

Session 3 Summary
Mission Design: Getting There and Back

Chaired by:
Brent W. Barbee (NASA-GSFC)
Daniel R. Adamo (Consultant, formerly JSC)

Open Global Community NEO Workshop
George Washington University

February 22nd, 2011

Session 3 Summary: Findings

- ▶ Mission opportunities proliferate according to HSF capability and NEO characteristics
- ▶ Impulses comparable to a lunar orbit mission require NEO mission duration > 1 year
- ▶ Flexible exploration requires sustained access to progressively more interesting targets
- ▶ Missions to NEOs bridge HSF capability gap from orbiting the Moon to orbiting Mars
- ▶ A reasonable IMLEO limit of ≈ 300 mT greatly restricts future mission opportunities to currently known NEOs
- ▶ Even at > 100 mT IMLEO per launch, multiple launches are required for NEO missions
- ▶ Close Earth/NEO encounters are necessary for discoveries *and* for low Δv / low duration HSF mission opportunities
- ▶ There are 18 NEOs for which mission opportunities with IMLEO < 200 mT and duration < 180 days were available near their discovery epochs
- ▶ Practical, affordable missions result from visiting the most accessible NEOs
- ▶ Short mission duration reduces habitation/consumables/shielding/trash mass & volume
- ▶ Bigger near-term ROI is obtained from better NEO survey/tracking than from better HSF capability
- ▶ Multiple launches and orbit assembly prior to HSF Earth departure incurs significant risk
- ▶ Risk reduction via infrastructure is more costly than via launch optimization
- ▶ An architecture that involves redesignated NEO destinations or reused elements must not require departure from LEO

Session 3 Summary: Recommendations

- ▶ Thoroughly catalog, characterize, and track NEOs down to 100 m diameter or less
- ▶ Identify key HSF technologies and architectures relating to NEO mission opportunities
- ▶ Survey NEOs from deep space vantage to find the best mission opportunities in advance
- ▶ Target initial HSF missions at the most accessible NEOs with conventional technology
- ▶ Minimize the number of launches and assembly complexity required for crewed Earth departure
- ▶ Utilize metrics such as IMLEO, reflecting mission duration and performance for all mission phases, and accounting for launch ascent performance as driven by Earth departure asymptote declination; this requires the adoption of a baseline mission architecture for use in computations but is much more useful than a simple Δv tally subsequent to Earth orbit insertion