ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use

1. Visibility remains good, gaps close to perigee only
2. Orbit ground track repeats every 8 days (3 revolutions)

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use

1. Visibility close to perigee allows us to use full time outside Van Allen belts for 2 out of 3 revolutions

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use

1. FCT:
    a. Richard Southworth (SOM) - everything
    b. Jutta Huebner (SOE / deputy SOM) – payload / simulator
    c. Dave Salt (SOE) – AOCS
    d. Stefano de Padova (SOE) – OBDH, MCS
    e. Norbert Pfeil (SOE 50%) – EPS, JEM-X, MCS Testing
    f. Timothy Finn (SOE 50%) – Ground Stations, OMC
    g. Liviu Toma (SOE 50%) – AOCS, automation
    h. Bruno Gandolfo (analyst) – Planning, Database, Reporting
2. Stations:
    a. Prime Kiruna
    b. B/U VIL2, Maspalomas, Weilheim, Kourou, NNO
3. MCS fully migrated to Solaris 10 system based on virtualisation

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use

1. **INTEGRAL is not designed to hibernate** (very limited on-board autonomy)
2. Regular contact needed --> FCT and FD teams have to be maintained (reduction possible), MCS & G/S & FDS etc. have to maintain functionality
    a. *Design is 36 hours autonomy, could be relaxed at low risk to 5 days(tbc)*
3. Spin up INT to gain stability for longer autonomy?,
    a. *Only practical for relatively short periods since we need to track the sun, would require a new operation mode (FDS) and procedures*
    b. *Sun tracking operations complex (de / re-spin or move spin axis)*
    c. *ESAM entry would use large quantity of fuel in this mode = > not practical for hibernation*
4. Once people are gone/moved to other projects, the detailed knowledge is gone and no fast reaction is possible anymore.
    a. *Reaction period estimated at 2 - ∞ months (hard to predict)*
5. - Saving wrt fuel (low) & costs TBD

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use

6. *Station costs: almost the sole customer for KIRUNA1, income lost from Integral will be redistributed as costs to other SRE missions (EO use little station time!).*
    a. *In the worst case KIR1 will be disposed of making resumption of operations difficult and potentially more expensive*
7. *Conclusions:*
    a. *To save money by reducing operational return, enlarge the perigee gap - still a stupid idea since it re-distributes costs to the other missions so our science return is reduced at a net saving of 0,*
    b. *Easy to implement & easy to get back to nominal operations scenario.*
    c. *To save fuel go for 4WD or possibly remove wheels Low Speed region*
    d. *Operate the bloody thing for as long as possible, that's what it's there for!!!*

ESA UNCLASSIFIED - For Official Use