

Reconfigurable contour beam synthesis using a mechanical FEM surface description of dual offset reflector antenna surfaces

W.H. THEUNISSEN

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Philosophiae Doctor

in the
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
SOUTH AFRICA
January 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1. Geostationary satellites	1
1.2. Antenna systems on geostationary satellites	6
1.3. The mechanical finite element diffraction synthesis technique	8
Chapter 2: Diffraction synthesis and radiation pattern computation for reflector antennas	11
2.1. Geometry of the dual reflector antenna and coordinate description	13
2.2. Subreflector analysis	15
2.2.1. Calculation of specular points	15
2.2.2. Edge diffraction	21
2.3. Calculation of the far-field radiation pattern	24
2.3.1. The p-series method	24
2.3.2. The Jacobi-Bessel series expansion method	26
2.3.3. The Gaussian beam technique	36
2.4. Surface expansion in terms of the Modified Jacobi polynomials	44
2.5. Verification of the accuracy of the developed codes	47
2.5.1. The p-series method	47

2.5.2. The Gaussian beam technique	52
2.6. Calculation of the antenna footprint	54
Chapter 3: Optimization of the contour beam gain cost function	56
3.1. Cost function	56
3.2. Optimization methods	57
3.2.1. The Steepest Gradient Solver	57
3.2.2. The Genetic Algorithm Solver	58
3.3. Design of a CONUS beam	60
Chapter 4: Mechanical design of the reflector	65
4.1. Mechanical description of the surfaces using shell elements	65
4.2. Diffraction synthesis results and mechanical design performance	70
Chapter 5: Contour beam synthesis using the mechanical FEM	
surface description	77
5.1. Mechanical FEM diffraction synthesis	77
5.2. The effect of mechanical surface properties on actuator number and placement	81
5.3. Synthesis of an adjustable elliptical beam using the mechanical FEM surface description	93
5.4. Synthesis of an reconfigurable beam using the mechanical FEM surface description	97
Chapter 6: Conclusion	101
References	103

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the help and encouragement of the following people:

Professors J. Joubert and W.J. Odendaal of the University of Pretoria, my study leaders, Professor W.D. Burnside of The Ohio State University ElectroScience Laboratory, for all his help and advice, Professor G. Washington of the Smart Materials and Structures Laboratory at The Ohio State University.

I would also like to thank Hwansik Yoon for his valuable help in understanding mechanical finite element analysis and for writing the FEM unit of the diffraction synthesis code and Dr. Teh-Hong Lee, Dr. Hsi-Tseng Chou and Prof. P.H. Pathak for their help and support.

This dissertation is dedicated to Heidi.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The subtended angle of the earth as seen from a geostationary satellite is approximately 17°	4
Figure 2. Geometry of the dual offset reflector antenna.	14
Figure 3. Geometry of Cassegrain dual offset reflector antenna.	15
Figure 4. Perfectly conducting wedge for calculation of diffraction from subreflector edge	23
Figure 5 (a) Modified Jacobi polynomial for $m=0$	29
Figure 5 (b) Modified Jacobi polynomial for $m=1$	29
Figure 5 (c) Modified Jacobi polynomial for $m=2$	30
Figure 6. Co-polarized surface current density for a Cassegrain type dual offset reflector antenna.	31
Figure 7. Far-field radiation pattern for the Cassegrain DOSR geometry shown in figure 6	32
Figure 8(a). Calculated far-field for a dual offset reflector antenna showing the subreflector edge diffraction effect for an oversized subreflector	33
Figure 8(b). Subreflector edge diffraction effect on the radiation pattern of a dual offset reflector antenna	34
Figure 9. Diagram to determine sampling interval effect on the visible k-space spectrum	35
Figure 10. Mapping of GB's onto the solid angle subtended at the feed by the reflector rim	37
Figure 11. Samples of coordinate systems used for launched beams showing location of the real part of the saddle point (magenta circles) for a 10° offset angle from boresight going around in 36° increments	39
Figure 12. Projection showing unit circle used for surface series expansion of the subreflector in terms of the modified Jacobi polynomials	45
Figure 13 (a). Co-polarized far-field calculated using the developed p-series code	48
Figure 13 (b). Cross-polarized far-field calculated using the developed	

p-series code	49
Figure 14 (a). Co-polarized far-field calculated using OSU NECREF Version 3.0 . . .	50
Figure 14 (b). Cross-polarized far-field calculated using OSU NECREF Version 3.0	51
Figure 15. Far-field calculated using PO and the GB technique for a front fed offset parabolic reflector shaped using the modified Jacobi polynomial expansion	53
Figure 16. u-v-space test grid mapping onto geocentric surface. Test points are used to calculate the cost function during synthesis	55
Figure 17. Required main and subreflector surface deviation in 1mm contour intervals for CONUS type contour beam	62
Figure 18. Template used to calculate cost function during synthesis of the CONUS beam	63
Figure 19. CONUS beam generated using combination of genetic and steepest gradient solvers in synthesis algorithm	63
Figure 20. Actuator positions projected on the x_s - y_s plane	67
Figure 21. Showing individual stack showing clamshell configuration	68
Figure 22. Rainbow actuators in stacked clam configuration	69
Figure 23. Required deviation from the initial hyperboloid surface in 2 mm contour intervals and the calculated co-polarized antenna radiation footprint for case 2	72
Figure 24. Required deviation from the initial hyperboloid surface in 2 mm contour intervals and the calculated co-polarized antenna radiation footprint for case 4	73
Figure 25. The achievable subreflector surface with no actuator adjustment and the resulting co-polarized radiation footprint	74
Figure 26. Mechanically achievable surface and the calculated co-polarized radiation pattern for case 2	75
Figure 27. Mechanically achievable surface and the calculated co-polarized radiation pattern for case 4	76
Figure 28. FEM shell element geometry	78
Figure 29. Subreflector projection in the x_s - y_s plane showing the FEM node-	

and element positions	79
Figure 30. Subreflector surface deviation due to displacement of actuator 66 by 10mm	80
Figure 31. Required surface deviation contours in 1 mm contour intervals for the subreflector surface with an unshaped main reflector giving a cost function of 59.5 units on an elliptical contour beam case	81
Figure 32 (a) Surface deviation contours for 16 actuators arranged in a triangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	84
Figure 32 (b) Surface deviation contours for 22 actuators arranged in a triangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	85
Figure 32 (c) Surface deviation contours for 38 actuators arranged in a triangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	86
Figure 33 (a) Surface deviation contours for 15 actuators arranged in a rectangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	87
Figure 33 (b) Surface deviation contours for 21 actuators arranged in a rectangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	88
Figure 33 (c) Surface deviation contours for 40 actuators arranged in a rectangular pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	89
Figure 34 (a) Surface deviation contours for 14 actuators arranged in a radial pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	90
Figure 34 (b) Surface deviation contours for 21 actuators arranged in a radial pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05", 0.1" and 0.3" respectively	91
Figure 34 (c) Surface deviation contours for 39 actuators arranged in a radial pattern and bonded to different surface material thickness of 0.05",	

0.1'' and 0.3'' respectively	92
Figure 35. Co-polarized far-field for the 0° elliptical beam case	94
Figure 36. Co-polarized far-field for the 45° elliptical beam case	95
Figure 37. Co-polarized far-field for the 90° elliptical beam case	96
Figure 38. Synthesized subreflector surface and Brazilian co-polarized radiation pattern footprint	98
Figure 39. Synthesized subreflector surface and Southern Africa co-polarized radiation pattern footprint	99
Figure 40. Synthesized subreflector surface and Australian co-polarized radiation pattern footprint	100