Content

Index of tables **26**

Index of figures **31**

1. Scope **51**

2. Overview **53**

2.1 Objectives ***53***

2.2 Scientific potential of a 100-m class telescope ***54***

2.3 Context ***58***

2.4 The OWL concept ***60***

2.4.1 The history of telescope growth. 60

2.4.2 A giant telescope in an industrial context 61

2.5 Top level requirements ***62***

2.6 Design overview ***64***

2.6.1 Telescope optics 65

2.6.2 Structural design 71

2.6.3 A controlled opto-mechanical system 73

2.6.4 Enclosure, open air operation 78

2.6.5 Instrumentation 80

2.7 Progressive implementation ***83***

2.8 Observatory operation ***85***

2.9 Site considerations ***86***

2.10 Plans for final design and construction ***88***

2.11 Cost estimate 91

2.12 The ELT Design Study 93

2.13 Scalability 95

2.13.1 Science 95

2.13.2 Requirements 96

2.13.3 Concept design 97

2.13.4 Cost and schedule 98

2.14 Risk areas 99

2.14.1 Environmental risks 100

2.14.2 System risks 102

2.14.3 Risk management 107

3. Science case 109

3.1 Introduction 109

3.2 Science with OWL 110

3.2.1 OWL performance 111

3.2.1.1 Confusion about confusion 111

3.2.1.2 Étendue, or the AΩ product 111

3.2.1.3 Signal-to-noise vs diameter D 111

3.2.1.4 The power of a 100m telescope 112

3.2.1.5 The wavelength range 114

3.2.2 The highlight science cases 116

3.2.2.1 Terrestrial Planets In Extra-Solar Systems 116

3.2.2.2 Resolved Stellar Populations in a representative sample of the Universe 118

3.2.2.3 The First Objects And Re-Ionization Structure Of The Universe 118

3.2.2.3.1 The highest Redshift Galaxies 118

3.2.2.3.2 Galaxies at the end of Re-ionization 119

3.2.2.3.3 Probing the universe during the re-ionization epoch 120

3.3 Requirements from the science case 121

4. Top level requirements 127

4.1 Introduction 127

4.2 Overall requirements 127

4.2.1 The OWL telescope 127

4.2.2 The Conceptual Design (Phase A) 128

4.2.3 Evolution of the Top Level requirements 128

4.2.4 Operational lifetime 128

4.2.5 Location of OWL 128

4.2.6 Optical design 128

4.2.7 Maintenance 129
4.2.8 Instrumentation 129
4.2.9 Coating optimization 129
4.2.10 Astronomical site monitor 129
4.2.11 Safety 129
4.3 Performance requirements 129
4.3.1 Telescope transmission 130
4.3.2 Emissivity 130
4.3.3 Sky coverage 130
4.3.4 Image quality 130
4.3.4.1 Telescope 130
4.3.4.2 Adaptive Optics 130
4.3.4.2.1 Telescope AO 131
4.3.4.2.2 Single Conjugate AO 131
4.3.4.2.3 Multi Conjugate AO 131
4.3.4.2.4 Ground Layer AO 132
4.3.4.2.5 Multi-Object AO 132
4.3.4.2.6 Extreme AO 132
4.3.4.2.7 AO at optical wavelengths 133
4.3.4.2.8 Laser Guide Stars 133
4.3.5 Atmospheric dispersion compensation 133
4.3.6 Atmospheric refraction 133

5. System Engineering 135

5.1 Level 1 requirements 135

5.2 Design constraints and guidelines 137

5.3 Complex Systems, methods and modelling 138
5.3.1 Complex System 138
5.3.2 Methods 139
5.3.2.1 Science and Engineering. 139
5.3.2.1.1 System Design 140
5.3.2.1.1.1 Top Level Requirements 140
5.3.2.1.1.2 System Requirements Management 140
5.3.2.1.1.3 Functional Analysis 141
5.3.2.1.1.4 Logical Architecture Definition 142
5.3.2.1.2 Physical Design & Manufacturing 143
5.3.2.1.2.1 Physical Design 144
5.3.2.1.2.2 Manufacturing 144
5.3.2.1.3 System Integration 144
5.3.2.2 Tools 145
5.3.3 Modelling 145
5.3.3.1.1 Modelling Approach 145

5.3.3.1.2 Architecture Concept 148
5.3.3.2 DOORS Model, System requirements management 151

5.4 Disturbances Characterization 152
5.4.1 Environment 152
5.4.1.1 Wind 152
5.4.1.1.1 Wind characterization from literature 152
5.4.1.1.1.1 Wind Velocity, integral length and turbulence intensity Profiles 152
5.4.1.1.1.2 Power Spectral Density 153
5.4.1.1.2 Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) 155
5.4.1.1.3 Full scale measurements 157
5.4.1.1.4 Wind tunnel measurements 158
5.4.1.2 Atmospheric turbulence (AO) 159
5.4.1.3 Temperature, humidity, rain, snow, ice, dust, radiation 161
5.4.1.4 Microseismicity 164
5.4.2 System Induced Disturbances 164
5.4.3 Human induced disturbance 164
5.4.3.1 Camp, hotel, sewage, transport, etc 164
5.4.3.2 Power generation 164
5.4.3.3 Light pollution 165
5.4.4 Survival load case of the opto-mechanical elements 165
5.4.4.1 Earthquake 165
5.4.4.2 Wind 166
5.4.4.3 Temperature 167

5.5 Error budgets 167

5.6 Reliability, Availability, Maintainability, Safety (RAMS) 180
5.6.1 Product Assurance Roles & Responsibilities 180
5.6.2 Safety 180
5.6.2.1 General 180
5.6.2.2 Safety Assurance Program and organization 181
5.6.2.3 Safety assurance activities 181
5.6.3 Reliability and Maintainability 181
5.6.3.1 Failure Tolerance 181
5.6.3.2 Single point failure list 181
5.6.3.3 Reliability and Maintainability Data File 181
5.6.3.3.1 Reliability Engineering 182
5.6.3.3.1.1 Reliability Analyses 182
5.6.3.3.2 Maintainability Engineering 182
5.6.3.3.2.1 Establishment of Maintainability Requirements 182
5.6.3.3.2.2 Maintainability Inputs to Maintenance Plan 183
5.6.3.3.2.3 Maintainability Analyses 183
5.6.3.3.2.4 Maintainability Demonstration 183
5.6.4 Conclusion – OWL Dependability Objective Sheet 184

6. Telescope optics 185

6.1 Requirements and guidelines 185

6.2 Optical design 188

6.2.1 Design trade-off 188
6.2.2 Baseline design 194
6.2.3 Optional corrector 198
6.2.4 Reduced aperture designs 198
6.2.5 Future design iterations 201

6.3 Optical characteristics 202

6.3.1 Nominal optical quality 202
6.3.2 Vignetting 206
6.3.3 Stray light and baffling 207
6.3.4 Emissivity 208
6.3.5 Sensitivity analysis 209
6.3.6 Imaging of turbulent layers 213
6.3.7 Imaging of Laser Guide Stars 216

6.4 Diffraction and high contrast imaging 218

6.4.1 Diffraction 218
6.4.1.1 Structure of PSF in diffraction-limited regime 218
6.4.1.1.1 Pupil modelling elements 218
6.4.1.1.2 Secondary mirror support 220
6.4.1.1.3 “Missing” segments 220
6.4.1.1.4 Ropes 221
6.4.1.1.5 Diffraction by the gaps 221
6.4.1.2 PSF representation: intensity slices 223
6.4.1.3 Effects of phasing errors on the PSF 224
6.4.1.3.1 Diffraction associated to piston and tip-tilt 224
6.4.1.3.2 Intensity slice representation (FoV=1”, λ=650nm) 224

6.5 Optics design and fabrication 226

6.5.1 Segments 226
6.5.1.1 Segment size and distribution 227
6.5.1.2 Segments thermo-mechanical properties 229
6.5.1.3 Segments substrates 230
6.5.1.4 Segments polishing 236
6.5.1.5 Segments supports 240
6.5.2 Corrector optics 241

6.6 Safety 245

7. Non-adaptive wavefront control 247

7.1 Requirements 247

7.2 General control architecture 248
7.2.1 Wind rejection 251
7.2.2 Friction compensation 256
7.2.3 Field stabilization 260

7.3 Pre-alignment 263

7.4 Active optics 265
7.4.1 Introduction 265
7.4.2 Alignment of the segments in M1 and M2 265
7.4.3 Correction of mirror deformations 266
7.4.4 Correction of the rigid-body alignment of the mirrors 268
7.4.5 Relationship between various types of aberrations 269
7.4.6 Operation with adaptive optics 269

7.5 Phasing 270
7.5.1 Phasing strategy 270
7.5.2 Blind phasing 270
7.5.3 Position sensors 271
7.5.4 On-sky calibrations 271
7.5.4.1 Optical Phasing 271
7.5.4.2 On-sky phasing techniques - overview 271
7.5.4.2.1 Modified Shack-Hartmann technique 271
7.5.4.2.2 Modified Mach-Zehnder technique 272
7.5.4.2.3 Phase filtering technique 273
7.5.4.2.4 Diffraction image technique 274
7.5.4.2.5 Pyramid technique 275
7.5.4.2.6 CCD 275
7.5.4.3 Open loop performance 276
7.5.4.3.1 The optical signal 276
7.5.4.3.2 The CCD images 276
7.5.4.3.3 Signal analysis 277
7.5.4.3.4 Results 278
7.5.4.3.5 Increase of the capture range 279
7.5.4.3.6 Calibration 279
7.5.4.4 Identification of the borders 280
7.5.4.5 Closed-loop results 280
7.5.4.6 Phasing OWL 281
7.5.4.6.1 Phasing of one petal 281
7.5.4.6.2 Phasing of the petals 285
7.5.4.6.3 Measurements under aberrations 285
7.5.4.6.4 Disentangling M1&M2 285
7.5.5 Control of segmented mirrors (M1 & M2) 286

7.6 Active Phasing Experiment (APE) 295
7.6.1 Opto-mechanical design 295

7.6.2 Internal Metrology 297
7.6.3 The Phasing WaveFront Sensor Module 297
7.6.4 Schedule and observations 297

8. Adaptive Optics 299

8.1 Introduction 299

8.2 First generation Adaptive Optics 299

8.2.1 Single Conjugate Adaptive Optics 300
8.2.1.1 Performance requirements 301
8.2.1.2 Implementation Concept 303
8.2.1.2.1 M6 Adaptive Mirror unit 303
8.2.1.2.2 Visible wavefront sensor unit 306
8.2.1.2.3 Infrared Pyramid WFS 309
8.2.1.2.4 Real Time Computer (RTC) 312
8.2.1.3 Predicted performance 313
8.2.1.3.1 Visible Shack Hartmann wavefront sensor 313
8.2.1.3.2 Infrared Pyramid Wavefront sensor 314
8.2.1.3.3 Performance at 10 microns and beyond 316
8.2.1.3.4 Effect of the outer scale of turbulence on performance 317
8.2.1.4 Near-Term development plan 318
8.2.1.4.1 Modelling and Simulation 318
8.2.1.4.2 AO Concept and design 319
8.2.1.4.3 AO key elements status and development 321
8.2.1.4.4 Testing a large DM in closed loop 334
8.2.1.4.5 Detectors for wavefront sensors 336
8.2.1.4.6 Real Time Computer 337
8.2.2 Ground Layer Adaptive Optics 342
8.2.2.1 Performance requirements 344
8.2.2.2 Implementation Concept 346
8.2.2.2.1 Corrector and wavefront sensors 346
8.2.2.2.2 Control and Real Time Computer 346
8.2.2.3 Predicted performance 348
8.2.2.3.1 Sky coverage 348
8.2.2.4 Near-Term development plan 352
8.2.2.4.1 Modelling and Simulation 352
8.2.2.4.2 AO concept and design 352
8.2.2.4.3 AO key component status and development 353
8.2.3 Distributed Multi Object Adaptive Optics 354
8.2.3.1 Implementation Concept 356
8.2.3.1.1 Overview 356
8.2.3.1.2 Wavefront sensor 357
8.2.3.1.3 Micro deformable mirror 357
8.2.3.1.4 Control and Real Time computer 358

8.2.3.2 Predicted performance 360
8.2.3.3 Near-Term development plan 361
8.2.3.3.1 Modelling and Simulation 362
8.2.3.3.2 AO Concept and design 362
8.2.3.3.3 AO key component status and development 363

8.3 Second generation Adaptive Optics 363

8.3.1 Multi Conjugate Adaptive Optics 364
8.3.1.1 Performance requirements 365
8.3.1.2 Implementation Concept 366
8.3.1.2.1 Corrective elements 366
8.3.1.2.2 Wavefront sensors 367
8.3.1.2.3 MCAO control 367
8.3.1.2.4 Real Time Computer 367
8.3.1.3 Predicted performance 368
8.3.1.3.1 MCAO sky coverage 368
8.3.1.3.2 Simulation Results 369
8.3.1.4 Mid-Term development plan 373
8.3.1.4.1 Modelling and Simulation 373
8.3.1.4.2 MCAO design 373
8.3.1.4.3 MCAO calibration issues 374
8.3.1.4.4 AO key component status and development 375
8.3.2 Extreme Adaptive Optics and High Contrast Imaging: EPICS project 381
8.3.2.1 EPICS Top level performance requirements 381
8.3.2.2 EPICS Adaptive Optics concept 381
8.3.2.2.1 Common path system: 382
8.3.2.2.2 Individual Channel paths 384
8.3.2.3 Coronagraphy 384
8.3.2.4 Correction of co-phasing errors 386
8.3.2.5 EPICS performance 388
8.3.2.6 Technological requirements for EPICS 389
8.3.2.7 Future development plan 390

8.4 Third generation Adaptive Optics 392

8.4.1 Introduction 392
8.4.2 Toward the 3rd generation AO systems with LGSs 392
8.4.2.1 From Single Conjugate to Laser Tomography AO 392
8.4.2.2 Laser assisted Ground Layer Adaptive Optics 393
8.4.2.3 Laser Assisted Multi-Conjugate Adaptive Optics 394
8.4.2.4 Laser Assisted Multi-Object Adaptive Optics 395
8.4.3 ELTs and LGSs issues 395
8.4.4 Potential solutions to LGS issues 397
8.4.4.1 Spot Elongation 397
8.4.4.2 Spot aberrations 397
8.4.4.3 Fratricide effect 398
8.4.5 New Laser Guide Star concepts 398

8.4.5.1 Pseudo Infinite Guide Stars ... 398
8.4.5.2 Sky Projected Laser Array Shack-Hartmann ... 399
8.4.5.3 Virtual Wavefront Sensor ... 399
8.4.5.4 Variable Wavefront Sensors ... 400
8.4.5.5 Laser Guided AO with on-sky phase shifting Interferometry ... 401
8.4.6 Strategies of the LGS program for OWL ... 404
8.4.6.1 Background ... 404
8.4.6.2 Status and planned tasks ... 404

9. Telescope structure and kinematics ... 407

9.1 Design Principles ... 407

9.2 Design Assumption ... 409

9.3 Design Evolution ... 409

9.3.1 1997 Design ... 411
9.3.2 1998 Design ... 411
9.3.3 1999 Design ... 412
9.3.4 2000 Design ... 414
9.3.5 2002 Design ... 414
9.3.6 2004 Design ... 415
9.3.7 2005 Design (current baseline). ... 416

9.4 Conceptual Design. ... 416

9.4.1 Structural design ... 417
9.4.1.1 Material selection ... 417
9.4.1.2 Structural element selection ... 418
9.4.2 Fractal Design ... 419
9.4.2.1 Base module ... 419
9.4.3 Azimuth Structure. ... 420
9.4.4 Altitude Structure. ... 421
9.4.4.1 Primary mirror obscuration ... 423
9.4.4.2 Structural ropes ... 423
9.4.4.2.1 Material selection ... 424
9.4.4.2.2 Wind on ropes ... 425
9.4.4.3 Focal Stations ... 426
9.4.4.3.1 Alternative focal station. ... 427
9.4.5 Sub-Systems design. ... 428
9.4.5.1 Kinematics ... 428
9.4.5.1.1 Torque requirement. ... 428
9.4.5.1.2 Acceleration. ... 428
9.4.5.1.3 Friction Drive & Bearing. ... 428
9.4.5.1.4 Hydrostatic pads and direct drive. ... 434
9.4.5.1.5 Magnetic Levitation ... 435
9.4.5.2 Corrector. ... 437

9.4.5.3 M3 and M4 Unit 438
9.4.5.4 M5 Unit 438
9.4.5.5 M6 Unit 438
9.4.5.5.1 Interface to the corrector 439
9.4.5.5.2 M6 Unit design volume 439
9.4.6 Segments support system. 440
9.4.6.1 Segment assembly. 441
9.4.6.2 Extractors. 441
9.4.6.3 Position Actuators characteristics. 442
9.4.6.3.1 Axial stiffness 442
9.4.6.3.2 Load cases. 442
9.4.6.3.3 Accuracy. 442
9.4.6.3.4 Stroke 442
9.4.6.3.5 Closed Loop Bandwidth. 443
9.4.6.3.6 Maximum tracking rate 443
9.4.6.3.7 Maximum slewing rate 443
9.4.6.3.8 Heat dissipation. 444
9.4.7 Wind Evaluation Breadboard 444
9.4.7.1 WEB layout. 444
9.4.8 Internal Metrology 446
9.4.9 Thermal control and design provision 446
9.4.9.1 Thermally controlled volumes 446
9.4.9.2 Passive thermal control of the mechanical steel structure. 447
9.4.10 Safety 447
9.4.11 Mass & Moment breakdown. 448

9.5 Structural analysis 448
9.5.1 Analysis tree 450
9.5.2 Static Analysis 451
9.5.2.1 Gravity 452
9.5.2.2 Steady State Wind 453
9.5.3 Thermal analysis 454
9.5.4 Dynamic Analysis 458
9.5.4.1 Modal 458
9.5.4.2 Dynamic Wind Load 463
9.5.4.2.1 Macro scale wind effect on segmented mirrors 464
9.5.4.2.2 Micro scale wind effect on phasing error 467
9.5.4.3 Effect of soil and foundation 469
9.5.5 Safety Analysis 471
9.5.5.1 Wind 471
9.5.5.2 Earthquake 472
9.5.5.3 Buckling 472
9.5.5.4 Fatigue 473
9.5.5.5 Pretension of ropes 474

9.6 Structure design Options 475

9.6.1 Base line High configuration (2005 design) ... 475
9.6.2 Glass Ceramic low configuration ... 475
9.6.3 SiC high and low configurations ... 476
9.6.4 Glass Ceramic 60 m configuration ... 477

10. Adapter-Rotator ... 479

10.1 Requirements ... 479

10.2 Constraints ... 480

10.3 Notional Design ... 481

10.3.1 Pick-up mirrors ... 482

10.4 Adapter-Rotator configuration vs instruments and functions ... 483

11. Enclosure and infrastructures ... 485

11.1 Telescope enclosure ... 485

11.1.1 Baseline design description ... 487
11.1.2 Concrete works ... 495
11.1.3 Structure and mechanisms ... 497
11.1.4 Alternatives ... 501

11.2 Infrastructures ... 506

11.2.1 Mirrors maintenance ... 508
11.2.2 Laboratories ... 509
11.2.3 Control room and personnel offices ... 510
11.2.4 Air conditioning and chilled water plants ... 510
11.2.5 Fluid distribution ... 511
11.2.6 Power station ... 511
11.2.7 Personnel accommodation building ... 512
11.2.8 Site preparation ... 512
11.2.8.1 Camp and first infrastructures ... 513
11.2.8.2 Earth works for telescope platform ... 513
11.2.8.3 Access roads to the Observatory ... 515
11.2.8.4 Miscellaneous ... 516

12. Instrumentation ... 517

12.1 Technical instrumentation ... 517

12.2 Science instrumentation ... 518

12.2.1 Scope of the instrument concept studies ... 518
12.2.2 Instrument Concept Studies ... 519
12.2.3 CODEX: high resolution. ultra-stable VIS-R spectrograph ... 519

12.2.3.1 QuantEYE 523
12.2.3.2 Hyper-telescope NIR camera 526
12.2.3.3 ONIRICA: OWL NIR Imaging Camera 527
12.2.3.4 MOMFIS: Multi Object. Multi Field Near –IR Spectrograph 534
12.2.3.5 EPICS: Exo- Planet Imaging Camera Spectrograph 537
12.2.3.5.1 Science drivers 538
12.2.3.5.2 Targets 538
12.2.3.5.3 Top level requirements 539
12.2.3.5.3.1 Instrument. general 539
12.2.3.5.3.2 Instrument main observing modes and performance requirements 540
12.2.3.5.3.3 Requirements to the site . the telescope and observing time 541
12.2.3.5.4 InstrumentConcept 541
12.2.3.5.5 Adaptive optics 542
12.2.3.5.6 Coronagraphy 543
12.2.3.5.7 Instruments 543
12.2.3.5.7.1 Differential Imager 543
12.2.3.5.7.2 Integral Field Spectrograph 544
12.2.3.5.7.3 Differential Polarimeter 544
12.2.3.5.8 Integration times for a 5 σ detection in case of background limited observation 545
12.2.3.5.9 Need for 100m 548
12.2.3.5.10 Systematic Errors 548
12.2.3.5.11 Technological requirements for EPICS 548
12.2.3.6 T-OWL: Mid-Infrared Imager 549
12.2.3.7 SCOWL : Imager at Submillimeter Camera at OWL 553
12.2.4 Versatile Instruments and Dedicated Experiments or Surveys 557
12.2.5 Telescope Interface and Deployment Considerations 557
12.2.6 Adaptive Optics Requirement Overview 559
12.2.7 Detector Requirement Overview 559

13. Transport and integration 561

13.1 Transport 561
13.1.1 Design provisions 561
13.1.1.1 Mechanics 561
13.1.1.2 Optics 562

13.2 Site integration 562
13.2.1 Design provisions 563
13.2.1.1 Mechanics 563
13.2.1.2 Alignment metrology 563
13.2.1.3 Telescope truss structure integration 564
13.2.1.3.1 Phase 1 564
13.2.1.3.2 Phase 2 565
13.2.1.3.3 Phase 3 565
13.2.1.3.4 Phase 4 566

13.2.1.3.5 Phase 5 567
13.2.1.3.6 Phase 6 567
13.2.1.3.7 Phase 7 568
13.2.1.4 Segment integration 569
13.2.1.4.1 Segment handling tool 570
13.2.1.5 Optics 573
13.2.1.5.1 Initial alignment 573
13.2.2 Safety 574

14. Site Characterisation 575

14.1 Introduction 575
14.1.1 Instrumentation and methods 575
14.1.1.1 Cloudiness 575
14.1.1.2 Precipitable Water Vapor 576
14.1.1.3 Aerosol Extinction 576
14.1.1.4 Seeing 576
14.1.1.5 Turbulence Vertical Profiles 576
14.1.1.6 Turbulence Outer Scale 577
14.1.1.7 Wave front coherence time 577

14.2 Parameters space 577
14.2.1 General astronomy 577
14.2.1.1 Cloudiness 577
14.2.1.2 Precipitable water vapour 578
14.2.1.3 Aerosol Extinction 581
14.2.1.3.1 Saharan dust 581
14.2.1.3.2 Contrails 582
14.2.1.4 Sky background 583
14.2.1.5 Seeing 584
14.2.2 Telescope design & operation 585
14.2.2.1 Wind. temperature and humidity 585
14.2.2.2 Seismicity 585
14.2.2.3 Topology. soil characteristics 586
14.2.2.4 Infrastructures 587
14.2.3 AO observations 588
14.2.3.1 Lower atmosphere turbulence and wind 588
14.2.3.2 Higher atmosphere turbulence and wind 590
14.2.3.3 Full Atmospheric profiles 591
14.2.3.4 Sodium layer 593

14.3 Site selection strategy 593
14.3.1 Identification of potential candidates 593
14.3.2 Characterization of the parameter space 597
14.3.3 Analysis of climate stability 598
14.3.3.1 The experience of ESO Observatory 598

14.3.3.2 FRIOWL 599

14.4 Site preservation and monitoring 602

14.4.1 Local Seeing control 602

14.4.2 Astronomical Site Monitoring Station 603

15. Maintenance and operations 607

15.1 Maintenance 607

15.1.1 Design provisions 607

15.1.1.1 Human access and handling 607

15.1.1.1.1 Human access 607

15.1.1.1.2 Handling Facilities 608

15.1.1.2 Corrector Handling 609

15.1.1.3 M6 Unit Handling 610

15.1.1.4 Primary mirror covers handling 611

15.1.1.4.1 Covers Docking and undocking operations. 612

15.1.1.5 Sliding Enclosure 613

15.1.1.6 Secondary mirror handling 614

15.1.2 Safety 615

15.2 Observatory operations 615

15.3 Science operations 617

16. Management 619

16.1 Introduction 619

16.2 Programme organization 622

16.3 Programme management and control 627

16.4 Programme team 628

16.5 Programme phases 629

16.6 Schedule 630

16.7 Cost of the programme 632

16.7.1 Cost estimate methodology 632

16.7.2 Cost 632

16.7.3 Staffing 633

16.7.3.1 Design phase 633

16.7.3.2 Construction phase 633

16.7.3.3 Operations phase 633

Design parameters – Summary 634

References **641**

Acknowledgements **649**

Contributors **652**

Appendix 1. The ELT Design Study **655**

A-1.1 Work Packages *655*

A-1.2 Wavefront control *660*

A-1.3 Optical fabrication *666*

A-1.4 Mechanics *667*

A-1.5 Enclosure & wind studies *669*

A-1.6 Adaptive Optics *669*

A-1.7 Operations *670*

A-1.8 Instrumentation *670*

A-1.9 Site characterization *671*

A-1.10 Integrated modelling *672*

Appendix 2. ELT Design Study Participants **673**

Appendix 3. System status at construction readiness review **677**

Appendix 4. Phase B Schedule estimate **683**

Appendix 5. Phase C/D schedule estimate **689**

Appendix 6. Cost estimate **703**

Appendix 7. Software tools **707**

Appendix 8. Optical design – criteria and merit function **711**

Appendix 9. Optional corrector **715**

Index of tables

Table 2-1 Summary of top level requirements 63
Table 2-2. Baseline design, optical characteristics. 65
Table 2-3.Segments characteristics. 69
Table 2-4 Instrument Concept Studies 81
Table 2-5. Subsystems status at start of segments integration. 84
Table 2-6. OWL cost estimate, capital investment. 92
Table 2-7 Summary of exo-planet capability as a function of ELT size 95
Table 2-8 Summary of studies of resolved stellar populations as a function of ELT size 96
Table 2-9 Summary of studies of the high-redshift Universe as a function of ELT size 96
Table 2-10. Dependence of main telescope requirements on diameter D 97
Table 2-11. Summary of environmental risks (a few comments still to be incorporated). 101
Table 2-12. System risks 103
Table 2-13. Areas of Risk Impact. 108
Table 3-1. Primary science cases 110
Table 3-2. (From Science Book) Gains in magnitude for the same signal-to-noise and exposure time when observing unresolved sources in the background-limited regime. The gains are shown relative to an 8m telescope delivering 0.5” images. 113
Table 3-3. (from [118]) IR performance of several ELTs compared to that of the JWST space telescope, in terms of the point source sensitivity ratio ELT/JWST. In the near-infrared an ELT outperforms a 6.5m cold (~30K) space telescope such as JWST (bold font shows ratio > 0.5). 114
Table 3-4. Diffraction limit (Res, in milliarcsecond) and corresponding limiting magnitudes for various telescope sizes, under identical conditions and assumptions (i.e. same Strehl ratio of 50%, efficiency 30%, sky background from Paranal, no atmospheric extinction). While the absolute values may change with assumptions, the relative ones should not. 115
Table 3-5. Summary of the capabilities of a sub-mm instrument on OWL compared to those of ALMA. 116
Table 3-6. Science requirements. S stands for Strehl ratio 121
Table 3-7 Requirements from the main science cases (adapted from Hook [120]) 126
Table 4-1. Single conjugate AO requirements. 131
Table 4-2. Multi-conjugate AO requirements 132

Table 4-3. Ground-layer AO requirements. 132

Table 4-4 Multi Object AO requirements 132

Table 4-5. Extreme AO requirements. 132

Table 4-6. AO requirements at optical wavelengths (provisional). 133

Table 4-7. Effect of differential displacement due to atmospheric refraction between meridian and one hour from meridian. RA and DEC are right ascension and declination, Sep is the separation between the stars, Displ is the relative differential displacement in milliarcsec at one hour from meridian, and ΔT is the maximum exposure time in minutes to have a displacement < 10% of the diffraction peak. 134

Table 5-1. Image quality requirements, non-adaptive modes. 136

Table 5-2. Image quality requirements, with first and second generation adaptive optics. 137

Table 5-3. Failure / damage hierarchy and allowable rate of occurence. 137

Table 5-4. Structural subsystem. 149

Table 5-5. Optic model, inputs and outputs. 149

Table 5-6. Control loops. 150

Table 5-7. Integrated Model - Intermediate steps. 150

Table 5-8. Integrated Model validation methods. 151

Table 5-9: Typical expected median values of the atmospheric turbulence parameters based on the experience at existing observatories. 161

Table 5-10: Various environmental conditions on Paranal. 162

Table 5-11: Temperature conditions on Paranal. 164

Table 5-12: Earthquake characteristics for two different sites. 166

Table 5-13: Survival wind speed for telescope and enclosure structure. 167

Table 5-14: Survival temperature conditions for the telescope and enclosure structure. 167

Table 5-15. Image quality budget - main positions. 169

Table 5-16. OWL Image quality budget in SCAO mode. 170

Table 6-1. Optical design: guidelines and objectives. M=Mandatory; C=Critical; D=Desirable. 186

Table 6-2. Ratings for designs No 1 to 4. (*) P=Pass; F=Fail. 193

Table 6-3. Baseline design, optical prescription. 197

Table 6-4. 4-mirror f/15 design, 60-m aperture; optical prescription. 199

Table 6-5. 4-mirror f/15, 60-m aperture design. Nominal optical quality. 199

Table 6-6. Baseline design, optical quality. 202

Table 6-7. Expected emissivity at 2.2 μm, classical Al or Au coatings. 208

Table 6-8. Expected emissivity at 2.2 μm, Gemini enhanced Ag coatings. 208

Table 6-9. Baseline design, sensitivity matrix. 211

Table 6-10. Baseline design, sensitivity matrix, corrector decenters (rigid body). 212

Table 6-11. Segments characteristics. 227

Table 6-12. Compared performance of Zerodur, fused silica and silicon carbide with respect to through-thickness CTE and thermal gradients (1.6-m flat-to-flat, 70 mm thick segments). 230

Table 7-1 Altitude axis: summary of the design results 255

Table 7-2 Azimuth axis: summary of the design results 255

Table 8-1: Spectral Envelope of maximum Tip-tilt signal (mirror tilt) to be corrected by M6AM. On-sky tip-tilt is ~ mirror tilt/20. 302
Table 8-2: SCAO Strehl ratio (%) with the visible wavefront sensor 302
Table 8-3: SCAO Strehl ratio (%) with the infrared wavefront sensor 302
Table 8-4: Requirements for the Calico- Mux development funded by Caltech and ESO 311
Table 8-5: Local Loop Characteristics 327
Table 8-6: Analog performance (Capacitive Sensor) 327
Table 8-7: Characteristics of potential materials for thin shells. 330
Table 8-8: Main characteristics of the OWL large DMs 333
Table 8-9: Essential characteristics of the VLT adaptive secondary mirror. 333
Table 8-10: AO systems commissioned or under development. SPARTA support starts with MAD 338
Table 8-11: GLAO Ensquared Energy (%) in 50mas pixel over 6' FOV 346
Table 8-12: GLAO – Gain in Ensquared Energy in 50mas pixel over 6' FOV, corrected PSF vs. seeing. 346
Table 8-13: GLAO Ensquared Energy variation in 50 mas pixel over FOV (PSF uniformity) 346
Table 8-14. Field references. 360
Table 8-15: MCAO performance (Strehl Ratio, %) over 1' FOV vs. seeing and NGS magnitudes; 366
Table 8-16: MCAO Strehl Ratio variation (in rms Sr) over the 1' FOV; 366
Table 8-17. Four technologies to achieve the XAO requirements 390
Table 8-18: Quantitative evaluation of the known LGS issues versus telescope diameter 397
Table 9-1: Design guidelines 409
Table 9-2: Kevlar available grades. 424
Table 9-3: Main axes friction drive and bearing topology. 433
Table 9-4: Load cases. 433
Table 9-5: Main axes torque requirement. 433
Table 9-6: Friction drive generated torque 434
Table 9-7: Cost breakdown of OWL's drive and bearing systems 434
Table 9-8: Maglev main requirements 435
Table 9-9. Bearings & drives linear generate forces. 436
Table 9-10. Minimum required stiffness. 437
Table 9-11: Telescope mass breakdown 448
Table 9-12: Mass moment of inertia 448
Table 9-13: Mass and inertia budget of the FE model in zenith configuration. 450
Table 9-14: Differential rigid body motions of the optical elements due to gravity. 452
Table 9-15: Worst case rigid body and PTV motions of M1 and M2 segments due to static wind. 453
Table 9-16: Eigenfrequencies and effective masses of zenith configuration. 458
Table 9-17: Eigenfrequencies and effective masses of 30 º configuration. 458
Table 9-18: Eigenfrequencies and effective masses of 60 º configuration. 458

Table 9-19: 1σ maximum piston displacement of M1 and M2 due to von Karman wind load spectra applied to complete mirrors area. 467

Table 9-20: 1σ maximum displacements of M1 and M2 segments (part of the mirror area loaded). 467

Table 9-21: Maximum stresses. safety margins and displacements or survival wind load cases. 471

Table 9-22: High configuration 475

Table 9-23: Low configuration. 476

Table 9-24. Design options. overall properties. 478

Table 10-1. Adapter-rotator requeirements for a set of representative instruments. 483

Table 10-2: Adapter-rotator requirements for a set of representative AO Systems. 484

Table 10-3 Adapter-rotator requirements for Active Optics. 484

Table 11-1. Main sites characteristics. 486

Table 11-2: Concrete and steel quantities 496

Table 11-3: Power consumption estimation 511

Table 11-4: Volume of earth to be removed to prepare the site. 515

Table 12-1. Instrument Concept Studies. 518

Table 12-2. Gain in photon statistics with telescope size 525

Table 12-3 Magnitude limits for point sources at 100m. 60m and 30m 529

Table 12-4 Magnitude limits (S/N=5) for 1 hour integration time for OWL and JWST 530

Table 12-5 Proposed wave-lengths set for the differential imager 543

Table 12-6: Characteristics of Earth-like planets used in the simulation. 546

Table 12-7: Characteristics of Jupiter-like planets used in the simulation. 546

Table 12-8 Main characteristics of SCOWL 555

Table 12-9 AO Requirements from Instruments * : seeing-reduced image quality desirable +: high frequency monitoring of water content of atmosphere desirable 558

Table 12-10 Detector Array Requirement 559

Table 14-1: PWV (mm) statistics for Paranal (January - August 1998) and Chajnantor (January - September 1999) for satellite and ground based site monitor measurements of PWV. .. 579

Table 14-2: Site locations and information 579

Table 14-3: Typical IR Backgrounds at Paranal (mag/arcsec-2). from J. Cuby et al.. The Messenger 101. p.3. September 2000. Note that K. L and M values include telescope background. 584

Table 14-4: Average background at Paranal (mag/arcsec-2). from >4000 FORS1 exposures during Apr.-Sep. 2001. by F. Patat. UBVRI Night Sky Brightness at ESO-Paranal during sunspot maximum. The Messenger 115. March 2004. 584

Table 14-5: 50-years horizontal ground peak acceleration (g units) with 10% probability of exceedence. 585

Table 14-6: Soil characteristics for Paranal area (Site 1) and La Palma (Site II) 587

Table 14-7: NCEP / NCAR Reanalysis datasets used 600

Table 14-8: ECMWF Reanalysis datasets used (ERA-15) 600

Table 14-9:TOMS Aerosol datasets used 601

Table 15-1: Human access. 608

Table 15-2 Sliding enclosure maintenance requirements 613
Table 16-1. Total estimated cost (incl. contingency and overheads) 632
Table 16-2. Estimated human resource requirements, design phase. 633

Table A- 1. ELT Design Study - overview of the Work Packages. 660
Table A- 2. Position sensors main specifications. 660
Table A- 3. Position actuators, essential characteristics. 662
Table A- 4. Function of merit, criteria and relative weights. 712
Table A- 5. Mandatory requirements. 712
Table A- 6. Merit function; guidelines for ratings. 714
Table A- 7. Optional corrector, optical prescription. 717

Index of figures

Figure 2-1. Using primary distance indicators to disentangle cosmological models. The plot shows the apparent magnitude difference relative to an empty universe of several cosmological models as a function of redshift. Regions of application for various methods of distance estimates with OWL are indicated. 56

Figure 2-2 Simulation of observations of Supernovae with OWL.The current data from ground and space observations are shown. These observations will allow to determine the cosmic SN rate, and help disentagle cosmological models (e.g. whether a “quintessence field” or a “phantom energy” exist)..... 57

Figure 2-3 Brief history of the telescope. Stars are refractors, asterisks are speculum reflectors and circles are glass reflectors. Some specific telescopes are named. 60

Figure 2-4 Improvement in sensitivity of telescopes expressed in “equivalent diameter of a perfect telescope” = $\sqrt{(\eta D^2)}$, with η the telescope overall efficiency (the dashed line is an aid to the eye, not a fit). 61

Figure 2-5. Layout of the OWL observatory. 64

Figure 2-6. Layout of the baseline optical design. 66

Figure 2-7. Primary mirror geometry (3048 segments). 70

Figure 2-8. Secondary mirror geometry (216 segments). 71

Figure 2-9. Telescope structure, overall layout. 72

Figure 2-10. Structural steel module 73

Figure 2-11. Friction drive 73

Figure 2-12. First light results with MAD (laboratory conditions). Atmospheric turbulence is emulated with phase screens. Seeing 0.5 arc seconds, coherence time 5 ms, wavelength 2.2 μm. Adaptive loop frequency 210 Hz. 77

Figure 2-13. PSD of turbulent wind speed in open air and inside VLT enclosure (no wind screen). 79

Figure 2-14. Sliding enclosure (courtesy CL-MAP)..... 80

Figure 2-15. Design phase, major milestones. 89

Figure 2-16. Phase C/D major milestones. 90

Figure 2-17. ELT Design Study, Work Breakdown Structure..... 93

Figure 2-18. ELT Design Study, overall schedule..... 94

Figure 2-19. Unit cost vs. quantity (industrial data)..... 99

Figure 3-1. Time needed to achieve the same S/N on diffraction-limited telescopes as a ratio to the time needed on a 100m, i.e. t/t100 (note the background limited, t/t100 ∝ D4, and shot noise limited, t/t100 ∝ D2, regimes)..... 112

Figure 3-2. (From Science Book) The theoretical diffraction limits (λ/D) for 8m, 30m and 100m telescopes are plotted at three wavelength values corresponding approximately to the J, H and K infrared bands (horizontal bars). Also plotted are curves of projected angular size as a function of redshift for objects of various physical sizes (10pc, 50pc, 300pc and 1kpc) for two sets of cosmological parameters: (ΩM,ΩΛ)=(0,0) and (0.3,0.7) for the lower and upper curves respectively. 113

Figure 3-3. Observability of major emission lines with redshift. 114

Figure 3-4 Simulated image of a solar-type system at 10 parsec (32 light-years)..... 117

Figure 3-5 (From Science Book) Synthetic Colour-Magnitude Diagram computed using constant star formation rate from 13 Gyr ago to the present. The age of the stars are coded in different colours. Labels indicate different evolutionary phases: BL - blue loop; HB - Horizontal Branch; RC – Red Clump; RGB – red giant branch; AGB – asymptotic giant branch; MS – main sequence. From [119]. 119

Figure 3-6 Simulation of the formation of the galaxies in the Local Group in a cold dark matter scenario, by Ben Moore, Zurich, astronomy and cosmology research group (www.nbody.net). 120

Figure 5-1 : Project V-diagram. 140

Figure 5-2: Requirements breakdown. 141

Figure 5-3: Schematic example of functional breakdown. 142

Figure 5-4. OWL architecture example. 142

Figure 5-5: Phase A “open loop” design iterations 143

Figure 5-6: Block diagram of the OWL Integrated Model 146

Figure 5-7: Relationship between the height above the ground and the mean velocity 153

Figure 5-8: Model velocity-PSD close to the M1 segments 154

Figure 5-9: Force PSD averaged over three different areas 155

Figure 5-10: Instantaneous pressure field on M1 156

Figure 5-11: Comparison of PSDs obtained by CFD with model PSDs 156

Figure 5-12: JBO Lovell Radio Telescope with pressure sensors 157

Figure 5-13 : Pressure power spectrum on the reflector of the Jodrell Bank Telescope 158

Figure 5-14: Pressure PSD measured in a wind tunnel 159

Figure 5-15. Respective areas of action of active and adaptive optical systems as a function of the spatial and temporal frequency of the perturbations 159

Figure 5-16: VLTI-Vinci Optical path difference power spectrum and Kolmogorov model saturation for aperture distances larger than the outer scale L_0 (credit. E. di Folco, ESO 2004) 160

Figure 5-17: Steel pipe exposed to sun radiation 162

Figure 5-18: Temperature evolution 163

Figure 5-19: Environmental conditions. 163

Figure 5-20: Acceleration response spectrum (Telescope, MLE, 0.34 g, 1.5 % damping)..... 166

Figure 6-1. Implied characteristics. 187

Figure 6-2. Mechanical implementation of different optical designs. 189

Figure 6-3. Baseline optical design (design No 1). 190

Figure 6-4. Ritchey-Chretien design (design No 2)..... 190
Figure 6-5. Four mirror, spherical primary & flat secondary mirrors solution (design No 3). 191
Figure 6-6. Four-mirror, conic M1 & M2 design (design No 4)..... 191
Figure 6-7. Four-mirror solution; f/0.89 spherical primary mirror 192
Figure 6-8. 5-mirror solution, f/1.42 spherical primary mirror..... 192
Figure 6-9. Baseline optical design, major dimensions..... 195
Figure 6-10. Baseline design, optomechanical implementation. 196
Figure 6-11. 4-mirror f/15 design, 60-m aperture..... 198
Figure 6-12. Optical test set-up for the testing of a convex, aspherical 8-m class mirror..... 200
Figure 6-13. 60-m four mirror design with f/0.75 parabolic primary mirror..... 200
Figure 6-14. Coaxial design with f/5 focus. Field of view 6 arc minutes, f/1.3 primary mirror... 201
Figure 6-15. Baseline design; Strehl Ratio vs field of view. 202
Figure 6-16. Baseline design; rms spot size (arc seconds) vs field radius. 203
Figure 6-17. RMS wavefront error (microns) vs field radius. 203
Figure 6-18. Point Spread functions at 0.5 microns. Box size 0.040 arc seconds..... 204
Figure 6-19. Ensquared energy at 0.5 microns. Scale: 100 microns = 0.0342 arc seconds. ... 204
Figure 6-20. Point Spread functions at 2.2 microns. Box size 0.200 arc seconds..... 205
Figure 6-21. Ensquared energy at 2.2 microns. Scale: 500 microns=0.171 arc seconds. 205
Figure 6-22. Distortion..... 206
Figure 6-23. Vignetting by M5 as a function of M5 diameter. 206
Figure 6-24. Possible set of baffles..... 207
Figure 6-25. Pupil mask (emissivity budget). The pupil mask covers all obstructed areas except the inter-segment gaps and tensioning ropes. 209
Figure 6-26. Aberrated layer image. 213
Figure 6-27. Adaptive correction error (wavefront RMS) for 1 km conjugate defocus..... 214
Figure 6-28. Image quality of the pupil conjugation; field of view 1 arc minute diameter. 215
Figure 6-29. Image quality of the pupil conjugation; field of view 3 arc minutes diameter. 215
Figure 6-30. Image quality of the pupil conjugation; field of view 6 arc minutes diameter. 216
Figure 6-31. Spot diagrams, LGS at 90 km on-axis and 3 arc minutes off-axis. 217
Figure 6-32. Wavefront map, LGS at 90 km, 3 arc minutes off-axis..... 217
Figure 6-33. Model of the pupil for studying diffraction effects 218
Figure 6-34 PSF from the pupil presented above. The field of view is 1 arc second diameter, wavelength is 650 nm. Here and further: logarithmic scale. 219
Figure 6-35 Diffraction by the “spider”. PSF box size 0.72” 220
Figure 6-36 Diffraction by “missing” segments. PSF box size 0.72” 221
Figure 6-37 Diffraction by the ropes. PSF box size 0.72” 221
Figure 6-38. Mechanism of the formation of diffraction peaks (gaps): the grid factor (dots) is multiplied by the segment PSF. Left: without gaps; except for the central one all peaks of the grid factor fall into zeros of the segment PSF_s. Right: with gaps; peaks no longer coincide with PSF_S zeros..... 222
Figure 6-39 Diffraction by intersegments gaps of the primary (left) and of the secondary mirrors (right). Box size 0.72 arc secons. 222

Figure 6-40 Intensity slice representation of OWL PSF between 10^{-5} and 10^{-7}. Most diffraction artefacts are apparent. 223

Figure 6-41 Intensity slice representation of OWL PSF with 30nm and 56nm wavefront RMS residual segmentation piston, tip-tilt errors on two segmented mirrors. 226

Figure 6-42. Segment unit product tree. 227

Figure 6-43. Primary and secondary mirror segments distributions. 228

Figure 6-44. Primary mirror geometry, obscurations and intersegments gaps variation. 229

Figure 6-45. Primary mirror segment blank. 231

Figure 6-46. Secondary mirror segment blank. 232

Figure 6-47. Zerodur hexagonal cast. Courtesy Schott. 233

Figure 6-48. CTE homogeneity of Zerodur. Courtesy Schott. 233

Figure 6-49. Thermo-mechanical figure of merit. 234

Figure 6-50. Precursor (left) and 1-m sintered SiC segment (right). Courtesy Boostec. 235

Figure 6-51. Segments optical quality (rms slope) specifications. 237

Figure 6-52. Segments optical quality (rms amplitude) specifications. 238

Figure 6-53. Interferogram of a LAMOST 1-m spherical segment prototype. Courtesy REOSC. 239

Figure 6-54. Segment deflection on axial support. Zerodur, thickness 70 mm. 240

Figure 6-55. M4 aspherization profile. 241

Figure 6-56. M4 slope difference with respect to best fitting sphere. 242

Figure 6-57. High spatial frequency wavefront error, VLT primary mirror. 243

Figure 6-58. M4 optical test set-up. 244

Figure 6-59. M4 nominal interferogram, double pass. 244

Figure 7-1. Wavefront control - overall layout. 248

Figure 7-2 Wavefront Control Architecture for OWL 249

Figure 7-3 Block diagram of the closed-loop system 251

Figure 7-4 Normalized PSD of the wind loads applied to different height: altitude configuration 252

Figure 7-5 Frequency characteristics of altitude models for four different configurations 252

Figure 7-6 Frequency characteristics of azimuth models for two different configurations 253

Figure 7-7 Output sensitivity function as a a measure of both the rejection of perturbation and the robustness for the altitude axis 254

Figure 7-8 Output sensitivity function as a measure of both the rejection of perturbations and the robustness for the azimuth axis 254

Figure 7-9 PSD of tracking error on the main bearing (altitude axis 30 deg) – open-loop (dashed), closed-loop (solid) 255

Figure 7-10 Main bearing (altitude axis) tracking error for 30 deg configuration 255

Figure 7-11 Left) bogie subjected to various forces-- Right) friction as a function of velocity 256

Figure 7-12. Tracking a ramp reference signal in closed-loop. Left: slope 0.1 arcsec/sec stick-slip motion. Right: slope 0.5 arcsec/sec; stick-slip disappears. 257

Figure 7-13 Block-diagram of bogie control system: feedback + feed-forward friction compensation strategy 258

Figure 7-14 Closed loop simulation of seven bogies (with friction compensation), one bogie is passive which exhibits small stick-slip motion, oscillations are induced on other bogies. 258

Figure 7-15 Closed-loop simulation of the altitude axis at 30 deg tracking a ramp reference signal with a slope of 0.1 arcsec/sec: left) no feed-forward friction compensation---right) with feed-forward friction compensation 259

Figure 7-16 Closed-loop simulation of altitude, 30-deg configuration 260

Figure 7-17 Wavefront error (tilt) on the sky- Altitude simulation: zenith configuration, main axis control with different wind loads applied to different levels 260

Figure 7-18 PSD of the wavefront error (tilt) on the sky 261

Figure 7-19 Wavefront error (tilt) after field stabilization correction as a function of the closed-loop bandwidth 261

Figure 7-20 Block diagram of the closed-loop control of M6: field stabilization 262

Figure 7-21 PSD of the corrected tilt wave front error on the sky 262

Figure 7-22 Simulation results: wavefront errors before and after correction, tilt motions of the M6 unit and the input torque applied to the unit. 263

Figure 7-23. Field of View of the Shack-Hartmann sensors on M3 and M4. 268

Figure 7-24. Two types of lenslet and their projection onto the edge of the segments 272

Figure 7-25. Shape of the PSF for piston steps ranging from 0 to λ/2. 272

Figure 7-26. Conceptual setup of a Modified Mach-Zehnder interferometer. 273

Figure 7-27. Mach-Zehnder signal profile for a piston step of $\pi/2$ and for different optical path differences between the two arms. Theoretical predictions are on the left hand side and experimental results on the right hand side 273

Figure 7-28. Phase mask principle 274

Figure 7-29. Signal obtained with a mechanical piston step of 230 nm. 274

Figure 7-30. Signal obtained with the diffraction image technique (courtesy A. Schumacher) 275

Figure 7-31. Signal obtained with the pyramid sensor for a piston step between square segments (courtesy S. Esposito) 275

Figure 7-32. Position and surface piston levels of the hexagonal subapertures on the piston plate used for the laboratory tests (A=0nm, B=18nm, C=50nm, D=325nm). 276

Figure 7-33. Phasing sensor signal from the multisegment phase plate without (left) and with (right) turbulence. 277

Figure 7-34. Sensor signals and fitted curves for one border for the two cases without (upper plot) and with (lower plot) turbulence. Note the change of the character of the signal : from an oscillating behaviour to smooth wings according to the function f. 278

Figure 7-35. ZEUS measurements: amplitude of te signals versus known piston steps without (a) and with a turbulent generator (b). Note the reduction of the amplitude of the fitted sine curve from 0.65 to 0.29. 278

Figure 7-36. Hough transform of the signal (left) and the detected lines (right). 279

Figure 7-37. Piston steps distribution: Initial (a) and after 6th loop (b). The grey scale is in nm. 280

Figure 7-38. Closed loop simulations. Gain 0.5. Initial wave front RMS = 322.5nm, final RMS = 12.7nm. 281

Figure 7-39 Indexation of the segments 282

Figure 7-40. Indexation of the borders between the segments 283

Figure 7-41. The signal from the gaps obtained by a high-pass filtering (a), two spatial Fourier filters (b), and the filtered patterns for the secondary (c) and primary (d) mirrors. 286

Figure 7-42 Scheme of segment system configuration 287
Figure 7-43 PSD of wind load on one segment 288
Figure 7-44 Position error RMS as a function of control bandwidth of each actuator 288
Figure 7-45 Closed-loop position error PSD compared to open loop PSD 289
Figure 7-46 Closed-loop response of system--- closed-loop bandwidth: 10Hz 290
Figure 7-47 Closed-loop simulation ---- with AFC, closed-loop bandwidth 10Hz 290
Figure 7-48 Closed-loop simulation ---- with AFC, closed-loop bandwidth 5Hz 291
Figure 7-49 Reaction force on back structure and wind load on segment 292
Figure 7-50 PSD of wind load and reaction force and back structure 292
Figure 7-51 Seven segment configuration 293
Figure 7-52 Wind load force on seven segments 294
Figure 7-53 Seven segment closed-loop simulation: edge sensor readings and absolute position of the segments. 294
Figure 7-54: 3D view APE on the nasmyth platform 296
Figure 7-55: 3D view of the ASM 296
Figure 7-56: Conceptual design of the IM 297
Figure 8-1: M6 Adaptive Mirror located in the corrector structure of the telescope. 300
Figure 8-2: Single Conjugate Adaptive Optics concept 300
Figure 8-3: Limited corrected FoV due to anisoplanatism in the SCAO concept 302
Figure 8-4: Statistical distribution of the outer scale 303
Figure 8-5: Conjugation altitudes of the M6AM unit 303
Figure 8-6: Geometrical characteristics of the M6 Adaptive Mirror 304
Figure 8-7: Control scheme of the M6AM unit and interface with the active optics. 305
Figure 8-8: Transmission of the wavefront sensor pick-up dichroic 306
Figure 8-9: Defocus of the wavefront sensor versus field position 307
Figure 8-10: Technology concept of the WFS L3CCD detector 307
Figure 8-11: Quantum Efficiency with deep depletion enhancement in the red 308
Figure 8-12: OWL pupil dissector for the Shack Hartmann wavefront sensor 308
Figure 8-13: Shack Hartmann wavefront sensor concept 309
Figure 8-14: Pyramid wavefront sensor concept 311
Figure 8-15: SCAO Shack Hartmann or Pyramid Real-time architecture 312
Figure 8-16: Strehl vs. Magnitude for the SH-WFS (without RON), in K, H, J bands (top to bottom), for the good seeing model (left) and bad seeing model (right). Results are on-axis 313
Figure 8-17: VLT Planet Finder performance for different Readout Noise 313
Figure 8-18: Ensquared Energy versus pixel size (K-H-J; top to bottom), for good seeing (left) and bad seeing models (right). Bright stars are considered. 314
Figure 8-19: Affect of anisoplanatism on the performance of the SCAO system, in K, H and J bands (top to bottom), in good seeing model (left), and bad seeing (right). 314
Figure 8-20: Strehl vs. Magnitude for the IR PYR (without RON on the left, 5e- ron rms on the right), in K, H, J bands (top to bottom), for the good seeing model. Results are on-axis. 315

Figure 8-21: Long Exposure PSF with 10000 ph/subap/integ (bright NGS), for the K band (left) and J-band (right). Both pictures are on-axis. Stretch is logarithmic..... 315

Figure 8-22: EE vs. pixel size, in the K, H and J bands, good seeing, and bright guide star. .. 316

Figure 8-23: Shape for the DM during closed loop. The "spikes" near the telescope central obstruction, created by diffraction effects on the PYR WFS. 316

Figure 8-24: On-axis strehl versus wavelength for a bright reference star 317

Figure 8-25: Point Spread Functions obtained with SCAO. From left to right 2.2, 5 and 10 µm. Good seeing conditions, bright on-axis star. 317

Figure 8-26: P-V DM mechanical stroke requirements versus spatial frequency for a seeing of 1.5” and different outer scales (Courtesy, T. Fusco-ONERA)..... 318

Figure 8-27: Strehl (on-axis) vs. L0, for the SH based SCAO system (good seeing), in K, H and J bands 318

Figure 8-28: Conceptual design for the 1120mm diameter, 1170 actuators VLT deformable secondary mirror..... 322

Figure 8-29: Force/thin shell mirror (VLT design) based on Cold plate, Reference body & thin shell. A Hexapod, attached to the cold plate, provides fine focusing & centering (Courtesy, Microgate/ADS, Italy)..... 322

Figure 8-30: Closer view of the actuator distribution on one half of the DSM (Courtesy Microgate/ADS) 323

Figure 8-31: Light weighting scheme of the VLT design Reference Body; estimated weight (Zerodur) is 27kg while a monolithic design would lead to 130 kg (Courtesy Microgate/ADS, Italy)..... 324

Figure 8-32: Double side polishing device for flat shell. Six shells, maximum diameter of 68mm each can be polished at once (Courtesy SESO, France) 325

Figure 8-33: The successive steps of thin shell slumping (Courtesy INAF) 326

Figure 8-34: Scheme of internal control loop of actuator positions (left hand side). Feed-forward force added to the control schematic on the right hand side..... 327

Figure 8-35: Mode stiffness versus mode number for the VLT DSM..... 328

Figure 8-36: Theoretical Influence Function of a thin shell DM. Left: the IF (scale in mm), right: the associated stress in the glass (square grid of actuator at 29mm spacing, 2mm thick) 329

Figure 8-37. Permanent magnet mounted on the shell..... 330

Figure 8-38. Permanent magnet sizing. 330

Figure 8-39: Shell thickness producing 15 nm rms gravitational sag (30nm rms wavefront error) vs. actuator pitch..... 331

Figure 8-40: Shell gravitational sag (nm) vs. act. pitch for Zerodur, ULE, Borosilicate, Steel & CVCSiC. 331

Figure 8-41: Shell deformation or stroke. Absolute analytical model accuracy: 50%; valid for relative material comparison..... 332

Figure 8-42: Optical diagram of the VLT Deformable Secondary Mirror test setup..... 334

Figure 8-43: Mechanical setup of the VLT deformable secondary mirror Test facility..... 335

Figure 8-44: Possible test setup for the OWL M6. In the case of spherical mirror a corrector is needed for aberration compensation (not shown here) 335

Figure 8-45: Quantum Efficiency curves of the L3 CCD and the PN-sensor..... 336

Figure 8-46: Pn-Sensor readout principle for the 256x256 detector. 337

Figure 8-47: Left: Shack-Hartmann read-out; right: Pyramid read-out 341

Figure 8-48: SPARTA Architecture 342

Figure 8-49: Preliminary statistics of the turbulence profile at Paranal 343

Figure 8-50: Fraction of turbulence located at 200 m as measured by the SLODAR at Paranal 344

Figure 8-51: Ground Layer Adaptive Optics concept 344

Figure 8-52: GLAO real-time hardware architecture 347

Figure 8-53: Frequency of circular 6 arcmin diameter fields as a function of the number of NGS included at the North Galactic Pole for different NGS limiting magnitudes 349

Figure 8-54: Frequency of circular 6 arcmin diameter fields as a function of the number of NGS included on them at at l=0° and b=|50°| for different NGS limiting magnitudes. 349

Figure 8-55: Performance of the VLT MACAO system on UT4 350

Figure 8-56: GLAO Ensquared Energy in 50mas for seeing of 0.53”(left) and 1” (right) at 0.5μm; 6 NGSs 350

Figure 8-57: Gain of EE in 50mas brought by GLAO relative to seeing for seeing of 0.53”(left) and 1” (right) at 0.5μm; 6 NGSs 350

Figure 8-58: EE vs field of view position (K-band); 3NGS in 3’ plus 3 NGSs [3-6’]; faint star 1e-/sub-aperture/s, good seeing model 351

Figure 8-59: Corrected PSF with GLAO using 6 NGSs, 6', good seeing (left) and bad seeing (right), K band, on-axis, 10ph / subap / NGS top curve is GLAO, bottom curve is the uncorrected seeing. 351

Figure 8-60: Effect of the outer scale of turbulence (L_0) on the Strehl obtained with GLAO with 3 NGSs within 3' FOV; good seeing; Top to bottom: K, H, J. 351

Figure 8-61: HAWK-I concept based in CPU-only SPARTA architecture. With the new FPGA architecture the number of computational units will be reduced. 353

Figure 8-62: Concept of Multi-object Adaptive Optics or Distributed Adaptive Optics with wavefront sensors in open loop 354

Figure 8-63: MOAO concept with the wavefront sensor in pseudo closed loop 355

Figure 8-64: GLAO combined with MOAO concept with the wavefront sensor in open loop (right) and in pseudo closed loop (left) 356

Figure 8-65: MOMFIS schematic functional diagram (Courtesy LAM, France) 357

Figure 8-66: MOMFIS general view of the implementation: in the focal plane small pick-off mirrors are positioned with a robot, directing the target beams steering mirrors and the reference star beams to the WFS. The steering mirrors direct in turn the beam to the DM and IFU units (Courtesy LAM, France) 358

Figure 8-67: MOAO control loops 359

Figure 8-68: MOAO Real-Time Computer Concept. The diagram shows an example with only 4 wave-front sensors with local DM and 6 clusters each serving one IFU. The Dm on the right side is the M6AM. 360

Figure 8-69: Gain in Ensquared Energy in a 50 mas pixel for each scientific target, H band, 1” seeing. 361

Figure 8-70. Left: mean distance to the center of the field (arcmin) for the considered constellations. Right: integrated magnitude of all the used NGSs 361

Figure 8-71: Optical setup of SESAME (Courtesy LESIA) 362

Figure 8-72: General MCAO concept (left). Star Oriented MCAO concept (right). Each NGS wavefront is measured with dedicated WFS and the signals are recombined to determine the correction to be applied to each DM conjugated at different altitudes. 364

Figure 8-73: Opto-mechanical concept of ONIRICA (Courtesy INAF) 365

Figure 8-74: Architecture for a SH-based MCAO system with reduced number of reconstructed modes. 368

Figure 8-75: Frequency of circular 6 arcmin diameter fields as a function of the number of NGS included on them at the North Galactic Pole (left) and at an intermediate galactic latitude l=0° b=50° (right) 369

Figure 8-76: Strehl (K-band) as a function of the NGS number distributed on a 6 arcmin FoV optimized in the central 1 arcmin. Solid line: Mv=5, dashed line: Mv=16, dashed-dotted line: Mv=17, dashed-dotted-dotted line: Mv=18. For each magnitude: top line on-axis, bottom line: off-axis. 370

Figure 8-77: Strehl (on-axis) for the good seeing model, MCAO, 3 NGSs, 2' FOV, K, H, J (top to bottom), Mv=16 corresponds to 5 photons/subap/frame..... 370

Figure 8-78: Numerical simulations of MCAO correction (Strehl ratio in K band, H and J bands (top to bottom)) on a 6 NGS asterism (Mv=5 (left plot) and Mv~16 (right plot)), the good seing model (~0.5'' was used). Correction is optimized for a 1' FoV (diameter)..... 370

Figure 8-79: Barycentre speed of a G2-V star due to the differential atmospheric refraction between the WFS effective wavelength and the instrument observing in K band for different target declinations 371

Figure 8-80: Barycentre speed of a B5-V star (top) and a M5-V (bottom) with respect to a G0-V star observed in J Band. The curves stop when the Zenithal distance is larger than 60°. 372

Figure 8-81: Mapping of the FoV for interaction matrix estimation in MCAO 375

Figure 8-82: The MAD bench installed in the ESO optical laboratory during testing..... 376

Figure 8-83: Optical layout of MAD. 377

Figure 8-84: Left: the SH WFS area during integration. Right: the LOWFS during final testing. 378

Figure 8-85: Left: MACAO bimorph DM used for conjugation at 8.5 Km. Right: the multi layer turbulence generator MAPS. 378

Figure 8-86: MAD first light SCAO closed loop 379

Figure 8-87: MAD first light GLAO closed loop. Only one phase screen at 6 Km altitude has been used and the guide stars were located on a circle of 1.5' diameter. The FWHM reduction factor is ~2.5. 379

Figure 8-88: Encircled energy gain in the first light GLAO closed loop. At the FWHM radius of the corrected image the gain is ~2. 380

Figure 8-89: Common path XAO concept for EPICS. 384

Figure 8-90: Individual scientific channel path. 384

Figure 8-91: 5-sigma detection level after differential imaging for 0.1 nm rms differential chromatic error before the coronagraph (circular average). λ = 1600 nm. 385

Figure 8-92: Residuals after dual imaging with a perfect coronagraph (left), and a double stage Lyot coronagraph with prolate apodization (right.) 386

Figure 8-93: AO correction of co-phasing residuals. Left: initial co-phasing errors. Right: best fit with DM2 (0.67 actuator separation). 386

Figure 8-94: Residual left by best fit of DM_2..... 387

Figure 8-95: Cut in wave-front maps of Figure 8-102 and In Figure 8-94. Solid line: initial co-phasing errors (piston and tip-tilt, 20 nm rms). Dashed line: DM_2 fit. Dotted-dashed-line: residual error figure after correction by DM_2 (6 nm rms error residual of high spatial frequencies). 387

Figure 8-96: Effect of co-phasing on coronagraphic image at 1600 nm (Circular average of 2D image). Solid line: PSF without coronagraph. Dashed line: Coronagraphic image with initial

co-phasing residuals of 20 nm rms. Dotted-dashed line: Coronagraphic image of residuals after AO correction (6 nm rms). 388

Figure 8-97: Strehl ratio versus wave-length. 388

Figure 8-98: Theoretical point spread function after a perfect coronagraph. 389

Figure 8-99: Probability to find a NGS/Galaxy versus magnitude over 2' FoV. Top to bottom: Galactic plane, 180-20°, Galactic Pole 393

Figure 8-100: Performance (gain in EE compared to seeing) of a single on-axis LGS. Solid: on-axis, dash: off-axis. Top to bottom: K, H and J bands. The good seeing model was used (0.5''). 394

Figure 8-101: LGS MCAO performance (K-band). Tip - Tilt stars at LGS positions. 395

Figure 8-102: Pseudo Infinite Guide Star conceptual layout. 398

Figure 8-103: Sky-Projected Laser Array Shack-Hartmann conceptual layout. 399

Figure 8-104: Virtual wavefront sensor conceptual layout. 400

Figure 8-105: Variable wavefront sensor conceptual layout. 401

Figure 8-106: Basic principle of measuring atmospheric turbulence with phase shifting interferometry. 402

Figure 8-107 Schematic arrangement of a multiconjugate correction with lasers and LPSI. ... 403

Figure 8-108: Fiber laser 404

Figure 8-109: CW Raman laser 405

Figure 8-110: Hollow Core Photonic Crystal fibre. 405

Figure 9-1: locked rotor mode evolution 410

Figure 9-2: Rotating Mass evolution. 410

Figure 9-3: 1997 design, rocking chair design I. 411

Figure 9-4: 1997 design, rocking chair design II. 411

Figure 9-5: 1998 design. Four petals design. 412

Figure 9-6: 1999 design I. Decoupled M2 unit. 413

Figure 9-7: 1999 design II. Light rocking chair design. 413

Figure 9-8: 1999 design III. Cradle and bearings design. 413

Figure 9-9: 2000 design. Cradle and bearings design evolution. 414

Figure 9-10: 2002 design. Cradle and bearings design evolution. 415

Figure 9-11: 2004 design. Fractal design. 415

Figure 9-12: OWL telescope structure. Side view. 416

Figure 9-13: OWL telescope structure. Side view. 417

Figure 9-14: Structural materials stiffness and strength. 418

Figure 9-15: Typical welded node. 419

Figure 9-16: Base Fractal pattern. 419

Figure 9-17: Base Module. 420

Figure 9-18: Node exploded view 420

Figure 9-19: Azimuth Structure 420

Figure 9-20: Azimuth structure and foundation interface 421

Figure 9-21: Altitude Structure 422

Figure 9-22: Top view..... 422
Figure 9-23: Sets of parallel rope..... 424
Figure 9-24: Rope mechanical interface..... 424
Figure 9-25: Wind vortex shedding. 425
Figure 9-26: Cable damping system. (Courtesy of ULB). 425
Figure 9-27: Active damping concept. (Courtesy of ULB)..... 425
Figure 9-28: Focal station layout. 426
Figure 9-29: Focal station external dimensions. 427
Figure 9-30: Focal station external dimensions. Side view. 427
Figure 9-31: Fibre fed focal station. 427
Figure 9-32: Axial and Radial Bogies. 429
Figure 9-33: Bogie layout 429
Figure 9-34: Axial And Radial Bogies cross section. 429
Figure 9-35: Azimuth bogies location. 430
Figure 9-36: Computer controlled hydraulic cylinders of the master bogies..... 431
Figure 9-37: Communicating vessels measurement..... 432
Figure 9-38: Bogies breadboard test setup..... 433
Figure 9-39. MagLev for trains 436
Figure 9-40. OWL MagLev available design location. 436
Figure 9-41: Corrector 437
Figure 9-42: M6 lay out design and location 438
Figure 9-43: M6 unit overall dimensions. 439
Figure 9-44: Optical bems intersection 439
Figure 9-45: M6 available design volume. 440
Figure 9-46: Segment support system. 441
Figure 9-47: Hexagonal segment assembly..... 441
Figure 9-48: Layout of WEB. 445
Figure 9-49: WEB Functional Layout. 445
Figure 9-50: Air conditioning layout..... 447
Figure 9-51: Inner ventilation. 447
Figure 9-52: FE Model of OWL in zenith configuration. 449
Figure 9-53: Side view of FE Model of OWL 60º from zenith. 450
Figure 9-54. Analysis tree flow chart. 451
Figure 9-55: Vertical uz displacement distribution due to gravity for zenith configuration. Complete structure (left) and mirrors M1 to M6 (right). 453
Figure 9-56: Displacement distribution due to gravity for 60º configuration. Complete structure in global vertical uz direction (left) and mirrors in normal displacements (right). 453
Figure 9-57. Normal displacement distribution of optical elements under static wind at60º..... 454
Figure 9-58: Vertical z-displacement distribution due to uniform temperature change of 10° C. 455

Figure 9-59: Equivalent stress distribution due to temperature change of 10° C. 455
Figure 9-60: Temperature distribution due to sun radiation at 60° altitude angle. 456
Figure 9-61: Vertical (uz) displacement distribution due to sun radiation at 60° altitude angle. 457
Figure 9-62: Equivalent stress distribution due to sun radiation at 60° altitude angle. 457
Figure 9-63: Mode shape of first eigenfrequency in zenith configuration at 1.59 Hz. 459
Figure 9-64: Altitude locked rotor mode shape in zenith configuration at 2.58 Hz. 459
Figure 9-65: Azimuth locked rotor mode shape in zenith configuration at 2.86 Hz. 460
Figure 9-66: Piston mode of altitude and corrector structure at 4 Hz. 460
Figure 9-67: Piston mode of M2 unit structure at 7.3 Hz. 461
Figure 9-68: FE models of M1(left) and M2 cell (right) structures. respectively. 461
Figure 9-69: Piston mode of M1 Cell structure alone at 5.1 Hz. 462
Figure 9-70: Piston mode of M2 cell structure alone at 7.8 Hz. 462
Figure 9-71: Natural frequencies versus mode number. 463
Figure 9-72: Effective masses versus frequency. 463
Figure 9-73: 1σ normal displacement distribution of M1. 465
Figure 9-74: 1σ normal displacement distribution of M2. 465
Figure 9-75: 1σ response PSD of piston displacement of M1 466
Figure 9-76: 1σ response PSD of piston displacement of M2. 466
Figure 9-77: 1σ response PSD of segments piston displacement of M1. 468
Figure 9-78: 1σ response PSD of segments piston displacement of M2. 468
Figure 9-79: FE-model and major dimensions of the OWL with foundation and soil. 470
Figure 9-80: Transfer function from wind load to y-deflection of M1. 471
Figure 9-81: SMITH diagram 474
Figure 9-82: Base line. High configuration 475
Figure 9-83: Low configuration 476
Figure 9-84: OWL scaled down 60 meters 477
Figure 10-1: Adapter Rotator 479
Figure 10-2: Adaptor Rotator location 480
Figure 10-3: Adapter Rotator section 481
Figure 10-4: Adapter Rotator Instrument design volume 482
Figure 10-5: Pickup mirror scan range 482
Figure 11-1: Cargolifter building 487
Figure 11-2: Baseline lay-out (courtesy CI-Map) 489
Figure 11-3. Top view of the enclosure and telescope foundations. 490
Figure 11-4: Principle scheme of natural cooling of the enclosure volume 491
Figure 11-5 Simple thermal model of the enclosure 492
Figure 11-6 Typical temperature evolution of the enclosure assuming site 5 m/s wind speed. 493
Figure 11-7 Enclosure opening cycle (courtesy CI-Map). 494

Figure 11-8: Enclosure foundations overview day park position (above). Night park position (bottom) 495
Figure 11-9: Typical reinforcement 497
Figure 11-10 Typical cladding panel 498
Figure 11-11: Main arch 499
Figure 11-12: Hinge (courtesy cl-MAP) 499
Figure 11-13: Conceptual design of the drive system 500
Figure 11-14: Principle of the air supporting structure (courtesy Airlight) 502
Figure 11-15: Lay out of the alternative design of the OWL enclosure 503
Figure 11-16. Two halves concept (right below teh VLT telescopes platform) 503
Figure 11-17: Radome concept (cupola) for OWL (courtesy cl-MAP) 504
Figure 11-18: Radome concept using air cushion technology (courtesy AirLight) 505
Figure 11-19 Arch-like structure fixing the arches holding the membranes 506
Figure 11-20 Airtensity concept radome enclosure open 506
Figure 11-21: Ventarrones (top right of the figure) 507
Figure 11-22: La Palma 507
Figure 11-23: Horizontal in-line coating plant (courtesy SISTEC-It) 509
Figure 11-24: Ventarrones: Observatory lay out (auxiliary building side above; hotel side below) 514
Figure 11-25 The enclosure installed in La Palma 515
Figure 12-1. The CODEX concept. The simulation represents two observations of the Ly α forest of the same QSO taken at time T_0 (dotted line) and at time T_0+10^7 years (continuous). CODEX/OWL will measure this effect for a separation of the two epochs as short as 10 years by comparing a large sample of high S/N QSO absorption spectra obtained with OWL. 520
Figure 12-2. Expected wavelength shift for different cosmological models: Standard Cold Dark Matter (lower line. no cosmological constant) and Λ Cold Dark Matter (middle line) with cosmological constant = 0.7. The upper line gives the difference of the two. The signature of the non-zero cosmological constant is the change in sign of the wavelength shift. 521
Figure 12-3. Magnitude distribution of known brightest QSO's vs. redshift. From photon statistics and simulations of measurements in the Ly α forest at different redshift one derives the "iso-accuracy" curves plotted in the diagram. The required 1 cm/s/ accuracy is obtained with all the QSO below the 'iso-accuracy' curve in 2000 hours integration (80m telescope. total efficiency 14%. S/N= 13600). In reality the required statistics will be obtained by observing with shorter integrations different QSOs (~40) distributed over the whole sky and at different redshifts. 521
Figure 12-4. Optical Layout of one of the CODEX units. Each spectrograph is contained in a volume of ~3x2x1 meter. The 5 Units will be identical. 522
Figure 12-5. Statistics of photon arrival times in light beams with different entropies. Light may carry more information than that revealed by imaging and spectroscopy: Photons from given directions with given wavelengths give the same astronomical images and spectra. though the light may differ in statistics of photon arrival times. These can be "random". as in maximum-entropy black-body radiation (Bose-Einstein distribution with a certain "bunching" in time). or may be quite different if the radiation deviates from thermodynamic equilibrium. (Loudon: The Quantum Theory of Light. 2000). 524
Figure 12-6 Current optical concept for a QuantEYE detector head: a distributed detector array and a segmented aperture. The collimator-lens system magnifies 1/60 times (collimator

focal length = 600 mm. lens focal length = 10 mm). giving a nominal spot size of 50 μm for a 1arcsec source..... 525

Figure 12-7 The concept of the Hypertelescope 526

Figure 12-8: NIR C-M diagram from therotical isocrones by Girardi wt al. (2002. A&A 391.195) 528

Figure 12-9 The PSF radial intensity distribution as derived from MCAO assessment for the central field of ONIRICA at OWL and used in the simulation of photometry in crowded stellar fields 529

Figure 12-10 The limiting (S/N=5) magnitude $K_{(AB)}$ for point sources as a function of the exposure time 529

Figure 12-11 The limiting (S/N=5) magnitude K(AB) for point sources as a function of the exposure time for OWL and the JWST (assuming same instrument and detector performance)..... 530

Figure 12-12 Optical layout of ONIRICA (central field) 531

Figure 12-13: Concept of the channel splitting in ONIRICA. The FoV splitting is provided by a pyramidal mirror located at the intermediate focal planes. 531

Figure 12-14: Sketch of a single unit of a Smart Fast Camera 532

Figure 12-15: The picture on the left illustrates the SFC concept in which the light of a wide FoV is divided by a lenslet array. 532

Figure 12-16: Opto-mechanical layout of ONIRICA including the two. wide and narrow. channels. The tubular trusses have the function to stiff the cryogenic tubes. 533

Figure 12-17 Two views of the instrument envelope in the instrument bay 533

Figure 12-18 MOMFIS conceptual optical layout (see text). 535

Figure 12-19. Overall MOMFIS implementation in the focal station..... 536

Figure 12-20. Illustration of the MOMFIS operation. Image Correction is performed locally along the line of sight of the target before image slicing and wavelength dispersion. 537

Figure 12-21. Contrast vs. angular separation for different types of planets. (Courtesy O. Lardiere)..... 538

Figure 12-22: Number of stars versus distance from Earth for different spectral types..... 539

Figure 12-23: O_2 A-band at high spectral resolution. 541

Figure 12-24: EPICS will be composed of three spectral channels for the scientific instruments and one for wave-front sensing. 542

Figure 12-25: Differential Imager based on dichoics splitting the beam in 4 wavelengths. 543

Figure 12-26: Block diagram for the EPICS polarimetric mode concept..... 544

Figure 12-27: Optical scheme for the high precision polarimetric mode in EPICS 545

Figure 12-28: Example of halo intensity with perfect coronagraph after adaptive optics correction . Error sources: servo-lag. photon noise (30 % transmission + L3CCD noise excess in WFS). chromatic seeing. aliasing. fitting. static aberration (5 nm rms). 546

Figure 12-29: Minimum exposure time as a function of distance to detect at 5 σ an Earth-like planet in the H20 band (1.25μm. r_0=12.1cm. τ_0=10mn. Simple Differential Imaging. 0.08μm bandwidth. 0.44 atmospheric transmission) 547

Figure 12-30: Minimum exposure time as a function of distance to detect at 50 σ a Jupiter-like planet in the CH4 band (1.60μ. r_0= 12.1cm. τ_0= 10ms. Simple Differential Imaging. 0.055μm bandwidth) 547

Figure 12-31. Rotation curve of the nucleus Seyfert 2 galaxy NGC 7582 (M. Wold. 2005). Circles: VLT-VISIR measurements using the [NeII] line at 12.8μm with a spatial resolution of 0.4" (40pc). Lines: models with different masses of the central blac hole..... 549

Figure 12-32: Optical concept of one of the imaging-low resolution spectroscopy of T-OWL.. 550

Figure 12-33. Sensitivity of T-OWL as compared to other thermal infrared facilities for imaging of stellar-like sources. 551

Figure 12-34. The effect of a “growing” telescope primary on the PSF . Each frame is a 2x2arcsec^2 field with the resulting PSF. The columns from left to right correspond to year after year until completion of the OWL-. The rows are for three filling strategies: the top row is by starting with a 100m x 100m cross. the middle row is a ring-like geometry starting from the outside and the lower row is a ring-like geometry starting from the inside. 553

Figure 12-35: Dust mass detectable (10σ) by SCOWL at 450μm around nearby stars as a function of distance. The upper green line represents the mass of the dusty system ε Eri. and the lower line the dust mass of our own Solar System. 554

Figure 12-36: SCOWL cryostat cross section. 556

Figure 13-1: Structural nodes container 561

Figure 13-2: Pipe elements shipping 562

Figure 13-3: Azimuth tracks alignment metrology. 563

Figure 13-4: Structural elements alignment. 563

Figure 13-5: Azimuth tracks integration 565

Figure 13-6: Azimuth Basement integration. 565

Figure 13-7: Azimuth first floor integration 566

Figure 13-8: Azimuth structure complete integration 566

Figure 13-9: Altitude lower part integration. 567

Figure 13-10: Altitude M1 cell and central tower integration. 567

Figure 13-11: altitude structure complete integration 568

Figure 13-12: Segment Support Structure. 569

Figure 13-13: Segments integration. 570

Figure 13-14: Segment handling tool. notional design 570

Figure 13-15: Segment handling tool. notional design 571

Figure 13-16: Handling of segment on the extractor. 571

Figure 13-17: Clamped and constrained segment. 572

Figure 13-18: Un-clamped and un-constrained segment 572

Figure 13-19: Segment coarse pre-phasing 573

Figure 13-20: Segment fine pre-phasing 573

Figure 14-1: Fraction of time that skies are clear (%) at night for the years 1999 and 2000 over Canaries. NW Africa and Southern Spain (A. Erasmus. ESO Interim Report. Oct. 2004) 578

Figure 14-2: Locations of the sites in Chile. Bolivia and Argentina that were compared using satellite data. Contours show the topography at 500m intervals (see Table 14-2). 580

Figure 14-3: PWV percentile values at each site under clear conditions 580

Figure 14-4: The Carlsberg Meridian Circle (CAMC) database at La Palma 581

Figure 14-5: Diurnal Atmospheric Extinction over Teide Observatory (Tenerife. Canary Islands). Ref: A. Jimenez et al.. Fig.4 581

Figure 14-6: Correlation of satellite UV and ground based V monthly averaged measurements CAMC AE>0.20. NIMBUS7 AE>0.2. Pixel center < 55km from ORM 582

Figure 14-7: World map of jet aircraft contrails in 1992 (top). and predicted for 2050 (bottom). from [72] 583

Figure 14-8: Seeing vs. local wind direction (0=North. 90=East etc.) and velocity at Paranal for best (right) and worst (left) observing conditions (2001-2004. over 778127 samples; J. Navarrete. ESO Observatory) 584

Figure 14-9: Peak ground acceleration (PGA) that a site can expect during the next 50 years with 10 percent probability GSHAP (Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Project) 586

Figure 14-10: Site view 587

Figure 14-11: SLODAR Shack-Hartman pattern using narrow (left) and wide (right) binaries. 589

Figure 14-12: An example SLODAR determination of r0. Left: Measured Zernike coefficient variances. σj (crosses) and the theoretical (Noll) fit (solid line). Right: Calculated value of r0 versus WFS integration number (2ms CCD integrations at 190Hz) 589

Figure 14-13 One-dimensional simulated cross-correlation (solid line) and autocorrelation (broken line) in the direction of the binary separation for a 24x24 sub-aperture. 590

Figure 14-14: MASS principle. scintillation of a single star is measured through 4 concentric annular apertures. 590

Figure 14-15: Relative contribution of the various atmospheric slabs to the integral of the turbulence obtained by combining SLODAR and MASS profiler data after reduction of the overlap area. The common database covers about 116 hours from February to August 2005. 592

Figure 14-16: Complete atmospheric turbulence profile reconstructed from contemporaneous combined SLODAR and MASS measurements. 592

Figure 14-17: Observatorio Roque de los Muchachos (ORM). La Palma. Canary Islands. Spain (http://www.otri.iac.es/sitesting/) 594

Figure 14-18: Morocco Anti-Atlas mountain area has the highest percentage of photometric nights along the North African continental west coast 595

Figure 14-19: Paranal North area proposes several candidate sites along what could become "the photon valley" of the 21st century 596

Figure 14-20: the Macon range. to the East of the huge Arizaro salt flat in NW Argentina allies high altitude (>4500m) and lower seismic activity (http://www.iate.oac.uncor.edu/tolar/) 597

Figure 14-21: 20th century PDO "events" persisted for 20-to-30 years. while typical ENSO events persisted for 6 to 18 months 598

Figure 14-22: Monthly statistics of photometric nights at Paranal and La Silla and their relation to El-Nino Southern Oscillation Index 599

Figure 14-23: Monthly statistics of seeing at Paranal and La Silla and their relation to El-Nino Southern Oscillation Index 599

Figure 14-24: The FRIOWL user interface 602

Figure 14-25: DIMM seeing (1mn average) versus contemporaneous UT1 Cassegrain Active Optics Image Quality (atmospheric dispersion corrected) estimates for January-August 2005 (compilation. J. Navarrete. Paranal). 603

Figure 14-26: UT1-UT2 comparison of contemporaneous Cassegrain Active Optics Image Quality (atmospheric dispersion corrected) estimates for January-August 2005 (compilation. J. Navarrete. Paranal). 604

Figure 14-27: ISAAC. K (lower graph) and H (upper graph) band zenith image quality as measured (dots) and as exprected from DIMM after outer scale correction following [63]; M. Casali. I.R. image quality at the VLT. ESO Internal Report. 02 June 2005. 605

Figure 15-1: Accessibility 609

Figure 15-2: Corrector integration route 609

Figure 15-3: M6 unit integration route. 610
Figure 15-4: M6 unit integration route inside the corrector 610
Figure 15-5: M6 unit integration access 611
Figure 15-6: Primary mirror cover docking operation..... 612
Figure 15-7: Covers on Primary mirror..... 612
Figure 15-8 lifting platform for inspection and maintenance of cladding..... 614
Figure 15-9: OWL horizontal parking configuration. 614
Figure 15-10: Secondary mirror handling facilities..... 615
Figure 16-1. ESO Management structure. 621
Figure 16-2. OWL organizational structure. 626
Figure 16-3. High level schedule..... 631

Figure A- 1. Allocated volume for the Position sensors (Glass ceramic blanks). 661
Figure A- 2. Allocated volume for the Position sensors (Silicon Carbide blanks). 661
Figure A- 3. Position actuators. Implementation and design volume..... 662
Figure A- 4. WEB 0º layout (zenith), side view. 663
Figure A- 5. WEB 60º layout, front view. 663
Figure A- 6. Block-Diagram of APE..... 664
Figure A- 7. APE optical design; the telescope focus is at the bottom of the figure. PWFS: Pyramid WaveFront Sensor; BS: Beam Splitter; ASM: Active Segmented Mirror. 665
Figure A- 8. 1-m silicon carbide BOOSTEC blank prototype. 667
Figure A- 9. Friction drive breadboard 668
Figure A- 10. Optional two-mirror corrector (f/2.1 focus, 4 arc minutes total field of view). 715
Figure A- 11. Optional corrector; Strehl Ratio vs field radius. 716
Figure A- 12. Optional corrector; RMS spot size, RMS wavefront error vs. field radius. 716