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>N/(m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffness, straight lines</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damping, straight lines</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>N/(m/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteroid attachment radius</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.

The spring-damper configuration was originally motivated by a particular design, in which the criss-crossed lines represented a combination of axial winch cords and collapsed bag fabric, and the straight lines represented inflatable struts. However, as the design evolved, the spring-dampers came to represent an inflatable isolation device between the spacecraft and the asteroid in a more abstract sense.

Also shown in Figure 10 are solar panels that have been added to the model. The solar panels are modeled as thin cylinders mounted on zero-mass booms, which are attached to the spacecraft bus via 3-DOF ball joints. The ball joints are endowed with 3-DOF torsional spring-dampers with stiffness and damping constants set according to parameters received by the manufacturer.

The asteroid is modeled as a solid ellipsoid with three separately adjustable semi-axes, allowing us to represent any tri-inertial rigid object. As before, it is assumed that the capture itself takes place instantaneously, by attaching the spring-dampers between the spacecraft and the asteroid at a particular epoch.

A set of example parameters, which we shall refer to throughout the rest of this section, is given in Table 3.

Relationship to Physical System

Given that the simulation model is an abstraction of the true physical system, it is pertinent to ask how a quantitative relationship between the two can be established. One way of doing so is by deriving system-level stiffness and damping parameters of the model in different degrees of freedom, and comparing these to corresponding values for the physical system, derived from more complex soft-goods modeling or experiments. The results of this comparison can be used to adjust the simulation model to match the properties of a particular design, and, conversely, to synthesize design requirements that must be met by the mechanical system.

To obtain system-level stiffness and damping constants for the capture mechanism, we consider the changes in restoring...
forces and damping forces due to small deflections of the spacecraft’s position and attitude relative to the asteroid, around a setpoint defined by the nominal spring-damper lengths and zero velocities. Letting \( f \) and \( \tau \) denote the 3-dimensional vectors of restoring forces and torques with respect to some reference point, and letting \( \Delta p \) and \( \Delta \Theta \) denote the three-dimensional vectors of relative position and attitude deflections with respect to the same reference point, it can be shown that the Jacobian of \( [f; \tau] \) with respect to \( [\Delta p; \Delta \Theta] \) is given by

\[
- \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_i e_i e_i^T \right] - \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_i S_i(r_i) e_i e_i^T \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_i S_i(r_i) e_i e_i^T S(r_i)^T \right],
\]

where \( N \) is the number of spring-dampers, \( k_i \) is the stiffness constant of spring-damper \( i \), \( e_i \) is the unit vector pointing from the attachment point of spring-damper \( i \) on the spacecraft to the attachment point on the asteroid, and \( r_i \) is the vector from the reference point to the attachment point of spring-damper \( i \) on the spacecraft. The function \( S(\cdot) \), which maps from \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) to the set of \( 3 \times 3 \) skew-symmetric matrices, is such that \( S(x) y = x \times y \) for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3 \). We refer to the negative of the Jacobian as the stiffness matrix \( K \). Similarly, letting \( f_d \) and \( \tau_d \) denote damping forces and torques, the Jacobian of \( [f_d; \tau_d] \) with respect to the vector \( [\Delta v; \Delta \Omega] \) of velocity and angular velocity deflections is given by

\[
- \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i e_i e_i^T \right] + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i S_i(r_i) e_i e_i^T \right] - \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i S_i(r_i) e_i e_i^T S(r_i)^T \right],
\]

where \( c_i \) is the damping constant of spring-damper \( i \). We refer to the negative of this Jacobian as the damping matrix \( C \).

If we consider a nominal parameterization described in Table 3, using the spacecraft CM as the reference point, we obtain the following stiffness and damping matrices:

\[
K \approx \begin{bmatrix}
4943 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 8103 & 0 \\
0 & 4943 & 0 & -8103 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 68113 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -8103 & 0 & 79928 & 0 & 0 \\
8103 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 79928 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 17034
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
C \approx \begin{bmatrix}
871 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1406 & 0 \\
0 & 871 & 0 & 1406 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 12059 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1406 & 0 & 14015 & 0 & 0 \\
-1406 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1415 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2981
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Considering, for example, the translational mode along the \( z \) axis, we see that this mode is decoupled from the other modes, and has a system-level stiffness of 68,113 N/m; this number is within the limits of what can be achieved using an inflatable isolation device. We also see that the system-level damping in this mode is 12,059 N/(m/s), which translates into a relative system-level damping of \( \xi \approx 19\% \) for a 1,000,000 kg asteroid. This is a fairly high level of damping, though it may still be achievable with an inflatable isolation device.

**Results**

The simulation model has been exercised with a large number of asteroid and capture mechanism parameterizations. Some initial conclusions from these simulations were the following:

- Compared to the spider-web capture system, much stiffer spring-dampers are required in order to keep the asteroid and spacecraft separated. This is due to the difference in capture geometry—the spacecraft “pinches” the asteroid through a narrow set of directions, using lines connected directly to the spacecraft bus, instead of grabbing it from multiple directions with the help of the rigid robotic limbs.
- The spring-dampers must be arranged in a geometry that yields torsional stiffness around the \( z \) axis of the spacecraft, hence the cross-facing of the lines in the first set of spring-dampers.
- The need for stiffer spring-dampers effectively rules out relying on viscoelastic damping for detumbling the asteroid. Thus, our investigation naturally focused on a “quick-grab” strategy of rapidly catching up to the motion of the asteroid in preparation for active detumble/despinn using the spacecraft thrusters.
- Capturing the asteroid using a stiff capture mechanism results in a greater impact on the spacecraft immediately after grabbing the asteroid. A primary consideration is therefore the torque applied at the ball joints connecting the solar array booms to the spacecraft bus. These are compared to the SADA torque tolerances, for which an upper limit of 1,765 Nm in each axis is assumed.

The dynamics of the system after the grab takes place can be divided into two phases: a transient phase, in which the capture mechanism undergoes large deflections to absorb the relative motion between the spacecraft and asteroid; and a semi-steady-state phase, in which the asteroid and spacecraft act almost as a single rigid body, with very small deflections of the capture mechanism. Analysis and simulation of the semi-steady-state phase show that the SADA joint torques remain below the upper limit of 1,765 Nm even for worst-case asteroids, but the transient phase is more challenging.

When investigating the dynamics of the transient phase, we focused to a large extent on the sideways grab. There are two reasons for this, as mentioned in Section 3: (i) it represents the worst case of mismatch between the motion of the asteroid and the spacecraft, and it is therefore a good bounding case; and (ii) this type of approach is of interest because of the improved lever arm (and consequently reduced fuel requirements) during the subsequent de-spin.

Figure 12 shows the SADA joint torques for one of the solar panels for the sideways grab, using the parameterizations listed in Figure 3. In this example, the asteroid is spinning at 2 RPM, the presumed upper bound on the spin rate. It can be seen that the maximum torque far exceeds the limit of 1,765 Nm.

We are interested in seeing how the maximum torque changes when adjusting the stiffness of the capture mechanism. Figure 13 shows the maximum torque for the same example as in Figure 12, but with the stiffnesses of both sets of spring-dampers multiplied by factors between 0.1585 and 10 while keeping the damping ratios constant. Neither stiffening nor softening the mechanism is sufficient for reducing the torques to acceptable levels (softening the springs further leads to collision between the spacecraft and asteroid).

In general, the simulations indicate that, using the sideways grab strategy, the torques can be kept within acceptable limits for simple spinners up to approximately 1 RPM. When the asteroid is tumbling, the limits are exceeded for lower spin rates. Thus, the sideways grab is unlikely to be a viable practical strategy for fast spinners.
Figure 12. SADA joint torques for panel 1 during sideways grab at 2 RPM. The maximum torque far exceeds the limit of 1,765 Nm.

Figure 13. Max SADA joint torques for panel 1 for a range of stiffness multipliers

6. ABSTRACT 6-DOF JOINT

We next describe the abstract 6-DOF joint model. Here we assume that the capture bag is rigidly attached to the asteroid and connected to the ARV by an isolation device. Instead of assuming a specific design of the isolation device, we model it by an abstract 6-DOF joint consisting of three translational and three rotational linear spring-dampers, as illustrated in Figure 14. A design of the 6-DOF joint is fully specified by twelve parameters: the spring and damping coefficients for each of the six degrees of freedom. We denote the translational and rotational spring coefficients by $K_T^x$, $K_T^y$, $K_T^z$, $K_R^x$, $K_R^y$, and $K_R^z$. Likewise, we denote the translational and rotational damping coefficients by $C_T^x$, $C_T^y$, $C_T^z$, $C_R^x$, $C_R^y$, and $C_R^z$. As we explain shortly, we impose constraints on these coefficients in order to keep them within bounds that are physically realistic for an inflatable isolation device.

The objective of this abstract modeling approach is to better exploit the design space of the isolation device. A drawback of the approach outlined in the previous section is that the relationship between the stiffness and damping in different degrees of freedom is dictated by the geometrical configuration of the spring-dampers. With the 6-DOF joint, the stiffness and damping in the three translational and three rotational degrees of freedom can be specified directly and independently. As we describe in detail in the next section, the design parameters of the 6-DOF joint are tuned systematically through optimization.

We ensure that the stiffness in each degree of freedom is physically realizable by enforcing upper and lower bounds as well as symmetry constraints. Specifically, the rotational spring constants are bounded between 100,000 Nm/rad and 5,700,000 Nm/rad, while the translational spring constants are bounded between 5,000 N/m and 80,000 Nm. Since the isolation device must be symmetric about the ARV’s $z$ axis, we enforce the following symmetry constraints: $K_T^x = K_T^y$ and $K_R^x = K_R^y$. We also limit the damping coefficients to keep system-level damping percentages in the single digits. For later convenience, we denote the spring coefficients in the $x$ and $y$ axes as $K_{xy}^T$ and $K_{xy}^R$.

As in the previous section, we initially investigated the sideways grab approach, but it turned out that the requirements are not satisfied by any parameter values within the bounds described above. Instead, in the rest of this paper we focus on the angular-velocity match approach, which was described in Section 3.

7. DESIGN OPTIMIZATION

In this section we explain how we tune the design parameters of the 6-DOF joint model of the isolation device so that all the given requirements are satisfied. Our approach is to pose the design problem as a constrained optimization problem and solve it by using a genetic algorithm. Although we focus on the 6-DOF joint model in this paper, the optimization-based approach is not specific to a particular model, hence it can be used for broader classes of design problems.

Requirements

Table 4 summarizes the requirements imposed on our design problem. The first two requirements come from vehicle safety while the rest are required to keep the stiffness within physically reasonable bounds.

The maximum allowable SADA torques are 1,765 Nm in each axis, as mentioned in the previous section. The deflection
Deflection angle limited to 45° asteroid, with zero rotation defined by the relative attitude angle asteroid. The lateral and axial strokes are feasible set of design parameters. In particular, we pose a constrained optimization problem that is solved to obtain given the requirements specified above, we next formulate all possible moments of inertia and spin states. We consider asteroids with initial spin rates of up to 2 RPM and mass of up to 1,000,000 kg. Within this range, the requirements specified above must be robustly satisfied for all possible moments of inertia and spin states.

Optimization Problem Formulation

Given the requirements specified above, we next formulate a constrained optimization problem that is solved to obtain a feasible set of design parameters. In particular, we pose the optimization problem as a minimization of the deflection angle with constraints on SADA torques, lateral and axial strokes, and spring coefficients, as follows:

\[
\min \max_{t} \theta(t)
\]

over

\[
K^T_i \leq K^T_i \leq \overline{K}^T_i, \quad K^R_i \leq K^R_i \leq \overline{K}^R_i, \quad i = xy, z
\]

subject to

\[
\max_{t} T^S_{\text{SADA}}(t) \leq T^S_{\text{SADA}}, \quad \max_{t} T^A(t) \leq T^A
\]

Note that \( \theta, T^S_{\text{SADA}}, T^A \), and \( T^A \) are time-varying variables. Therefore, their maximum over time must be below the specified upper bound. Also note that we minimize the maximum deflection angle, \( \max_{t} \theta(t) \), instead of imposing a hard constraint on it. After solving the optimization problem, we check if the resulting maximum deflection angle is below the specified upper bound. If not, the design problem is infeasible.

The optimization problem can be formulated in other ways, for example, a minimization of one of the SADA joint torques while imposing constraints on the other SADA torques and the deflection angle. In general, the objective function should reflect the preference among feasible solutions. We chose the deflection angle as the objective function because it is considered to be preferable to have smaller deflection angle in order to minimize the risk of total loss of the ARV due to a collision with the asteroid. It is also possible to employ a more complicated preference metric consisting of multiple variables.

Evaluation of Objective and Constraint Functions using Darts/Dshell

We use Darts/Dshell in order to evaluate \( \theta(t), T^S_{\text{SADA}}(t), T^A(t) \), and \( T^A(t) \) in the optimization problem formulated above. We create physics models of the ARV and an asteroid, whose physical properties are specified by adjustable parameters.

As described in the previous section, we need to evaluate the maximum of the objective and constraint functions over time. Therefore, we must fully simulate the transient response, which starts at the time of contact between the capture device and the asteroid and typically lasts for \( \sim 100 \) s. This simulation must be performed at each iteration of the optimization. Its typical running time is 5–10 s.

Optimization Method

Building upon Darts/Dshell, we have recently developed the Darts/Dshell Optimizer that is capable of solving the optimization problem formulated above. Figure 16 shows the block diagram of our iterative optimization system. An optimization algorithm specifies a set of design parameters, which in our case include spring coefficients. Then the Darts/Dshell simulator is called as a subroutine that takes the design parameters as inputs and outputs the objective and constraint function values (i.e., \( \theta(t), T^S_{\text{SADA}}(t), T^A(t) \), and \( T^A(t) \)). The optimization algorithm takes them as inputs, and use the inputs to adjust the design parameters in order to refine the solution. This iteration is repeated until convergence to an optimal solution. It can handle both constrained and unconstrained optimizations.

We employ a genetic algorithm (GA) [5] to implement the Darts/Dshell Optimizer. A third-party implementation called...
the Matlab Genetic Algorithm Toolbox developed by [6] is used. GA is a metaheuristic optimization algorithm that mimics the process of natural selection. At each iteration (called a generation in a GA context), it populates individuals (i.e., candidate solutions) that have different genes, which are essentially the decision variables (design parameters in our case). The objective and constraint function values of every individual are evaluated, and high-performing individuals generate offspring to form the next generation. Genetic algorithms have been successfully applied for design problems in various domains, including spacecraft design [7], [8], [9].

In our case, the Darts/Dshell simulator is run to evaluate the objective and constraint function values for each individual at every generation. As a result, it typically takes a few hours to solve the optimization problem formulated above. In order to reduce the computation time, we implement a parallel computation capability on the Darts/Dshell Optimizer.

Robust Optimization

As mentioned earlier, the requirements must be robustly satisfied for all possible mass properties (i.e., moments of inertia) and spin states. However, although performing a robust optimization with GA is possible, it requires order-of-magnitude longer computation time than a regular GA. Instead, we obtain a robustly feasible solution as follows. First we heuristically find a “hard problem,” meaning a combination of a mass property and a spin state that tends to result in a large deflection angle, SADA torques, and lateral and axial strokes. Of course, the satisfaction of the constraints at this “hard problem” does not guarantee the satisfaction of the constraints at the worst case. In order to address this issue, we solve the “hard problem” with tightened constraints. The difference between the original constraint boundaries and the tightened boundaries works as a safety margin. Finally, we check the robust feasibility of the solution by conducting a parametric sweep over all possible combinations of the mass property and spin state, discretized at appropriate intervals. The result of the parametric sweep is described in detail in Section 8.

Table 5.

- Translational spring coefficients $K_{tx}$: 7,900 N/m
- Translational spring coefficients $K_{ty}$: 7,300 N/m
- Rotational spring coefficients $K_{tx}$: 570,000 Nm/rad
- Rotational spring coefficients $K_{ty}$: 4,630,000 Nm/rad

Optimization Result

By solving the optimization problem formulated above with the Darts/Dshell Optimizer, we obtained the solution shown in Table 5.

Note that the resulting design has low translational stiffness but high rotational stiffness. This result is qualitatively explained as follows. The low translational stiffness helps to reduce the SADA torque by slowing the transient response, but increases lateral and axial strokes. The Darts/Dshell Optimizer chose the smallest translational spring coefficients that do not violate the constraints on strokes. On the other hand, large rotational spring constants were chosen in order to minimize the deflection angle.

Figure 18 shows the time series data of the SADA joint torques, the deflection angle, and the lateral and axial stroke with the optimized design variables and the asteroid’s initial configuration shown in Figure 17. The horizontal axis of the figure is the elapsed time since the contact between the asteroid and the ARV. As can be seen from the plots, all the requirements are satisfied over this period. Note that the SADA torque about the y axis and the lateral stroke is very close to the constraint boundary, while the deflection angle is well below its upper bound. This result is expected because we formulate the optimization problem as a minimization of
deflection angle with hard constraints on the SADA torques and the strokes. Irregular transient responses are observed for approximately 50 s after the contact. Then follows an oscillatory behavior with approximately 80-s period.

By mass property we mean the mass and the moments of inertia of the asteroid. We assume that the mass is at the upper bound, 1,000,000 kg. Without loss of generality we assume that the principal axes correspond to the x, y, and z axes of the asteroid’s body frame. The ARV’s dynamic behavior is influenced by the asteroid’s mass, moments of inertia, and spin state, but not its shape. Therefore we assume without loss of generality that the asteroid is a solid ellipsoid. Its moments of inertia are fully specified by the length of its three semi-axes, which are denoted by $r_x$, $r_y$, and $r_z$. We assume $r_x \geq r_y \geq r_z$ and fix $r_z$ to its upper bound, 6.5 m. We let $r_y = k_x r_x$, and $r_z = k_z r_x$, and we vary $k_x$ and $k_z$ within a range $0.3 \leq k_x \leq 1$ with an interval of 0.1.

As for the spin state, we assume that the angular velocity is aligned with the $z$ axis of the inertial frame. We specify the initial attitude of the asteroid by Euler angles relative to the inertial frame, denoted by $\alpha$ (about the $x$ axis), $\beta$ (y axis), and $\gamma$ (z axis). We sweep over 38 initial attitudes, 19 of which are with $\beta = \gamma = 0$ and $\alpha = 0^\circ, 10^\circ, \ldots, 90^\circ$ while the others are with $\alpha = \gamma = 0$ and $\beta = 0^\circ, 5^\circ, 10^\circ, \ldots, 90^\circ$. The spin rate is varied from 0.5 RPM to 2 RPM with an interval of 0.5 RPM. This results in 5,472 combinations in total.

Figure 19 shows the result of the parametric sweep. In all the 5,472 cases, the requirements are fully satisfied.

9. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results of Section 8 suggest that, with a properly designed capture mechanism, it is indeed possible to handle the range of asteroids baselined for this study without giving rise to excessive loads on critical spacecraft components. Figure 19 indicates that the SADA torques are generally small; however, as explained in Section 7, the capture mechanism parameters were not chosen to minimize the torques, but to minimize the deflection angle subject to the torque constraint. Moreover, some of the worst-case scenarios may be considered unlikely enough to be excluded from future consideration. The asteroids resulting in the highest SADA torques tend to have the following characteristics:

- High spin rate
- Oblate shape
- Inertially axi-symmetrical mass geometry
- Large aspect ratio
- Large nutation angle (i.e., far from major-axis spin)

Clearly, many aspects of the capture problem are not reflected in the current simulation model. Some of the topics to be addressed in future work include the following:

- **Design realizability.** Although the design optimization was carried out with realistic bounds on stiffness and damping parameters, the parameters for each degree of freedom were chosen independently. For a given passive mechanical system, additional constraints will inevitably exist between the various degrees of freedom; these can be taken into account by introducing additional constraints in the optimization problem.
- **Precision of angular velocity match.** For the results in Section 8, it was assumed that the capture mechanism attaches to the asteroid instantaneously, at the moment when the angular velocity of the spacecraft is precisely matched with that of the asteroid. In reality, the capture will not be instantaneous, and there will be some residual relative motion between the asteroid and the spacecraft.
- **Settling dynamics.** In addition to the loads caused by the
motion of the asteroid, the act of quickly grabbing an unevenly shaped asteroid will induce loads on the spacecraft at the very beginning of the grapple phase

We end by noting that hardware-in-the-loop simulations, incorporating a scale model of an actual capture device, are planned for the future.

Figure 19. Parametric sweep results. The black lines show the maximum value at each spin rate.