2021 Space Power Workshop 
April 19, 2021

# Radiation and Power Predictions for Electric Orbit Raising, a Case Study

Presented by Harry Yates, Maxar Technologies

Authors: Catherine C. Keys, Brian Watkins, Cierra Coughlin, Bao Hoang, Samuel Beyene, Maxar Technologies

Prepared by: Maxar Technologies 3825 Fabian Way

USA

Palo Alto, CA 94303-4604

Prepared for: The Aerospace Corporation Space Power Workshop April 19-22, 2021



Information herein was first presented at SCITech in 2020:

## MAXAR Radiation and Power Predictions for Electric Orbit Rising (EOR), a Case Study

#### Catherine C. Keys, Brian Watkins, Cierra Coughlin, Bao Hoang, and Samuel Beyene

### MAXAR SCITech, 1/6/20 – 1/10/20 Orlando, Florida

X



#### **Electric Orbit Raising to GEO**

- Commuting to GEO by EOR is like biking to work
  - Driving is fast and easy, but you need gas (or a very large battery)
  - Biking is more efficient, but requires more planning
    - Need to map out a safe route
    - Need proper safety equipment
    - Need to plan for weather
  - Similar planning and preparation is needed for EOR







#### Benefits of Electric Orbit Raising

- Less propellant mass required
- More mass available for payload
- More launch options
- But...
  - It takes longer (many months)
  - Greater radiation exposure
  - Needs more solar array power
- Hence, more planning is needed
  - CONOPS require daily power predicts during EOR
  - The belts are constantly changing
  - Solar events can happen
  - Initial drop off matters



Credit: SpaceX Falcon 9 launches Telstar 19 Vantage

#### **Maxar EOR Experience**

- Electric Orbit Raising has been performed for a small number of Maxar GEO spacecraft
  - This presentation considers Maxar's first EOR and the resulting lessons learned
- Preparation for EOR
  - System Engineering looked at 60+ launch vehicle and EOR scenarios in order to bound thermal environment for the product line
    - Eclipse times can exceed those of GEO, resulting in colder temperatures
  - Solar Array Engineering conducted supplemental coupon Thermal Vacuum Testing to delta-qualify both our heritage Rigid Panel and new ROSA wings to lower temperatures
  - Power predictions generated by Space Environments and Solar Array Engineering for end of EOR
    - Ae8, Ap8 models used to predict radiation
      - Electron and Proton fluence
    - Use of heritage GEO power analysis model

#### X Thermal Predicts for a 5-panel Rigid wing at 43,437 km



Coupon

#### EOR Orbit and Radiation Exposure May Vary

- Longer duration does not always mean "worse" not a direct correlation
- Initial drop-off point is more important



Altitude [km]



\*1 Sub Synchronous Parking Orbit

#### Electron and Proton Environment and Predictions

- Ae8 and Ap8 legacy models
  - Ae8 maximum mean
  - Ap8 minimum mean
  - Known limitations
    - Uncertainty in radiation belts
    - Solar events not captured
- IRENE successor model
  - 75<sup>th</sup>, 90<sup>th</sup>, and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile
  - Known limitations
    - Model error ~3x in radiation belts
    - Belt dynamics not captured
    - Solar events not captured

- During a typical EOR
  - Increased proton flux in lower belt, compared with GEO
  - Increased electrons in upper belt, compared with GEO
- This mission EOR
  - No significant activity in the magnetosphere





#### Initial Solar Array Power Predicts and EOR Lessons Learned

- Heritage GEO power prediction tool used for analysis
  - Coverglass darkening due to Protons not seen for many missions
    - Due to relatively quick GEO Transfer Orbits (~2 weeks)
  - Known to be a factor in LEO, based on work done with NREL\*
  - Ran Ae8 and Ap8 for the initial planned EOR
- During this EOR, actuals began to depart from extrapolated expectation
  - A tiger team was convened to investigate and review models
  - Updated factor for Low Energy Proton (LEP) coverglass darkening to 2.55%\*
  - Updated Ae8 and Ap8 models for as-flown EOR
  - Ran IRENE for 75%, 90% and 95% confidence intervals

\*"Low-Thrust Geostationary Transfer Orbit (LT2GEO) Radiation Environment and Associated Solar Array Degradation Modeling and Ground Testing", Scott R. Messenger, Frankie Wong, Bao Hoang, Cordy D. Cress, Robert J. Walters, Craig A. Kluever, and Glenn Jones. *IEEE Transactions on Nuclear Science, Vol. 61, No. 6, December 2014.* 



#### Program Actual Solar Array Current vs. Prediction (During EOR)



X



#### Maxar Standard Practice Moving Forward

- Include coverglass darkening factor for Low Energy Protons during EOR
- Start with either
  - 90<sup>th</sup> percentile IRENE model
  - Heritage Ae8 / Ap8 with 20% margin
- Run power predict for exact orbital position for every 1-2 days during EOR
  - More work than just a point predict at EOL like heritage
  - Need precise positional data from Orbits group, for each day, during entire EOR
  - Need to "turn the crank" on radiation model for scores of cases (an overnight task, 20-30 hrs of run time)
  - Run solar array power tool for specific radiation at each point
- Need to understand where the "knee" happens in the power curve



#### Conclusions

- Solar arrays can get really cold during EOR
  - May need a delta qualification in a He-equipped chamber
- EOR radiation can be significant
  - Account for Proton degradation of coverglass (2-3%) see cited paper
    - Maxar is conducting supplemental testing to better characterize this factor
  - EOL power can be ~5% lower as a result of EOR (varies by program)
  - Depending on solar cell type, more losses can be seen in voltage
    - Don't skimp on string voltage in your design (when in doubt, add cells in series)
- Other, future EORs may be different and Maxar continues to incorporate lessons learned as we experience more EORs

#### Note that EOR power needs can end up driving solar array sizing

#### Thanks to the Maxar Space Environments Group

#### Cierra Coughlin / Brian Watkins / Catherine "Casey" Keys / Megan Avery





© 2021 Maxar Technologies. Published by The Aerospace Corporation with permission.

## MAXAR

MAXAR.COM