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## ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis of the Ascent portion of the GT-6A flight. IGS system performance during the Ascent phase of the mission was near perfect. The results of the analysis.indicate that the in-plane system navigation components were within $1 \sigma$ of ideal performance. With the exception of Stage II guidance initiation, the maximum IGS pitch and yaw attitude errors seen during flight were less than $1.5^{\circ}$ and $-2.0^{\circ}$, respectively.
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the analysis of the performance of the on-board computer during the Ascent phase of the GT-6B flight.

The purpose of this study was to verify that no anomalies occurred in the computer or its program during the Prelaunch and Ascent phases of the flight. The study was made using the Operational Program interpretive simulation which executes a Gemini computer program tape (magnetic) on the 7090 DPS. The simulation uses fixed point arithmetic and Gemini computer word length. Also, several associated simulation runs were made using the FORTRAN model of the GDC Ascent mode. The implementation of the study is discussed in detail in Reference l. The results obtained from the analysis of the GT-6B flight are discussed in the sections to follow.

Appendix A contains a tabulation of the DAS data obtained from the GT-6B flight. The data was obtained from one telemetry station and, therefore, has several discrete areas where data is incorrect or missing. However, the DAS parameter time histories are sufficiently complete to allow comparison with the flight reconstruction data which is included in graphical form in Appendix B. The data presented in Appendix B was derived using the GT-6B Operational Program as simulated on the 7090 DPS. This simulation performs all the Gemini arithmetic and logic operations in a manner identical to the GDC including fixed point arithmetic and parameter scaling. Additional details on the operation of this simulation as well as suggested improvements to the techniques used are described in Reference 1. These improvements have as yet not been implemented since authorization to do so has not been obtained.

The remainder of this section describes and explains the various data obtained from the flight and through mission reconstruction. It is divided into the following general areas of interest:
2.1 Gimbal Angle and Attitude Error Behavior
2.2 Position and Velocity Comparisons
2.3 Platform Azimuth Alignment
2.4 IGS Injection Conditions
2. 5 Navigation Accuracy
2.6 IVAR and IVI Operation
2. 7 IGS Discretes and Lift-off Synchronization
2.1 Gimbal Angle and Attitude Error Behavior

Figures 1 through 3 present the Inertial Guidance System Attitude errors obtained from post flight reconstruction. Inspection of the IGS attitude errors from lift-off through SECO revealed no unusual or unexpected behavior. However, the nature of the errors was somewhat different than seen on previous flights because of the biased azimuth launch technique employed for this flight.

During Stage I guidance the IGS attitude error signals reached the following maximum values:

| Pitch | $+1.87^{\circ}$ | @ 87 seconds* |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yaw | $-2.14^{\circ}$ | @ 114 seconds |
| Roll | $+1.27^{\circ}$ | @ 17 seconds $\%$ |

* The maximum pitch error command on telemetry was $1.45^{\circ}$ at 87 seconds.
** The maximum roll error command on telemetry was $0.72^{\circ}$ at lift-off.

The behavior of the pitch command as shown in Figure 1 is attributed to pitch programs.tart time differences between the primary and back-up systems and primary pitch programmer drift. This is expected since the Inertial Guidance System can initiate a pitch step up to $1 / 2$ computation cycle early. A primary pitch programmer pitch rate error of approximately $+23^{\circ} /$ hour (pitch up) is evident in the graph.

The roll error signal reached a value of $0.72^{\circ}$ immediately following lift-off, corresponding directly to a $0.72^{\circ}$ increase in the roll gimbal angle at this time. The roll error subsequently decreased through Stage I, reaching a value of $-.2^{\circ}$ just before staging. After staging, this signal changed abruptly to $-1.5^{\circ}$, reflecting the Stage II engine thrust alignment. The signal remained at this approximate $=1$ evel until SECO.

Inspection of the roll gimbal angle data indicates that the launch vehicle rolled $3.53^{\circ}$ during the roll program as compared with $3.54^{\circ}$ which was desired.

## 2.1 (Continued)

The pitch error signal reached a maximum value of $1.4^{\circ}$ at 90 seconds during Stage I. This error signal reached $+2.7^{\circ}$ at the initiation of Stage II guidance and is similar to characteristics seen in previous flights. The error signal slowly decreases as the primary system pitches the vehicle down and becomes null at about 210 seconds. The signal remains less than $0.5^{\circ}$ until SECO is reached.

During Stage $I$, the yaw attitude error reaches a maximum positive value of $1.2^{\circ}$ at about 80 seconds and a largest negative value of $-2.1^{\circ}$ at 114 seconds. Examination of the yaw gimbal angle behavior during Stage I indicates that the error signal variations are correlated with the vehicle yaw attitude commanded by the RGS as measured by the IGS yaw gimbal angle readings. Although the error signal and gimbal angle behavior are not as "smooth" as noted in earlier flights, no anomalies are noted. At staging, the yaw attitude error signal shows a shift of $+3^{\circ}$, which is approximately twice the shift noted on the GT-7 flight.

When Stage II guidance is initiated at approximately 168 seconds, the yaw attitude error signal reaches a maximum negative value of $-5^{\circ}$. It remains constant at this value for several seconds until the primary system starts to yaw the vehicle to the desired Stage II yaw attitude. The error then decreases and reaches null at about 210 seconds. The Stage II yaw error signal behavior is thus similar to the Stage II pitch error signal behavior and is attributable to the smoothing of data performed in the RGS. The yaw signal remains less than $0.5^{\circ}$ until just before SECO, when it becomes more negative and reaches about $-1^{\circ}$. This reflects the yaw right maneuver of the vehicle required by the IGS to null its measured out-of-plane velocity.

The attitude error characteristics after SECO reflect the vehicle attitude changes during the thrust tail-off period.

At about 358 seconds the rendezvous equations are entered as evidenced by the sudden shifts in IGS attitude error. The roll error signal reaches $+92.3^{\circ}$ corresponding to the counter clockwise rotation required to put the astronauts in a heads-up-orientation. The pitch attitude error signal is $-2^{\circ}$ reflecting the pitch up maneuver required to put the spacecraft in a horizontal attitude. The yaw attitude error reaches $-19^{\circ}$ reflecting the yaw right rotation of the vehicle required to correct the IGS out-of-plane velocity when forward thrusting is applied. The attitude error signals generated for the spacecraft at SECO +20 seconds for the orbit adjustment (IVAR) are listed in Table 4, IVAR and IVI operation.

## 2.1 (Continued)

Figures 12 and 13 represent the measured and commanded pitch and yaw attitudes as well as the pitch and yaw attitude commands as generated during post flight reconstruction. These plots show that following the Stage II guidance initiate transients, the RGS has steered the vehicle to the attitude desired by the back-up system. This excellent agreement between the two guidance systems results in the back-up system attitude error commands being very near zero for the duration of Stage II flight. The yaw error command deviates from zero near SECO because of the out-of-plane velocity residual measured by the back-up system. The noise appearing in these plots is caused by the linear interpolation used in reconstructing the mission and has been reported in previous Gemini post flight analysis documents.

### 2.2 Position and Velocity Comparisons

Table 1 compares the in-flight DAS navigation data with similar data derived frommissionreconstruction using the FORTRAN and Operational Program simulations. Inspection of this data indicates that a bit-for-bit comparison was not obtained in either reconstruction simulation, nor is it immediately obvious that one simulation provides a better reproduction of the flight than the other.

The largest position difference between the flight results and those obtained through reconstruction is seen in the $X$ component of the Operational Program Run ( 400 feet at 340 seconds). The major contributor to the 400 foot difference appears to be linear interpolation of data between DAS frames at SECO.

The reconstructed velocities are within 0.5 fps of the flight values. The velocity differences which exist at the end of the reconstruction are attributable to several factors. These are linear interpolation of data between DAS data frames, differences caused by the fixed point vs. floating point arithmetic of the simulations and different navigation error growth characteristics between the FORTRAN and Operational Programs. These factors have been discussed in detail in previous post flight analysis reports. Since the velocity and position differences for this flight reconstruction are so small, a detailed analysis to precisely isolate the various error contributions did not seem warranted.
TABLE 1 - POSITION AND VELOCITY COMPARISON
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## Platform Azimuth Alignment

Reconstruction of the in-flight DAS data indicated that the platform roll gimbal angle at the time of platform release was within two quanta (.072 $)$ of the value desired by the IGS. The value read by the GDC was 90.252 degrees (2507 quanta) and the commanded roll gimbal angle was 90.189 degrees.

The in-flight results indicated that both azimuth updates were received and properly used by the GDC. Table 2 lists the platform azimuth alignment values obtained from the flight reconstruction runs. The difference in misalignment estimates after the 140 second update is less than 8.5 sec and would contribute less than $1.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ out-of-plane velocity difference at SECO.

### 2.4 IGS Injection Conditions

Table 3 presents the IGS measured injection conditions obtained during the flight and those obtained from the post flight reconstruction simulations. Column 4 of the table lists the IGS navigation errors as measured by STL. These errors have been combined with the $X, Y$, and $Z$ velocity and position data from the flight, to derive the actual $X, Y$, and $Z$ velocity and position achieved in the flight, which is given in Column 5. The insertion parameters quoted in Column 5 were computed from the corrected $X, Y, Z$ data and should thus represent the actual insertion conditions achieved in the flight ( $V_{\perp}$ may be in error by lo 2 fps since the reconstruction value for platform misalignment had to be used in its computation). The indicated IGS navigation errors in terms of the insertion parameters are thus 3.1 fps in total velocity, -10.7 fps in radial velocity, -1.7 fps in out-of-plane velocity and -662 feet in altitude.

The IGS targeting quantities were biased to account for anticipated navigation errors of 1.9 fps in $X$ velocity, 0.9 fps in $Y$ velocity, and -0.2 in $Z$ velocity. It is noted that the velocity errors realized exceeded the anticipated errors by 11.1 fps in $Y$ and 2.6 fps in $Z$ velocity and the $X$ velocity error was smaller by 0.9 fps . It is concluded that had a switchover to the IGS been made early in the flight, the IGS would have achievedithe desired insertion conditions: within the specified tolerances.

### 2.5. Navigation Accuracy

Table 3 lists the IGS velocity and position errors as obtained from STL. The relatively large $Y$ velocity error suggest a bias or scale factor error on that axis. However, the navigation errors are within $1 \sigma$ of nominal performance.
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is approximately $8.5 \overparen{\mathrm{sec}}$ or equivalently a $1.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ out-of-plane velocity error at SECO.

Differences between the final Fortran and Operational Program results above
Values of $V_{7 G}$ received by the IGS via DCS from the Burroughs system were .68 .5 at 105 seconds and 425.25 at 145 seconds.
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IGS parameters listed were obtained from inflight DAS data.
(2) Out-of-plane velocity was, calculated using platform misalignment obtained from flight
(3) FOconstruction data.
fORTRAN and Operational Program results were obtained from reconstruction of the
(4) IGght using DAS accelerometer and gimbal angle data.
(5) IGS navigation data obtained from STL, error defined as IGS minus tracking data.
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### 2.6 IVAR and IVI Operation

Table 4 lists the IVI and FDI readings following SECO +20. These readings were obtained from the post flight reconstruction simulation. The roll attitude error is saturated (unlimited value is $92^{\circ}$ ), indicating the spacecraft should be rolled upright to the heads-up orientation. The pitch attitude error is $-2.2^{\circ}$ initially, indicating a desired pitch-up to a local horizontal attitude. The yaw attitude error is $-18.9^{\circ}$ indicating a yaw right command. This signal is large because the out-of-plane correction, 9.4 fps , is large relative to the in-plane correction, 20.4 fps .

The total velocity computed by the IGS indicates that the astronaut simultaneously rolled upright and thrusted to gain approximately 10 fps following separation. This is indicated as the X IVI is reduced from 21 to 12 fps and the roll signal decreased from $92.3^{\circ}$ to $7^{\circ}$ in the time interval from 359 to 373 seconds. When the heads-up orientation is achieved at 378 seconds $\left(\Delta \emptyset_{b}=-.2^{\circ}\right.$ ), the indicated in-plane correction is 12 fps forward, 1 fps down and the out-of-plane correction is 4 fps . The indicated pitch attitude is to pitch down $2.6^{\circ}$ (which would cause the total in-plane correction to appear on the FWD/AFT channel) and to yaw right $19.8^{\circ}$. These indications correspond to the IGS calculated $V_{g a}$. . (in-plane velocity correction required to reach apogee) of 11 fps and the out-of-plane velocity error of 6 fps .

TABLE 4
IVARAND IVI OPERATION

| Time <br> sec | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IVI-X } \\ & \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec} \end{aligned}$ | IVI- Y <br> $\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{sec}$ | IVI-Z <br> ft/sec | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta 0_{b} \\ & \text { dea } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta \Psi_{\mathrm{b}} \\ & \text { deg } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta \emptyset_{\mathrm{b}} \\ & \text { deg } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 359.7 | 21 | -1 | -7 | -2.2 | -18.9 | 92.3 |
| 361.8 | 19 | -1 | -7 | -2.0 | -19.3 | 92.5 |
| 363.8 | 18 | 0 | $=6$ | -. 9 | -18.4 | 86.0 |
| 366.6 | 16 | +3 | - 5 | - . 3 | -19.9 | 62.9 |
| 368.6 | 15 | 5 | -2 | +. 4 | -19.3 | 25.7 |
| 371.3 | 13 | 5 | -1 | +1.0 | -20.3 | 14.3 |
| 373.4 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 1.5 | $-20.0$ | 7.2 |
| 376.2 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2.1 | -19.7 | 2.1 |
| 378.4 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | -19.8 | - . 2 |
| 380.4 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 3.3 | -19.2 | . 1 |
| 383.2 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 3.9 | -18.2 | -. 1 |

### 2.7 IGS Discretes and Lift-off Synchronization

Detailed analysis of IGS time since lift-off, "tDAS" and comparison . with range time provides an estimate of lift-off synchronization (See Reference 1, Section IV. G). On this flight the analysis indicated the IGS was $21 \pm 15$ milliseconds late in the determination of lift-off. An error of 9 milliseconds is known to exist in a program constant used in lift-off determination (See IBM Report \#65-554-0042, Reference 3). This error results in an apparent delay in IGS lift-off synchronization. The synchronization accuracy obtained from. this flight is reasonable.

Table 5 presents a list of various discrete events issued or controlled by the IGS.

It was determined that the IGS SECO discrete was issued at a tDAS time of $338.739 \pm .003$ seconds. The tDAS time is lagging real time by 0.021 $\pm 0.015$ seconds $\bar{a}$ lift-off but the analysis indicates that the clock is running fast at about 95 ppm . Therefore, at the time the SECO discrete is issued, about 0.032 seconds have been gained and the corrected time for delivery of the IGS SECO discrete is $338.728+0.015$ seconds after lift-off. A preliminary value quoted by Aerospace for $R \bar{G} S$ SECO time is 338.737 seconds.

Analysis of the IGS velocity data in the area near SECO provides an estimate of $78 \pm 5 \mathrm{fps}$ for the Stage II engine cut-off impulse.
Time (1)

(sec) $\quad$| Elatform Release |
| :--- |

(1) All times are quoted based on GDC clock readings. The times are not corrected for lift-off sync errors.

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Time (1)
$(\mathrm{sec})$
168.192
338.728
$360.187^{(1)}$

Event
Time Stage II Guidance Initiate

IGS SECO (Uncertainty $+3.0 \mathrm{msec})$

IVAR Initiation

## Comment

Time quoted is the time at which attitude error signals. generated by the IGS Stage. II equations, are first sent to the autopilot.

Lift-off time synchronization error and clock drift are accounted for in quoted time.

Time is again quoted to reflect the time at which IVAR attitude errors are first displayed.
(1) All times are quoted based on GDC clock readings. The times are not corrected for lift-off sync errors.
3.0 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are formed based on the analysis performed and documented in this report:

1. IGS system performance during the Ascent portion of this mission was near perfect.
2. IGS navigation errors at SECO +20 were approximately $+1.0,+12.0$ and -2.8 fps on the $X, Y$ and $Z$ axes, respectively. This resulted in IGS errors of approximately 3.1 fps in velocity magnitude, -1.7 fps in the out-of-plane direction and - 10.7 fps in radial velocity.
3. IMU performance was within $1 \sigma$ of nominal.
4. With the exception of the attitude errors seen at Stage II guidance initiation, the maximum IGS pitch and yaw attitude errors seen during flight were less than $1.5^{\circ}$ and $-2.0^{\circ}$, respectively.
5. IGS was successful in accepting airborne azimuth updates and reducing what could have been a potential 230 fps out-of-plane velocity error to one less than 1 fps . The calculated platform misalignment on this flight was on the order of $-.53^{\circ}$.
6. IGS lift-off synchronization was established late by $21 \pm 15$ milliseconds.
4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis performed did not result in any recommendations in the GDC analytic equation area. Several recommendations were made as a result of the analysis of the GT-4 flight (Reference 2). These were as follows:

1. Sequence $\eta_{X}, V_{Z G}, S F_{X}, S F_{Y}, S F_{Z}$ and time of IGS SECO by multiplexing the DAS word position now allotted to $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{ZG}}$.
2. Add IGS SECO discrete to Martin telemetry to be sampled at 400 cps rate.
3. Use "START COMP" button in Ascent mode to eliminate undesirable entry into the Ascent mode afterAscent guidance is completed.

Of these recommendations, the first and third have been implemented in Math Flow 7, Modules II and V. The third recommendation was implemented using a time test instead of the "START COMP" button.
$\therefore$. 18
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## INTRODUCTION

For the purpose of the final report on the operation of the IBM Gemini Computer \#16 aboard the Gemini 6 spacecraft during the CatchUp and Rendezvous phases, emphasis will be placed upon:
1).The Rendezvous mode test between 12,235 and 13,274 seconds elapsed time.
2). The Catch-Up phase between 13,600 and 13,769 seconds.
3) The use of the Rendezvous mode prior to the closed loop transfer maneuver.
4) The closed loop Rendezvous phase between 17, 702 and 20,64l seconds TPI at 19,139 seconds elapsed time.
5) The TPF phase between 20,900 and 21,250 seconds.

Interest in Phases I and III developed because of the concern about an apparent incorrect value of transfer angle to Rendezvous, $W_{T}$, in the computer during and following the mode test, the reason for it and its effect upon the results from the computer in determining the TPI maneuver. Analysis of these phases was performed using selected DAS data input to a static simulator program and a telephone conversation with the Gemini 6 pilot.

Phases II, IV and V were analyzed using the post flight program which utilizes all the pertinent data from the DAS tapes. Briefly, the technique employed is to pass the flight DAS values of the three platform gimbal angles, the radar data (range, sine azimuth angle, sine elevation angle), the platform velocity sums and time associated with each parameter to the Math Flow 6 Operational Program by means of the normal ADCR $\Longleftrightarrow$ Control Program $\leftrightharpoons$ Operational Program communication link. In addition; the data decks are prepared such that the actual flight MDIU/DCS inserts are used. The generated IVI readings, based on these flight inputs, are then compared to the flight IVI values. For Rendezvous, the post flight reconstruction uses flight DAS data from and elapsed time of 17,701.97 seconds (time in mode of $3,803.46$ ) to an elapsed time of $20,641.62$ seconds (time in mode of $6,743.57$ ). This is sufficient time to exercise the taking of radar points and the display and decrementing of the IVI readings prior to the primary burn, and to follow the IVI displays through that burn and through the first and second vernier burns. The Catch-Up reconstruction uses the data from an elapsed time of $13,600.9$ seconds (time in mode of 1.903 seconds) to $13,768.8$ seconds (time in mode of 169.83 seconds).

PHASES I AND III
The DAS data of the periods indicated was converted to the format required by an IBM Rendezvous mode test program used for static simulation in floating point arithmetic to establish what the onboard computer should have been displaying to the pilot. A gap in the DAS data on hand at the present time exists between 15,482 and 17,279 seconds elapsed time and no displays occurring in this interval can be checked against the flight log. Inputs to the static simulator were data points consisting of radar range ( $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{R}}$ ), sine of radar elevation angle ( $\sin \mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ ), sine of radar azimuth angle ( $s i n r^{\prime}$ ), platform pitch gimbal angle ( $\theta_{b}$ ), platform yaw gimbal angle ( $\Psi_{b}$ ), platform roll gimbal angle $\left(\emptyset_{b}\right)$, and time of each data point.

Since a questionable value of $W_{T}$ was in the computer during the mode test prior to the coelliptic maneuver, three static simulation runs were made; the first used $W_{T}=180^{\circ}$, the second used $W_{T}=270^{\circ}$ and the third used $W_{T}=130^{\circ}$. The results of the IVI readings from the simulation runs and the DAS data are tabulated in Table I.

## TABLEI

## COMPARISON OF IVI READINGS FROM MODE TEST PERIOD

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Time* }(\mathrm{sec}) \\ & \text { in Mode } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \Delta V_{T}(\mathrm{fps}) \\ \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}=180^{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}(\mathrm{fps}) \\ \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}=270^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta V_{T}(f p s) \\ W_{T}=130^{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{T}}(\mathrm{fps})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 720 | 999 | 274 | - 9995 | 272 |
| 820 | - 999 | 248 | - . 944 | 253 |
| 920 | 999 | 303 | 999 | 308 |
| 1020 | 999 | 301 | 966 | 308 |

*NOTE: Time in mode re-initialized to zero at 12,235 seconds.
It is concluded that the value of $W_{T}$ in the computer during the interval of 12,235 to 13,274 seconds elapsed time was $270^{\circ}$. This agrees with the pilot's comment that $W_{T}$ was not entered during the mode test. The initial value table for the Rendezvous mode sets the value of $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ to $270^{\circ}$. No inflight values of $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}$ could be recalled by the pilot for this mode test interval.

PHASES I AND III ( continued)
An insert of $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}=130^{\circ}$ was then made in accordance with the flight plan before proceeding with the mission. Three points recalled by the pilot from inflight MDIU readouts were:

| Radar Range (n.m.) |  | $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}(\mathrm{fps})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{fps})$ |  |
| 117.89 | 544 |  |  |
| 61. | 181 | -- |  |
| 46. | 96 | 74.8 |  |
|  |  | 34. |  |

One static simulation run using $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}=130^{\circ}$ was made for the interval from 13,900 to 19,139 seconds elapsed time. Time in mode is again re-initialized to zero at 13,900 seconds. The time history of radar range, IVI readings and $\Delta V_{i}$ are tabulated in Table II.

TABLE II

| Time (sec) in Mode | Radar <br> Range (n.m.) | $\Delta V_{T}(f p s)$ Simulated | $\Delta V_{i}(f p s)$ Simulated | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{T}}(\mathrm{fps}) \\ \mathrm{DAS} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 720 | 146.76 | 711 | 342.1 | 712 |
| 820 | 144.17 | 709 | 344.6 | 701 |
| 920 | 141.59 | $\therefore 675$ | 322.7 | 672 |
| 1020 | 139.01 | 657 | 313.3 | 652 |
| 1120 | 136.39 | 642 | 305.6 | 644 |
| 1220 | 133.82 | 621 | 294.0 | 622 |
| 1320 | 131.23 | 628 | 303.1 | 614 |
| 1420 | 128.59 | 593 | 280.4 | 591 |
| 1520 | 126.02 | 582 | 276.7. | 581 |
| 1620 to $3720=$ No DAS data a vailable |  |  |  |  |
| 3820 | 66.33 | 213 | 90.6 | 214 |
| 3920 | 63.75 | 200 | 84.7 | 199 |
| 4020 | 61.19 | 181 | 73.3 | 181 |
| 4120 | 58.63 | 166 | 67.5 | 169 |
| 4220 | 56.09 | 151 | 59.6 | 151 |
| 4320 | 53.55 | 139 | 54.8 | 136 |
| 4420 | 51.01 | 115 | 41.3 | 124 |
| 4520 | 48.58 | 112 | 42.3 | 109 |
| 4620 | 46.00 | 96 | 34.3 | 96 |
| 4720 | 43.52 | 87 | 31.5 | 85 |
| 4820 | - 41.06 | 78 | 29.1 | 77 |
| 4920 | - 38.62 | $\therefore \quad 72$ | 27.9 | 72 |
| 5020 | . 36.20 | 70 | 32.4 | 69 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 \\
\vdots \\
5 & 5 \\
\vdots
\end{array}
$$

PHASES I AND III ( continued)
The only other source of a value of $180^{\circ}$ for $W_{T}$ at 13,900 seconds elapsed time would be a memory modification or program problem. A dump of the computer memory gave no clue to the source of $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}=180^{\circ}$. However, a review of the program listing revealed that $W_{T}$ is synonymous with an Ascent quantity N24 and a Re-entry quantity CKN5. Although this can cause no operational problem, it is possible that readouts of MDIU Address 83 in the Prelaunch or Re-entry modes could display an erroneous value of $W_{T}$. It is unlikely that the readout would be exactly $180^{\circ} .00$. The DAS data indicates that the computer mode switch was turned from the Catch-Up mode directly to the Rendezvous mode. Both modes inftialize $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{T}}$ to $270^{\circ}$.

PHASE II
Catch-Up - During this reconstruction, post flight IVI readings
of 41., - 1., 1. were obtained and compared with the flight DAS values of 42., - l., 1. The post flight IVI's counted down to zero as the DAS velocity sums were recognized and used by the Operational Program logic. For this simulation START COMP was depressed at a mode time of 22 seconds which corresponds to an elapsed time of $13,621 \mathrm{~seconds}$.

PHASE IV
Rendezvous - The following table presents the comparison between the reconstruction and the flight DAS IVI readings. Some overlap exists with Table II.

## TABLE III



NOTE: $\quad$ - START COMP button was depressed at 18,921 seconds elapsed time.

[^4]PHASE IV (continued)
ii - For this first vernier display the data for the first two radar points were missing from the DAS flight record and were ignored in the reconstruction.
iii - All the radar points were available for the second vernier IVI display.

It is also noted that the post flight IVI's did count down to within one foot per second of the flight values during the three burns.

## PHASE V

The relative trajectory history of the closing moments of the Rendezvous maneuver, taken from flight DAS data, is presented in Figures 1,2 and 3. The first figure indicates the radar range (GT-6 to GT-7) and GT-6 pitch angle variation with time as GT-6 closed on GT-7. At the termination of the data, GT-6 was directly below GT-7 at approximately 150 feet separation. Figure 2 indicates that the closure velocity was approximately 41 fps prior to the braking thrust and ended at 6 fps with 1000 feet separation, following 80 seconds of thrust management. Both Figures 2 and 3 show that 1500 feet of relative range was used in reducing the closure velocity by this 35 fps .

## CONCLUSIONS

There is no evidence in the DAS data that $W_{T}=180^{\circ}$ was in the computer at any time. If it had been there after 13,243 seconds (the time of the last $\Delta \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{T}}$ display in the mode test) but corrected to $130^{\circ}$ prior to 14,600 seconds (the time of the first $\Delta V_{T}$ display in the closed loop phase of the mission) it would not appear in the DAS data. The only evidence that it did exist was the inflight readout check of MDIU Address 83 just after 13,900 seconds.

Since there was a necessity to occasionally interpolate DAS gimbal angle data to determine the values used in the computation of the $\Delta V$ displays and also no lateness of radar data was considered, it is not unusual that the simulated reconstruction of the IVI and $\Delta V_{i}$ reading were not in exact agreement with the DAS data. The differences are considered negligible but could probably be reduced with considerable effort by performing an exercise in precisely defining the gimbal angle and lateness data inputs to the computer.
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CONCLUSIONS (continued)
The nearly identical (Post Flight vs. Flight) IVI displays resulting when flight DAS parameters are used to drive a ground-based Operational Program indicates that the filght computer behaved in a normal fashion and exhibited no anomalies during the exercise of the Catch-Up and Rendezvous logic.

Extrapolation of the range vs. time curve of Figure 1 to the nominal time of intercept indicates that the point of closest approach without the TPF maneuver would probably have been within 300 feet. This is further indicated by the linearity of the same curve up to the time that the TPF maneuver was initiated.
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## INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a partial reconstruction of the Gcmini $7 / 6$ flights. The failure of the on-board recorders made it impossible to do a complete reconstruction, and for this reason the data reflects only those times that ground receiving stations obtained data; namely from just beyond the end of retro to just under $400,000 \mathrm{ft}$.

An attempt was also made to reconstruct the data for Spacecraft 7 from the end of blackout to the termination of closed loop guidance. The results did not agree with the telemetry data as well as they should, however, for two reasons: (1) apparent failure to initialize all the program variables necessary to allow starting the operational program off in the middle of the closed-loop guidance logic, and (2) difficulty in synchronizing the computer clock, the computer cycle time $\Delta t$, and the accelerometer pulse sums to avoid large velocity errors due to a small time bias encountered during the high acceleration phase of re-entry. These difficulties could have been overcome, but it was felt that the time and expense involved could not be justified.

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Tables I and II show the comparison of reconstructed ( $R / C$ ) and telemetry ( $T / M$ ) data for Spacecrafts 6 and 7, respectively. It is believed that the differences can be explained by an uncertainty in the initial conditions used to start the reconstructions; see Section III for a discussion of the problem.

TABLEI(S/C 6) $\left(T_{E}=92170.375 \mathrm{sec}\right)$

|  | $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\gamma$ | $\emptyset$ | ${ }^{0} E$ | $\psi_{E}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T/M | 21307736 ft | 24389.179 ¢ps | $-1.422^{\circ}$ | $28.823^{\circ}$ | 260.481 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $92.342^{\circ}$ |
| R/C | 21307952 ft | 24388. 816 fps | - $1.421^{\circ}$ | 28.822 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $260.479^{\circ}$ | $92.241^{\circ}$ |

TABLE II $(\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C} 7)\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{E}}=1,188,595.2 \mathrm{sec}\right.$.

|  | $\mathrm{r}_{\mathbf{s}}$ | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\gamma$ | $\emptyset$ | ${ }^{0} \mathrm{E}$ | $\psi_{E}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T/M | 21302140 ft | 24407.125 fps | $-1.392^{\circ}$ | $28.846^{\circ}$ | $256.804^{\circ}$ | $88.023^{\circ}$ |
| R/C | 21302096 ft | 24407.162 fps | $-1.392^{\circ}$ | $28.846^{\circ}$ | $256.805^{\circ}$ | $88.023^{\circ}$ |

Tables III and IV contain the tabulated results for each computer cycle for the entire reconstruction. In both cases the data begins just beyond the end of retro-fire and terminates below an altitude of 400,000 feet.

The Gemini operational program simulation was initialized to begin integration during the vacuum phase as follows. The GT-5 reconstruction program was run in conjunction with Math Flow 6 Revision $D$ to a point just beyond the end of retro-fire. This procedure assured proper setting of logical choices and initialization of variables to allow re-starting the simulation in the vacuum logic. The actual flight initial conditions were then loaded; and the required integration variables were initialized to a set of values calculated from the earliest available telemetry frame. The transformation is as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{E}}= & \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{s}} \cos \emptyset \cos 0 \\
\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}= & =\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{s}} \cos \emptyset \sin 0 \\
\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{E}}= & \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{s}} \sin \emptyset \\
\dot{\mathrm{X}}_{\mathrm{E}}= & -\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{E}}\left(\sin \gamma \cos 0 \cos \emptyset-\cos \gamma \sin \psi_{\mathrm{E}} \sin 0\right. \\
& \left.\quad-\cos \gamma \cos \psi_{\mathrm{E}} \cos 0 \sin \emptyset\right) \\
\dot{\mathrm{Y}}_{\mathrm{E}}= & \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{E}}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{E}}\left(\sin \gamma \sin 0 \cos \emptyset+\cos \gamma \sin \psi_{\mathrm{E}} \cos \theta\right. \\
& \left.\quad-\cos \gamma \cos \psi_{\mathrm{E}} \sin 0 \sin \emptyset\right) \\
\dot{Z}_{\mathrm{E}}= & \mathrm{VE}_{\mathrm{E}}\left(\sin \gamma \sin \emptyset+\cos \gamma \cos \psi_{\mathrm{E}} \cos \emptyset\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where:

$$
0=0_{\mathrm{E}}-\Delta 0_{\mathrm{R}}+\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{T}}
$$

is the inertial longitude of the spacecraft at integration time $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$.
The only significant error source in the reconstruction is the uncertainty in the value of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$ associated with the telemetry frame used for program initialization. This error is in turn due to the uncertainty in $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$ at the end of retro-fire. TTcan be anywhere from 60.0 sec to about 60.6 sec at this point. Thus throughout the vacuum phase, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$ will be some multiple of 16 seconds more than this uncertain value at the end of retro-fire. The exact number of 16 second steps can be found from the difference between the TRS time $T_{E}$ which tags the first telemetry frame and the elapsed time from lift-off at which retro-fire occurred. Furthermore, good estimates of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}$ at the end of retro-fire were obtained by trial and error to bring the errors at $400,000 \mathrm{ft}$ to an acceptable level.

For GT-6, the first available telemetry record was at time 91133.86 sec, which corresponds to an integration time from retro of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{T}}=172.25 \mathrm{sec}$, approximately. The navigation parameters for that frame were:

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{s} & =21827787 \mathrm{ft} \\
V_{E} & =23756.097 \mathrm{fps} \\
\gamma & =-0.643^{\circ} \\
\emptyset & =11.189^{\circ} \\
O_{E} & =191.531^{\circ} \\
\psi_{E} & =61.452^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

For GT-7 the first available telemetry record was at time $1,187,541.9 \mathrm{sec}$ which corresponds to an integration time from retro of $T_{T}=236.25 \mathrm{sec}$, approximately. The navigation parameters for that frame were:

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{s} & =21831592 \mathrm{ft} \\
\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{E}} & =23763.843 \mathrm{fps} \\
\gamma & =-.067^{\circ} \\
\emptyset & =7.331^{\circ} \\
0_{E} & =188.663^{\circ} \\
\Psi_{E} & =60.138^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

The resonstructions show that no anomalies occurred in the GT-6 and GT-7 flight computers during the vacuum phase of the re-entry mission. Furthermore, although the results obtained for the attempted reconstruction following blackout were not of the degree of accuracy required to demonstrate proper performance, it is believed that the large errors encountered can be attributed to simulation difficulties.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TDAS } \\ & \text { (SEC) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TT } \\ & (S E C) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RS } \\ & (K-F E E T) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PHI } \\ & \text { (DEG) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E T A E \\ & E G) \end{aligned}$ | VE <br> (FPS) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GAMMA } \\ & \text { (DEG) } \end{aligned}$ | PSIE <br> (DEC) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1688.101 | 188.250 | . 21823.430 | 11.664 | 192.426 | 23761.180 | -0.667 | 61.65 |
| 1704.101 | 204.250, | 21818.916 | 12.137 | 193.325 | 23766.461 | -0.691 | 61.87 |
| 1720.101 | 220.250 | 21814.256 | 12.606 | 194.228 | 23771.934 | -0.715 | 62.09 |
| 1736.101 | 236.250 | 21809.430 | 13.071 | 195.134 | 23777.586 | -0.739 | 62.332 |
| 1752.101 | 252.250 | 21804.454 | 13.534 | 196.045 | 23783.437 | -0.762 | 2.573 |
| 1768.101 | 268.250 | 21799.306 | 13.993 | 196.960 | 23789.471 | -0.785 | 2.825 |
| 1784.101 | 284.250 | 21794.020 | 14.447 | 197.879 | 23795.684 | -0.808 | 63.086 |
| 1800.101 | 300.250 | 21788.584 | 14.899 | 198.803 | 23802.082 | -0.830 | 63.357 |
| 1816.101 | 316.250. | 21782.988 | 15.345 | 199.732 | 23808.664 | -0.852 | 63.637 |
| 1832.101 | 332.250 | 21777.248 | 15.788 | 200.665 | . 23815.424 | -0.874 | 63.926 |
| 1848.1C1 | $348.250^{\circ}$ | 21771.366 | 16.227 | 201.603 | 23822.359 | -0.895 | 64.224 |
| 1864.101 | 364.250 | 21765.332 | 16.660 | 202.546 | 23829.469 | -0.917 | 64.532 |
| 1880.101 | 380.250 | 21759.168 | 17.090 | 203.494 | 23836.754 | -0.937 | 49 |
| 1896.101 | 396.250 | 21752.862 | 17.514 | 204.448 | 23844.211 | -0.958 | 75 |
| 1912.101 | 412.250 | 21746.408 | 17.933 | 205.407 | 23851.842 | 0.978 | 10 |
| 1928.101 | 428.250 | 21739.834 | 18.347 | 206.371 | 23859.643 | -0.998 | 5 |
| 1944.101 | 444.250 | 21733.116 | 18.756 | 207.341 | 23867.598 | -1.017 | 0 |
| 1960.101 | 460.250 | 21726.266 | 19.15 | 208.317 | 23875.717 | -1.036 | 6.573 |
| 1976.101 | 476.250 | 21719.296 | 19.55 | 209.298 | 23883.998 | -1.055 | 66.946 |
| 1592.101 | 492.250 | 21712.198 | 19.949 | 210.285 | 23892.441 | -1.074 | 67.328 |
| 2008.101 | 508.250 | 21704.972 | 20.335 | 211.278 | 23901.049 | -1.092 | 67.719 |
| 2024.101 | 524.250: | 21697.628 | 20.714 | 212.277 | 23909.799 | -1.109 | 68.120 |
| 2040.101 | 540.250 | 21690.164 | 21.087 | 213.282 | 23918.711 | -1.126 | 8.529 |
| 2056.101 | 556.250 | 21682.586 | 21.454 | 214.293 | 23927.771 | -1.143 | 948 |
| 2072.101 | 572.250. | 21674.896 | 21.814 | 215.311 | 23936.969 | -1.159 | 69.376 |
| 2088.101 | 588.250: | 21667.090 | 22.167 | 216.334 | 23946.316 | 1.175 | 12 |
| 2104.101 | 604.250 | 21659.180 | 22.513 | 17.364 | 23955.803 | . 191 | 70.258 |
| 2120.101 | 620.250 . | 21651.162 | 2.852 | 18.400 | 23965.428 | 1.206 | 713 |
| 2136.101 | 636.250. | 21643.040 | 23.183 | 219.442 | 23975.193 | 1.220 | 1.176 |
| 2152.101 | 652.250 | 21634.820 | 23.507 | 220.491 | 23985.090 | 1.235 | 71.648 |
| 2168.101 | 668.250 | 21626.504 | 23.823 | 221.546 | 23995.125 | -1.248 | 72.129 |
| 2184.101 | 684.250 | 21618.092 | 24.131 | 222.607 | 24005.275 | -1.262 | 72.618 |
| 2200.101 | 7C0.250. | 21609.590 | 24.431 | 223.674 | 24015.561 | -1.275 | 73.116 |
| 2216.102 | 716.250 | 21601.004 | 24.723 | 224.748 | 24025.961 | -1.287 | 73.621 |
| 2232.101 | 732.250 | 21592.322 | 25.006 | 225.827 | 24036.473 | -1.299 | 74.135 |
| 2248.101 | 748.250 | 21583.562 | 25.280 | 226.913 | 24047.100 | -1.310 | 657 |
| 2264.101 | 764.250 | 21574.728 | 25.546 | 228.005 | 24057.848 | 1.321 | 187 |
| 2280.101 | 780.250 | 21565.822 | 25.803 | 229.104 | 24068.705 | 1.332 | 724 |
| 2296.101 | 796.250. | 21556.832 | 26.050 | 230.208 | 24079.656 | 1.342 | 6.269 |
| 2312.101 | 812.250 | 21547.780 | 26.289 | 231.317 | 24090.715 | 1.351 | 6.821 |
| 2328.101 | $828.250^{\circ}$ | 21538.662 | 26.518 | 232.433 | 24101.867 | 1.360 | 7.380 |
| 2344.101 | 844.250 | 21529.472 | 26.737 | 233.554 | 24113.125 | -1.369 | 77.947 |
| 2360.101 | 860.250 | 21520.224 | 26.946 | 234.681 | 24124.473 | -1.377 | 78.519 |
| 2370.102 | 876.250 | 21510.926 | 27.146 | 235.813 | 24135.896 | 1.384 | 79.099 |
| 2392.101 | 892.250 | 21501.572 | 27.335 | 236.950 | 24147.400 | -1.391 | 79.684 |
| 2408.102 | 9.08 .250 | 21492.170 | 27.514 | 238.093 | 24159.002 | -1.398 | 80.276 |

TABLE III GT-6 RECONSTRUCTED DATA

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOAS } \\ & \text { (SEC) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TT } \\ & (S E C) \end{aligned}$ | RS <br> (K̈-FEET) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PHI } \\ & \text { (DEG) } \end{aligned}$ | thetae (DEG) | VE (FPS) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GAMMA } \\ & \text { (DEG) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PSIE } \\ & \text { (OEG) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2424.101 | $924.250^{\circ}$ | 21482.714 | 27.683 | 239.240 | 24170.672 | -1.404 | 80 |
| 2440.101 | 940.250 | 21473.224 | 27.841 | 240.392 | 24182.402 | -1.409 | 81.475 |
| 2456.101 | 956.250 | 21463.688 | 27.989 | 241.549 | 24194.219 | -1.414 | 82.083 |
| 2472.101 | 972.250 | 21454.120 | 28.126 | 242.709 | 24206.094 | -1.418 | 82.696 |
| 2488.101 | 988.250 | 21444.522 | 28.252 | 243.874 | 24218.006 | -1.422 | 83.313 |
| 2504.101 | 1004.250 | 21434.886 | 28.367 | 245.043 | 24230.002 | -1.42 | 83.934 |
| 520.101 | 1020.250 | 21425.230 | 28.471 | 246.216 | 24242.043 | -1.428 | 84.55 |
| 53.101 | 1036.250 | 21415.552 | 28.564 | 247.392 | 24254.133 | -1.431 | 85.188 |
| 5;... 101 | 1052.250 | 21405.850 | 28.645 | 248.571 | 24266.252 | -1.433 | 85.820 |
| 2568.101 | 1068.250 | 21396.138 | 28.715 | 249.753 | 24278.426 | -1.434 | 86.455 |
| 2584.101 | 1084.250 | 21386.410 | 28.773 | 250.938 | 24290.625 | -1.435 | 87.09 |
| 2600.101 | 1100.250 | 21376.680 | 28.820 | 252.125 | 24302.861 | -1.435 | 7.73 |
| 2616.101 | 1116.250 | 21366.940 | 28.856 | 253.314 | 24315.113 | -1.434 | 8.374 |
| 2632.101 | 1132.250 | 21357.204 | 28.880 | 254.505 | 24327.385 | -1.434 | 9.017 |
| 2648.101 | 1148.250 | 21347.466 | 28.892 | 255.698 | 24339.664 | 1.432 | 9.661 |
| 2664.101 | 1164.250 | 21337.734 | 28.892 | 256.892 | 24351.957 | 1.430 | 0.306 |
| 2680.101 | 1180.250 | 21328.010 | 28.881 | 258.087 | 24364.250 | 1.428 | 0.951 |
| 2696.101. | 1196.250 | 21318.308 | 28.857 | 259.283 | 24376.535 | 1.425 | 91.597 |
| 2712.101 | 1212.250 | 21308.622 | 28.822 | 260.479 | 24388.816 | -1.421 | 92.241 |
| 1453.427 | 1213.250 | 21307.952 | 28.819 | 260.562 | 24389.660 | -1.421 | 92.286 |
| 1454.422 | 1214.250 | 21307.344 | 28.817 | 260.637 | 24390.428 | -1.421 | 92.326 |

TABLE (II (CONT'D) GT-6 RECONSTRUCTED DATA

| TDAS | T.T | RS |  |  | ve |  | PSIE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (SEC) | (SEC) | (K-FEET) | (DEG) | (DEG) | (FPS) | (DEG) | (DEC) |
| 1688.101 | 252.250 | 21827.052 | 7.827 | 189.537 | 23769.227 | -0.694 | 60.273 |
| 1704.101 | 268.25 C | 21822.370 | 8.321 | 190.413 | 23774.818 | -0.717 | 60.415 |
| 1720.101 | 284.250 | 21817.540 | 8.813 | 191.292 | 23780.580 | -0.740 | 60.567 |
| 1736.101 | 300.250 | 21812.540 | 9.303 | 192.174 | 23786.520 | -0.763 | 62.731 |
| 1752.101 | 316.250 | 21807.400 | 9.791 | 193.059 | 23792.641 | -0.785 | 60.902 |
| 1768.1Cl | 332.250 | 21802.104 | 10.276 | 193.948 | 23798.939 | -0.808 | 61.082 |
| 1784.101 | 348.250 | 21796.668 | 10.758 | 194.840 | 23805.408 | -0.830 | 61.271 |
| 18 CO .101 | 364.250 | 21791.072 | 11.238 | 195.735 | 23812.057 | -0.851 | 61.470 |
| 1816.101 | 380.250 | 21785.348 | 11.715 | 196.634 | 23818.875 | -0.873 | 61.678 |
| 1832.101 | 396.250 | 21779.474 | 12.189 | 197.537 | 23825.854 | -0.894 | 61.895 |
| 1848.101 | 412.250 | 21773.454 | 12.660 | 198.444 | 23833.004 | -0.914 | 62.121 |
| 1864.101 | 428.250 | 21767.290 | 13.127 | 199.355 | 23840.324 | -0.935 | 62.357 |
| 1880.101 | 444.250 | 21761.006 | 13.591 | 200.270 | 23847.805 | -0.955 | 62.602 |
| 1896.101 | 460.250 | 21754.584 | 14.052 | 201.190 | 23855.447 | -0.975 | 62.856 |
| 1912.101 | 476.250 | 21748.026 | 14.508 | 202.114 | 23863.252 | -0.994 | 63.125 |
| 19?8.101 | 492.250 | 21741.334 | 14.961 | 203.043 | 23871.207 | -1.013 | 63.393 |
| 1944.101 | 508.250 | 21734.522 | 15.410 | 203.977 | 23879.320 | -1.032 | 63.675 |
| 1960.101 | 524.250 | 21727.578 | 15.854 | 204.916 | 23887.584 | -1.050 | 63.967 |
| 1976.101 | 540.250 | 21720.506 | 16.294 | 205.860 | 23896.004 | -1.068 | 64.268 |
| 1992.101 | 556.250 | 21713.328 | 16.730 | 206.809 | 23904.566 | -1.085 | 64.579 |
| 2008.101 | 572.250 | 21706.022 | 17.161 | 207.763 | 23913.277 | -1.103 | 64.897 |
| 2024.101 | 588.250 | 21698.596 | 17.586 | 208.723 | 23922.131 | -1.119 | 65.227 |
| 2040.101 | 604.250 | 21691.070 | 18.007 | 209.688 | 23931.129 | -1.136 | 65.568 |
| 2056.101 | 620.250 | 21683.420 | 18.423 | 210.659 | 23940.254 | -1.152 | 65.916 |
| 2072.101 | 636.250 | 21675.668 | 18.833 | 211.636 | 23949.529 | -1.167 | 66.274 |
| 2088.101 | 652.250 | 21667.812 | 19.238 | 212.618 | 23958.926 | -1.182 | 66.641 |
| 2104.101 | 668.250 | 21659.852 | 19.637 | 213.607 | 23968.461 | -1.197 | 67.018 |
| 2120.101 | 684.250 | 21651.796 | 20.030 | 214.601 | 23978.121 | -1.211 | 67.404 |
| 2136.101 | 700.250 | 21643.634 | 20.417 | 215.601 | 23987.900 | -1.225 | 67.800 |
| 2152.101 | 716.250 | 21635.384 | 20.797 | 216.608 | 23997.814 | -1.238 | 68.204 |
| 2168.101 | 732.250 | 21627.038 | 21.171 | 217.621 | 24007.834 | -1.251 | 68.619 |
| 2184.101 | 748.250 " | 21618.608 | 21.539 | 218.640 | 24017.973 | -1.264 | 69.042 |
| 2200.101 | 764.250 | 21610.090 | 21.900 | 219.665 | 24028.232 | -1.276 | 69.474 |
| 2216.101 | 780.250 | 21601.492 | 22.254 | 220.697 | 24038.592 | -1.287 | 69.915 |
| 2232.101 | 796.250 | 21592.816 | 22.600 | 221.735 | 24049.057 | -1.298 | 70.367 |
| 2248.101 | 812.250 | 21584.062 | 22.939 | 222.780 | 24059.637 | -1.309 | 70.825 |
| 2264.101 | 828.250 | 21575.226 | 23.271 | 223.831 | 24070.311 | -1.319 | 71.295 |
| 2280.101 | 844.250 | 21566.332 | 23.595 | 224.888 | 24081.088 | -1.329 | 71.772 |
| 2296.101 | 860.250 | 21557.364 | 23.911 | 225.952 | 24091.949 | -1.338 | 72.258 |
| 2312.101 | 876.250 | 21548.332 | 24.219 | 227.023 | 24102.902 | -1.346 | 72.753 |
| 2328.101 | 892.250 | 21539.236 | 24.519 | 228.099 | 24113.947 | -1.355 | 73.256 |

TABLE IV GT-7 RECONSTRUCTED DATA

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOAS } \\ & \text { (SEC) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TT } \\ & (S E C) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RS } \\ & (K-F E E T) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PHI } \\ & \text { (OEG) } \end{aligned}$ | THETAE (DEG) | $\begin{aligned} & V E \\ & (F P S) \end{aligned}$ | GAMMA <br> (DEG) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PSIE } \\ & \text { (DEG) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2344.101 | 908.250 | 21530.090 | 24.811 | 229.182 | 24125.076 | $-1.362$ | 73 |
| 2360.101 | 924.250 | 21520.880 | 25.093 | 230.272 | 24136.285 | -1.369 | 74.287 |
| 2376.101 | 940.250 | 21511.628 | 25.367 | 231.367 | 24147.564 | -1.376 | 74.815 |
| 2392.101 | 956.250 | 21502.332 | 25.632 | 232.469 | 24158.914 | -1.382 | 75.35 |
| 2408.101 | 972.250 | 21492.986 | -25.888 | 233.577 | 24170.350 | -1.388 | 75.894 |
| 2424.101 | 988.250 | 21483.602 | 26.134 | 234.691 | 24181.838 | -1.393 | 76.445 |
| 2440.101 | 1004.250 | 21474.176 | 26.371 | 235.811 | 24193.393 | -1.398 | 77.003 |
| 2456.101 | 1020.250 | 21464.716 | 26.599 | 236.937 | 24205.002 | -1.402 | 77.568 |
| 2472.101 | 1036.250 | 21455.232 | 26.816 | 238.069 | 24216.670 | -1.405 | 78.141 |
| 2488.101 | 1052.250 | 21445.710 | 27.024 | 239.206 | 24228.391 | -1.408 | 78.72 |
| 2504.101 | 1068.250 | 21436.172 | 27.221 | 240.348 | 24240.143 | -1.411 | 79.305 |
| 2520.101 | 1 C 84.250 | 21426.610 | 27.409 | 241.496 | 24251.947 | -1.413 | 79.897 |
| 2536.101 | 1100.250 | 21417.034 | 27.585 | 242.649 | 24263.785 | -1.415 | 80.475 |
| 2552.101 | 1116.250 | 21407.440 | 27.751 | 243.807 | 24275.662 | -1.416 | 81.078 |
| 2568.101 | 1132.250 | 21397.848 | 27.907 | 244.969 | 24287.568 | -1.416 | 81.707 |
| 2584.101 | $1148.250^{\prime}$ | 21388.240 | 28.051 | 246.136 | 24299.498 | -1.416 | 82.321 |
| 2600.101 | 1164.250 | 21378.636 | 28.185 | 247.308 | 24311.445 | -1.415 | 82.945 |
| 2616.101 | 1180.250 | 21369.022 | 28.308 | 248.483 | 24323.406 | -1.414 | 83.563 |
| 2632.101 | 1196.250 | 21.359 .422 | 28.419 | 249.662 | 24335.387 | -1.413 | 84.195 |
| 2648.101 | 1212.250 | 21349.830 | 28.519 | 250.845 | 24347.373 | -1.411 | 84.821 |
| 2664.101 | 1228.250 | 21340.244 | 28.608 | 252.031 | 24359.365 | -1.408 | 85.455 |
| 2680.102 | 1244.250 | 21330.676 | 28.685 | 253.221 | 24371.324 | -1.405 | 86.094 |
| 2696.101 | 1260.250 | 21321.126 | 28.750 | 254.413 | 24383.293 | -1.401 | 86.735 |
| 2712.101 | 1276.250 | 21311.602 | 28.804. | 255.608 | 24395.236 | -1.397 | 87.378 |
| 2728.101 | 1292.250 | 21302.096 | 28.846 | 256.805 | 24407.162 | -1.392 | 88.023 |
| 2606.659 | 1293.250 | 21301.444 | 28.849 | 256.888 | 24407.896 | -1.392 | 88.067 |
| 2607.643 | 1294.250 | 21300.856 | 28.851 | 256.962 | 24408.557 | -1.391 | 88.107 |
| 2608.643 | 1295.250 | 21300.264 | 28.853 | 257.037 | 24409.330 | -1.391 | 88.147 |
| 2609.694 | 1296.375 | 21299.640 | 28.855 | 257.115 | 24410.029 | -1.391 | 88.190 |

TABLE II (CONT'D) GT-7 RECONSTRUCTED DATA
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