REPORT	DOCUMENTATION PAGE	
		3

¥ ٤

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

an an a tha an an an an an ann an an taobh an Threann an the traite states and the to serve to serve states of the serves

والربيان ومصيعته الطبيعا ومكر ومكر

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	0//2 10: 0/04 0/08		
Public reporting burden for this collection of i gathering and maintaining the data needed, a collection of information, including suggestion Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 2:	information is estimated to average 1 hour per nd completing and reviewing the collection of is for reducing this burden, to Washington He 2202-4302, and to the Office of Management	response, including the time for reviewing information. Send comments regarding th adquarters Services, Directorate for Inform and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (	instructions, searching existing data sources, is burden estimate or any other aspect of this ation Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson 0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.		
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave bla	ank) 2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DAT	ES COVERED		
	14 November 1996	Scie	ntific No. 3		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		5. FU	JNDING NUMBERS		
Survey of Experimental Results	From One Year of PASP PLUS	S Orbital PE 6	PE 63410F		
Operation			321 TA GV WILLAC		
Operation		I'K S	JZI IA GI WUAC		
D A Guidice*	I D Dolva				
D. A. Ouldice	J. K. Falys	Cont	ract F19628-93-K-0019		
H.B. Curtis**					
M. F. Piszczor**					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	8. PE			
Boston College			FOR I NOWBER		
Institute for Scientific Research					
Newton, MA 02159-1164					
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING A	GENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(E	S) 10. S	PONSORING/MONITORING		
Phillips Laboratory		A	GENCY REPORT NUMBER		
29 Randolph Road			DI TD 06 2006		
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-301	0		PL-1R-96-2286		
Contract Manager: Alan Griffir	/GPD				
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
* Phillips Laboratory/GPSG, 29	Randolph Road, Hanscom AFI	<mark>3, MA 01731-3010; ** NAS</mark> A	Lewis Research Center,		
Cleveland, OH					
Reprinted from 27th AIAA Plas	madynamics & Lasers Conferer	nce, 17-20 Jun 1996, New Orl	eans LA		
12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY	STATEMENT	12b.	DISTRIBUTION CODE		
Approved for public release; dis	stribution unlimited				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 wo	ords)	<b></b>			
			·		
With DASP Plus as its a	rimery payload the ADEY	than all previous space hor	Te photovoltois or notice to		
will rast flux as its p	a standard Pagama makat	combined The test armin	flower and the internetions		
mission from a NASA D	a standard regasds locker	measuring and space envir	s nown and the interactions-		
A 709 inclination 363	Iza X 2550 Iza orbit mag	incasuring and space citying	of manual sensors of PASP Plus		
A /0° inclination, 505	km × 2550 km orbit was	are described. The results	of measurements of leakage		
achieved, allowing both in	current under test-array p	ositive biasing and arc rates			
effects on nigh-voltage op	a function of bias voltage,				
and investigation of space radiation effects on array plasma density, array orientation, and other cond					
power output from passage through the inner radiation are presented. The results of measurements of					
belt in the apogee region. Data gathering by PASP array power-output			radation caused by space		
Plus was begun on 7 Aug	94 and ended on 11 Aug 95.	radiation are also examine	d. //		
in one year, PASP Plus co	llected an order of magnitude				
more data on environment	al interactions on solar arrays				
14. SUBJECT TERMS	0		15. NUMBER OF PAGES		
PASP PLUS	Space radiation effects				
APEX satellite	Bias voltage		16. PRICE CODE		
Space plasma effects	Plasma density				
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	N 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT		
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	SAR		
			and and Farmy 200 (Days 2 00) (EC)		

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89) (EG) Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239.18 Designed using Perform Pro, WHS/DIOR, Oct 94





AIAA 96-2331 Survey of Experimental Results from One Year of PASP Plus Orbital Operation

D.A. Guidice Phillips Laboratory Hanscom AFB, MA

H.B. Curtis and M.F. Piszczor NASA Lewis Research Center Cleveland, OH

J.R. Palys Boston College Chestnut Hill, MA

19961118 038

# 27th AIAA Plasmadynamics and Lasers Conference

June 17-20, 1996 / New Orleans, LA

For permission to copy or republish, contact the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics 370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024

# SURVEY OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FROM ONE YEAR OF PASP PLUS ORBITAL OPERATION

D.A. Guidice Phillips Laboratory, Geophysics Directorate Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts

> H.B. Curtis, M.F. Piszczor NASA Lewis Research Center Cleveland, Ohio

# J.R. Palys Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

# Abstract

With PASP Plus as its primary payload, the APEX satellite was launched by a standard Pegasus rocket released from a NASA B-52 aircraft on 3 August 1994. A 70° inclination, 363 km  $\times$  2550 km orbit was achieved, allowing both investigation of space plasma effects on high-voltage operation in the perigee region and investigation of space radiation effects on array power output from passage through the inner radiation belt in the apogee region. Data gathering by PASP Plus was begun on 7 Aug 94 and ended on 11 Aug 95. In one year, PASP Plus collected an order of magnitude more data on environmental interactions on solar arrays than all previous space-borne photovoltaic experiments combined. The test arrays flown and the interactionsmeasuring and space-environment sensors of PASP Plus are described. The results of measurements of leakage current under test-array positive biasing and arc rates under negative biasing as a function of bias voltage, plasma density, array orientation, and other conditions are presented. The results of measurements of testarray power-output degradation caused by space radiation are also examined.

## Background

Photovoltaic systems are the preferred method of satisfying the electric power requirements for DoD and commercial space missions. Reasons for this choice include the inexhaustible supply of energy coming from the sun, the relatively light weight and the reliability of

This paper is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. solar array subsystems, and the environmentally "clean" form of space power they supply.

Access to space is becoming broader with the advent of greater commercialization, increased communication requirements, and the introduction of a variety of new "small-sat" launch vehicles. While access to space is a privilege exploited by a greater number of users, the cost of acquiring this access is still high and greatly depends on overall mission complexity and spacecraft size. As a means of lowering spacecraft weight, users are considering operating their photovoltaic networks at higher voltages, so that more efficient power distribution subsystems can be used to minimize overall cable losses and/or reduce cable weight. In addition, a variety of new, advanced-technology solar cell materials and manufacturing techniques are being developed, stressing lighter weight and lessened susceptibility to space radiation.

Photovoltaic power systems will continue to prevail as the preferred choice for space power for the foreseeable future. They are not, however, without limitations that must be considered for any space application. Foremost among these limitations is the unavoidable interactions with the hazardous space environment in which they will operate. To understand these limitations, more information must be gathered before new photovoltaic technologies are put into use on operational spacecraft.

Laboratory simulations of space-environment interaction effects on solar arrays have been accomplished on a limited basis.<sup>1,2</sup> However, because of the complex and changing nature of the space environment, these ground tests are inadequate to quantify these effects. The Photovoltaic Array Space Power Plus Diagnostics (PASP Plus) spaceflight experiment was developed to acquire the needed flight test data. When originally conceived in 1985, the experiment consisted of four solar arrays and limited diagnostic instrumentation for short-term investigation of high voltage/space plasma interactions at Shuttle altitudes. In early 1990, the Air Force's Space Test Program (STP) offered the PASP Plus experiment a flight on the Advanced Photovoltaic and Electronics Experiments (APEX) satellite. Because of the expanded opportunity provided by APEX's elliptical orbit and 1-3 year lifetime, it was decided to broaden the scope of PASP Plus to include the investigation of the effects of space radiation dose on longterm solar array power output. We also added diagnostic instruments appropriate to PASP Plus's new mission profile.<sup>3</sup>

### PASP Plus Objectives

The objectives of the PASP Plus experiment were:

(1) Measure the plasma "leakage" current for different kinds of arrays subjected to positive biasing levels up to +500 V.

(2) Measure the arcing parameters for the different kinds of arrays subjected to negative biasing levels up to -500 V.

(3) Measure the long-term degradation in the power output of arrays using different solar-cell materials when exposed to space radiation.

(4) Establish cause-and-effect relationships between array interactions and environmental conditions.

## Experiment Instrumentation

The experiment consists of:

(1) A set of test arrays, some of which are divided into biased and unbiased segments.

(2) Experiment-control and interactions-measuring instruments that *create* array (or spacecraft) conditions leading to interactions and *measure* parameters of the interactions that occur.

(3) Diagnostic sensors to measure the ambient environmental conditions causing the interactions or affecting their severity.

### <u>Solar Arrays</u>

The 12 PASP Plustest arrays were subdivided into 16 electrically separate modules, 10 of which were subjected to positive and negative biasing. Two of the

planar arrays had wrap-through connectors. Three arrays (two planar and one concentrator) featured dualjunction solar cells. See Table I below.

### Table I. PASP Plus Solar Arrays

Mod.	Cell / Array	Number	Cell Size
<u>No.</u>	Type	of cells	$(\text{cm} \times \text{cm})$
0, <u>1,2</u>	Si (Std), 8 mil	20,20,60	2 x 4
<u>3</u>	Si, 8 mil wtc [Space St	a] 4	8 x 8
5	Si, 2 mil [APSA]	14	2.6 x 5.1
9	Amorphous Si	2	4 x 4
<u>4,6</u>	GaAs on Ge, 3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> mil	20,12	4 x 4
8	GaAs on Ge, 7 mil, w	etc 4	4 x 4
11	GaAs on Ge, 7 mil	8	4 x 4
7	AlGaAs//GaAs	20	2 x 2
10	InP, 12 mil	10	2 x 2
12,13	GaAs//CuInSe <sub>2</sub>	12, 3	2 x 2, 2 x 4
<u>14</u>	GaAs Mini-Cass	8	Concentrator
15	GaAs//GaSb Mini-Don	me 12	Concentrator

wtc = wrap-through connectors // = dual-junction solar cells underlined module = biased

A brief description of the PASP Plus test arrays was given by Guidice et al.<sup>4</sup> A detailed description, which included cell and array configuration drawings and color photographs of the arrays, was presented in a report by Adams.<sup>5</sup>

# Interactions Control/Measurement Instruments

<u>Array Biasing Network</u>: The PASP Plus controller generated and applied to any of the ten arrays (as commanded) a set of four all-positive or all-negative bias steps ranging from 50 to 500 Volts, with a resolution of roughly 4 Volts in that range. The biasing sequence took two minutes; each of the four 30-sec steps consists of 7 seconds of no bias (used for Langmuir Probe and I-V curve measurements) and 23 seconds of biasing. For both positive and negative biasing, there were seven pre-programmed sequences (including one all-zero) and one fully programmable (by ground command) sequence, which was used most of the time. Biases were applied to a module so as to add to its generated voltage; however, in almost all cases, the generated voltage was short circuited. <u>Electrometer</u>: The electrometer located within the controller is used to measure the leakage current from the space plasma. It covers the range from 0.2  $\mu$ A to 20 mA with a resolution of 0.2  $\mu$ A.

<u>Electron Emitter</u>: It produces a stream of *outgoing* electrons to help balance the *incoming* flow of electrons to the biased module during positive biasing, thereby averting the negative charging of the satellite and the negative potential contours around it. However, it was found that when the emitter was on (only during positive biasing), it interfered with the Langmuir Probe measurements of plasma density, which are essential to our leakage current investigation. No extensive analysis of *emitter-on* positive biasing data has been made.

<u>Transient Pulse Monitor (TPM)</u>: The TPM consists of a central processing unit, four electromagnetic transient sensors (E-field sensors for detection of radiated pulses) and one current-loop sensor around the high-voltage line inside the controller (for detection of power-line pulses). The TPM measured the properties (amplitude, derivative, integral) of the largest pulse in each onesecond interval and the number of pulses (up to 15) in that interval. The TPM was used to obtain the arc rate and characteristics of arc-discharge pulses that occur during negative biasing of the test arrays.

## **Diagnostic Sensors**

Langmuir Probe (LP): The Langmuir Probe measures the parameters (density and temperature) of the space plasma environment in front of the test arrays. To sweep the appropriate voltage range with respect to the space plasma, the LP was equipped with a so-called "senpot", capable of sensing how far negative the satellite frame-ground is below space-plasma reference and compensating for this deviation up to about -30Volts. When biasing is taking place, the LP makes its measurements during the 7 seconds of the 30-sec biasing interval when the bias voltage is not applied.

Electrostatic Analyzer (ESA): The ESA measures the energetic-particle density of electrons and positive ions (separately) in 20 logarithmically spaced bins over the energy range of 30 eV to 30 keV. The ESA can be used to detect the passage of APEX satellite through an enhanced auroral region. In addition, the lower-energy portion (<300 eV) of the ion spectrum can be used to determine the negative potential of the satellite during high-voltage positive biasing. <u>Sun Sensor</u>: The sun incidence-angle sensor measures the angles (on two orthogonal axes) between the normal to the array surfaces and the direction to the sun. While in sunlight, the satellite pointed the test arrays to within  $\pm 0.5^{\circ}$  of the center of the sun.

<u>Dosimeter</u>: The dosimeter is used to measure the highenergy particle flux and dose from protons and electrons that lead to degradation in solar-array power output. Its interface (power, command, telemetry) is separate from the PASP Plus controller. Table II gives some of its detection characteristics.

# Table II. Electron and Proton Energy Ranges for the PASP Plus Dosimeter

Dome	Alumini _g/cm <sup>2</sup>	ım Shield Shape	Electron Threshold (MeV)	Proton Energy (MeV)
D1	0.0294	flat	0.15	5 - 80
D2	0.55	hemisphere	1.0	20 - 115
D3	1.55	hemisphere	2.5	32 - 120
D4	3.05	hemisphere	5.0	52 - 125

<u>Contamination Monitors</u>: Sensors included both quartz crystal microbalances and calorimeters. No significant effects on array performance have been attributed to contamination.

### Data Collection

Data collection involving I-V curves and positive and negative biasing of the PASP Plus arrays took place over most of the period from 7 Aug 94 to 11 Aug 95, with several long gaps (e.g., 4 Nov 94 to 15 Jan 95 and 17 May to 1 Jul 95) due to APEX subsystem problems. On 12 Aug 95, a PASP Plus controller hardware malfunction resulted in the end of all biasing operations and taking of I-V curves. The dosimeter was separately interfaced to the satellite and therefore unaffected by this problem. An interrogator problem on APEX curtailed dosimeter data gathering in the fall of 1995. This was corrected, and telemetering of dosimeter data resumed about mid-Dec 1995 and continued into 1996. Summaries of the PASP Plus data collecting for positive and negative biasing operations are given in Tables III and IV.6

Table III. Summary of PASP Plus Positive Biasing Operations

<b>Environment and Operations Comments</b>	Bias $\pm 20$ min around perigee. Ram angle at perigee $\leq 90^{\circ}$ until 15 Aug. No eclipses over 7-17 Aug. All biasing in sunlight. Emitter on 1/3 of orbits after 11 Aug.	Biasing around perigee. Ram angle at perigee ≥90° and no eclipses for whole period. Emitter on about 1/3 of orbits.	Biasing around the orbit. Ram angle at perigee 71°→59° for 24-30 Oct. No eclipse until >28 Oct. Emitter not on.	Biasing only in sunlight. Controller off for altitudes $> 1200$ km. Ram angle at perigee 106° $\rightarrow 97^{\circ}$ . Emitter not on.	Biasing 40 min before to 30 min after perigee, but off for alt > 1200 km when near SAA. No eclipse throughout period. Ram angle at perigee $64^{\circ} \rightarrow 96^{\circ}$ . Emitter not on.	Biasing around orbit, but off for altitudes $> 1200 \text{ km}$ when near SAA. Ram angle at perigeo $105^{\circ} \rightarrow 74^{\circ}$ . Emitter not on. APEX problems! No biasing 17 May-1 Jul.	Biasing around orbit, but off for altitudes > 1200 km when near SAA. Ram angle at perigee 78°→51°. Emitter not on. PASP + controller problem 12 Augl No more biasing.
Plasma Density (cm <sup>-3</sup> )	$6 \times 10^3 \rightarrow 1 \times 10^5$ (2×10 <sup>5</sup> rare)	$6 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 2 \times 10^5$	$4 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 2 \times 10^5$	$2 \times 10^3 \rightarrow 6 \times 10^5$	$4 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 3 \times 10^5$	$4 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 8 \times 10^4$ (1x10 <sup>5</sup> rare)	$2 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 3 \times 10^5$
Voltage Range	+75 V to +500 V	+100 V to +300 V	+100 V to +320 V	+75 V to +220 V	+50 V to +220 V	+50 V to +430 V	+50 V to +490 V
<b>Biasing Period</b>	7 Aug - 18 Aug 94	10 Oct - 16 Oct 94	24 Oct - 30 Oct 94	15 Jan – 17 Jan 95	12 Feb - 2 Mar 95	27 Apr - 16 May 95	31 Jul - 11 Aug 95

.

.

.

••

Biasing around orbit, but off for altitude > 1200 Biasing around orbit, but off for altitude > 1200 this includes all of eclipse. Ram angle is ≤90° only past middle of eclipse. Ram angle at this includes all of eclipse. Ram angle is ≤90° Biasing only <1200 km. For APEX security, km when near SAA. Ram angle is ≤90° only km when near SAA. Ram angle is ≤90° only eclipse meas. Ram angle at perigee  $95^{\circ} \rightarrow 64^{\circ}$ . TPM threshold at 0 until 1 Feb, then set at 1. only past middle of eclipse. Ram angle at perigee 143 \*> 127°. TPM threshold set at 1. negative voltages (-220V to -450V) only in sunlight. Unfavorable ram angles at perigee (111° $\rightarrow$ 135°). TPM thresholds set at 0. No biasing in eclipse after 26 Aug. Higher No eclipse period in orbits. Ram angle at perigee is ≤90° over 17-23 Oct (88°→73°). Bias 12 min before to 42 min after perigee; Bias 20 min before to 40 min after perigee; past middle of eclipse. Ram angle at perigee past middle of eclipse. Ram angle at perigee then 10 min at end of eclipse. No significant perigee 98° + 176°. TPM threshold set at 1. TPM threshold at 0. APEX problem 4 Novi #1 limited to -300V (orbits include eclipse). Eclipses return on 29 Oct. Ram angle at perigee  $57^{\circ} \rightarrow 53^{\circ}$  in period. Arrays #2 and all Controller ops in sunlight until 4/5 Feb, Arrays #2 and #1 are limited to -380V. **Environment and Operations Comments** is 109° + 80°. TPM threshold set at 1.  $35^{\circ} \rightarrow 109^{\circ}$ . TPM threshold set at 1. TPM thresholds set at 0. **Table IV. Summary of PASP Plus Negative Biasing Operations** Plasma Density (cm<sup>-3</sup>)  $\leq 6 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 4 \times 10^5$  $\leq 6 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 6 \times 10^5$  $6 \times 10^3 \rightarrow 3 \times 10^5$  $2 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 4 \times 10^5$  $2 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 3 \times 10^5$  $6 \times 10^2 \rightarrow 2 \times 10^5$  $6 \times 10^3 \rightarrow 6 \times 10^5$ over 18-20 Jan)  $6 \times 10^3 \rightarrow 8 \times 10^4$ (some higher -160 V to -370 V -280 V to -460 V -240 V to -430 V -240 V to -300 V -240 V to -370 V -300 V to -460 V -450 V to -500 V -160 V to -400 V -75 V to -450 V Voltage Range 3 Mar - 26 Mar 95 30 Mar - 1 Apr 95 13 Apr - 18 Apr 95 31 Oct - 4 Nov 94 18 Jan - 11 Feb 95 17 Oct – 22 Oct 94 22 Aug - 3 Sep 94 19 Jul – 30 Jul 95 1 Jul – 18 Jul 95 **Biasing Period** 

To explore plasma-environment effects on different array configurations, we tested arrays with small numbers of cells and achieved the high voltage levels needed through biases provided by the PASP Plus controller. We investigated leakage current enhanced by the "snapover" phenomenon for bias-simulated positive voltage operation and the rates of array arcing under bias-simulated negative voltage operation. From the variations in voltage level and in the spaceenvironment conditions through which APEX flew, we were able to correlate (albeit imperfectly) the resultant interactions with the conditions imposed by nature and the experimental instrumentation.

## Analysis of Positive Biasing Data

For arrays that are susceptible to the "snapover" phenomenon (the planar arrays), the "parasitic" or "leakage" current ( $I_{leak}$ ) increases, as bias voltage and plasma density increase, by factors of 100 or more (even by as much as 1000 for planar arrays where snapover is initially suppressed by interconnect or side-edge shielding), as the entire array surface becomes engaged in current collection. The collecting area changes from the small areas of the cells' interconnects and side-edges to an area ultimately *larger* than the array's surface area, larger because current collection takes place in a plasma sheath that extends upward and outward from the biased array's surface.

We define a module's effective collecting area  $A_{coll}$  as the measured leakage current (Amp) divided by the thermal-plasma electron current density (Amp/m<sup>2</sup>).  $A_{coll} = I_{leak} / e n_e (\bar{v}/4)$ ; where e is the electron charge,  $n_e$  is the plasma density (measured by the experiment's Langmuir probe), and  $n_e \bar{v}/4$  is the number of thermal electrons that would cross a unit area in unit time.<sup>7</sup> The average electron velocity  $\bar{v}$  in a Maxwellian distribution is  $(8kT_e/\pi m_e)^{1/2}$ , where  $m_e$ is the electron mass and  $T_e$  is the electron temperature (also measured by the Langmuir probe).

The PASP Plus concentrator arrays (Modules #14 and #15) flown on APEX exhibited negligible leakage current over the whole range of plasma densities even for bias voltages up to +500 Volts.

To explore the effects of snapover, let us compare (for the purposes of this paper) the leakage current results for several different PASP Plus planar-array test modules. The data base used here includes all positive biasing data from 7 Aug 94 to 11 Aug 95 in sunlight and in the ram hemisphere ( $\theta_{ram} = 0^{\circ} \rightarrow 90^{\circ}$ ). In all cases, the experiment's electron emitter was off.

Figure 1 shows  $I_{leak}$  vs. applied positive bias ( $V_{bias}$ ) for five binned levels of plasma density for four planararray modules: #1, the old standard Si; #3, the Space-Station Si with wrap-through interconnects; #6, the somewhat older GaAs on Ge; and #8, the small GaAs on Ge array with wrap-through interconnects. The first three modules are of comparable total cell size (160, 256, and 192 cm<sup>2</sup>), while the fourth module (#8) is guite small (64 cm<sup>2</sup>).

Because of its highly exposed interconnects and side edges, Module #1 is collecting significant leakage current (1.5 to 45  $\mu$ A, depending on n<sub>e</sub>) at 50 V even without snapover. As V<sub>bias</sub> is increased, secondary emission of electrons off the cells' coverglass surfaces causes them to be at positive potentials (snapover starts to set in). Ileak rises slowly at first (note the somewhat shallower slopes of the Ileak vs. Vbias curves in the 50-100 V range). The slopes then steepen and maximize in the 100-200 V range as the snapover-induced large changes in collecting area dominate. Beyond about 200-300 V (depending on n<sub>e</sub>), the I<sub>leak</sub> vs. V<sub>bias</sub> curves flatten out (the collecting area maximizes) and  $I_{leak}$  no longer depends on  $V_{bias}$  but only the on the thermal electron flux, proportional to  $n_e$  and  $T_e^{\frac{1}{2}}$  (T<sub>e</sub> is much less important because of its limited range, 1000-6000 K in sunlit conditions).

Because of its "plasma shielding" wrap-through connectors and smaller cell-edge area (lessened cell-edge perimeter with just four large-area cells), Module #3 at 50 V collects very little leakage current, between 0.3 and 0.5  $\mu$ A, with 0.2  $\mu$ A being the electrometer's lower limit of measurement. As bias voltage is increased in the 50 to 100 V range, the  $I_{leak}$  vs.  $V_{bias}$  curves' slopes are steeper (on this log-log plot) than for Module #1 only because the Module #3 curves start off at such low  $I_{leak}$  values (Module #3's actual  $\mu A$  increases in  $I_{leak}$ are less than for Module #1). Then, as happened with Module #1, the slopes steepen and maximize in the 100-200 V range as the large changes in collecting area dominate. Beyond about 300-400 V, for the higher plasma densities ( $\geq 10^{10} \text{ m}^{-3}$ ), the I<sub>leak</sub> vs. V<sub>bias</sub> curves start to flatten out as the collecting area maximizes and I<sub>leak</sub> starts to depend mainly on n<sub>e</sub>.

Module #6 has standard interconnects, but thinner and less exposed than Module #1. Its exposed cell-edge area (number of cells  $\times$  cell perimeter  $\times$  photovoltaic material thickness) is about a factor of three less than for Module #1. For the higher plasma densities  $(3 \times 10^{10} \text{ and } 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3})$ , Module #6 at 50 V, before snapover intervenes, collects modest leakage current (1.5 to 5  $\mu$ A), about a factor of 10 less than Module #1, consistent with its smaller interconnect and celledge exposure. For the lower n<sub>e</sub> values, 10<sup>8</sup> to 10<sup>9</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>, Module #6 around 50 V collects surprisingly little  $I_{leak}$ , only 0.3 to 0.5  $\mu$ A. [We have no explanation for these very low values, which approximate those of Module #3]. In the 50-100 V range, the slopes of the Ileak vs. Vbias curves increase gradually, then steepen and maximize in the 100-200 V range, as the large changes in collection area dominate, similar to Modules #1 and #3. The curves then flatten out in the 250-400 V range for the lower  $n_e$  curves and in the 350-500 V range for the higher n<sub>e</sub> curves. After flattening out, the sets of  $I_{leak}$  vs.  $V_{bias}$  curves for Modules #1, #3 and #6 all asymptotically reach Ileak values similar to each other for the same  $n_e$ , but varying with  $n_e$ , roughly 18-22  $\mu$ A for  $n_e = 10^9 \text{ m}^{-3}$ , 75-85  $\mu$ A for  $n_e = 10^{10}$  $m^{-3}$ , and 700-800  $\mu A$  for  $n_e = 10^{11} m^{-3}$ .

Module #8, GaAs on Ge with wrap-through connectors, is very small with only four  $4 \times 4$  cm cells.  $I_{leak}$  at 50 V is low, except for the  $n_e = 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3}$  curve, which is probably in error due to the paucity of 50 V measurements with  $n_e \approx 10^{11} \text{ m}^{-3}$ . The slopes of Module #8's curves gradually increase in the 50–100 V range, steepen and maximize in the 100–200 V range, but then only start to turn over in the 300–500 range. Because of the limited cell area of this small module, the snapover-controlled I<sub>leak</sub> never reaches the levels attained by Modules #1, #3 and #6, which draw current from a much more extensive plasma sheath.

The analysis presented here shows that once snapover is fully developed (as happened for Modules #1, #3 and #6), further increasing of the bias voltage would merely increases the negative floating potential of the spacecraft, so that the "array to plasma" voltage, which is actually responsible for the interactions, does not change appreciably.  $I_{leak}$  then depends almost exclusively on plasma density (more exactly on thermal electron flux, which includes a  $T_e^{\frac{1}{2}}$  term, but with the small variation in  $T_e$  this term has little effect).

Let us examine the high-voltage end of the  $I_{leak}$  vs.  $V_{bias}$  curve sets for Modules #1, #3 and #6 shown in

Figure 1. The  $I_{leak}$  curves flatten out as they reach values of 700-800  $\mu$ A for  $n_e = 10^{11} m^{-3}$ . For the  $n_e = 10^9 m^{-3}$  curves,  $I_{leak}$  reaches (or would reach when it fully flattens out) values of 18-22  $\mu$ A.  $I_{leak}$  has about a 1½ order-of-magnitude variation with  $n_e$ , while  $n_e$ itself has a two order-of-magnitude variation,  $10^9 \rightarrow 10^{11} m^{-3}$ . Thus, at the high-voltage end of the  $I_{leak}$  vs.  $V_{bias}$  curves where snapover is fully developed (Modules #1, #3 and #6 in Figure 1, but not #8),  $I_{leak}$ appears to be roughly proportional to  $n_e^{0.75}$ .

Since  $A_{coll}$  is *defined* with  $n_e$  to the first power in its denominator, while  $I_{leak}$  at the "snapover maximized" high-voltage end of the curve sets increases roughly as  $n_e^{0.75}$ , the collecting area (as we define it) at the high-voltage end should decrease with increasing plasma density (A<sub>coll</sub> should be roughly proportional to  $n_e^{-0.25}$ ).

Figure 2 shows A<sub>coll</sub> vs. array-to-plasma voltage V<sub>A-P</sub> for five binned levels (10<sup>9</sup> to 10<sup>10</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>) for Modules #1, #3, #6 and #8 (same modules as Figure 1).  $V_{A-P}$ is obtained by subtracting the magnitude of the spacecraft's negative "frame" potential V<sub>frame</sub> (devived from ESA ion-channel data) from the applied positive bias (V<sub>bias</sub>). The location of the energy peak (in eV) in the ESA's ion energy spectrum corresponds to V<sub>frame</sub> in Volts. [Thermal ions arrive at the ESA's ion-channel aperture with an energy corresponding to V<sub>frame</sub>.] For arrays where this effect is significant, V<sub>frame</sub> is developed from available measurements (somewhat sparse) as a function of V<sub>bias</sub> and n<sub>e</sub>. The derived V<sub>frame</sub> is subtracted from V<sub>bias</sub> to obtain V<sub>A-P</sub>. Even for the highest  $V_{bias}$  and  $n_e$  levels,  $V_{frame}$  is < 100 V for Module #1, #3 and #6. For Module #8, V<sub>frame</sub> is so small it cannot be derived, so  $V_{A-P} = V_{bias}$ .

Let us examine the high-voltage end of the  $A_{coll}$  vs.  $V_{A-P}$  curve sets for Modules #1, #3 and #6 in Figure 4.  $A_{coll}$  reaches (or would reach when it flattens out) values of 1.5-1.7 m<sup>2</sup>, for  $n_e = 10^9 m^{-3}$ , the *lowest*  $n_e$  curve. At  $n_e = 10^{11} m^{-3}$ ,  $A_{coll}$  decreases to values of 0.50-0.58 m<sup>2</sup> for Modules #1, #3 and #6. There is about a one-half order-of-magnitude *decrease* in  $A_{coll}$  for the two order-of-magnitude *increase* in  $n_e$ . This result illustrates  $A_{coll}$ 's roughly  $n_e^{-0.25}$  dependence on plasma density when snapover has become fully developed, and increases in positive bias voltage tend just to increase the negative frame potential. As for the small Module #8, it never reached fully-developed snapover at the highest bias levels of PASP Plus ( $V_{frame}$  was to low to measure), so no conclusions on  $n_e$  dependency for  $A_{coll}$  are possible.



Leakage current vs. applied positive bias voltage for five plasma density ranges for four PASP Plus planar-array modules tested: Module #1 of the old standard Si Array; Module #3, the Space Station Si Array with WTC; Module #6 of the standard GaAs on Ge Array; and Module #8, the small GaAs on Ge array with WTC. All data used in the drawings were from ram-hemisphere in-sunlight measurements. Fig. I.

Plasma Density (m^-3) 1.00 × 10<sup>11</sup> \_\_\_\_\_ 3.16 × 10<sup>10</sup> \_\_\_\_\_\_ 1.00 × 10<sup>10</sup> \_\_\_\_\_\_ 3.16 × 10<sup>9</sup> \_\_\_\_\_\_



: -· :

Collecting area vs. array-to-plasma voltage for five plasma density ranges for four PASP Plus planar-array modules tested: Module #1 of the old standard Si Array; Module #3, the Space Station Si Array with WTC; Module #6 of the standard GaAs on Ge Array; and Module #8, the small GaAs on Ge array with WTC. All data used in the drawings were from ram-hemisphere in-sunlight measurements. Fig. 2.

Plasma Density (m^-3) 1.00 x 10<sup>11</sup> 3.16 x 10<sup>10</sup> ------

 $1.00 \times 10^{10}$ 

3.16 × 10<sup>9</sup> 1.00 × 10<sup>9</sup>

# Analysis of Negative Biasing Data

The arc rates for PASP Plus's ten negatively biased test arrays were measured by the experiment's Transient Pulse Monitor (TPM) and the rates correlated with applied bias voltage and measured vehicle-orientation and environmental parameters. At this time there has been no analysis of the the other measured parameters of arcs (amplitude, derivative, or integral) with respect to bias voltage or flight-related conditions.

The concentrator arrays, due to the shielding of their cells from the space plasma, manifested no significant arcing during the course of our measurements, arcing at only the highest negative voltage levels, once at most in a biasing period, in less than 2% of the biasing trials. The very low number of trials where arcing took place made it impossible to study any dependencies.

The measured arc rate for the planar arrays showed a strong dependency on the mechanical configuration (i.e., metal interconnect and cell side-edge exposure to the space plasma). Analysis of PASP Plus measurements showed that planar arrays having their interconnects shielded from the space plasma have lower arcing rates. The arrays with wrap-through connectors have less arcs than would be expected based on other factors.

Modules #1 and #2 of the standard silicon array showed substantial arcing (even up to one arc per second) for voltages > 160 V, plasma densities >  $10^9 \text{ m}^{-3}$  in ram, both in sun and eclipse. This is to be expected since Array 0,1,2 is of old construction (exposed roughsurface interconnects). According to theory, if the interconnects have many field-emission sites (microscopically jagged regions with high electric-field enhancement factors), charging processes caused by enhanced-field electron emission can be initiated, leading to collisional ionization of neutral gas desorbed from the cell's coverglass, eventually resulting in an arc discharge.<sup>8</sup>

While Modules #1 and #2 showed much higher arc rates than the other arrays, the arc rate of <u>all</u> arrays showed a strong dependence on bias voltage. Arcing onset (threshold) voltages were found to be generally in the -100 V to -300 V range. See Table V for the experimentally measured and computer-simulated arcing onset voltages.

It was found that ion flux ( $F_{ion} = n_{ion} v_{ion} \cos \theta_{ram}$ ) was also an important factor in determining arc rate. Access of the plasma's positive ions to the interactions volume between an array's solar cells is necessary for initiation of the sequence of interactions leading to arcing to occur. Figure 3 shows the measured arc rate dependence of Module #2 on bias voltage for a particular ion flux level  $(10^{13} \text{ m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1})$ . Figure 4 shows the arc rate dependence of Module #2 on ion flux for a particular bias voltage level (-300 V). Data points are shown by the filled and open circles in the figures. The curves drawn represent the best-fit exponential curves for the data set in each figure.

# Table V. Arcing Onset Voltages: Experimental Measurements and Computer Simulations

Moo <u>Arr</u>	dule/ ay Type	In-Space Measured Onset Voltage	Computer-Simulated Onset Voltage
1,2	Standard Silicon	-160 V	-160 V
3	Space Sta Si with wto	-160 V	Not Derived
5	Thin Si (APSA)	-100 V to -125 V	-100 V
4,6	Standard GaAs on (	-125 V Se	-120 V
8	GaAs on Ge with wtc	= -260  V to  -300	V Not Derived
11	GaAs on (	Ge - 180 V	-180 V

In general, arcing requires that the array not be in wake, in most cases this means  $\theta_{ram} = \pm 90^{\circ}$ . However, for modules prone to arc (#1 and #2) it was observed that, at high negative biases especially in eclipse (cold is another arc enhancing factor), arcing occurred for the module near the edge of the deployed panel (Module #2) for ram angles up to nearly 120° while Module #1 in the center of the panel would not arc until  $\theta_{ram}$  was  $\leq 100^{\circ}$  (with few arcs beyond 90°).

From negative-biasing data analysis, arcing was found to be more prevalent under cold array conditions, especially at the ends of eclipse periods. Based on theory, cold array temperatures would be expected to promote arcing: greater concentrations of neutral gas available for desorption and the gas staying in the interaction area (having less energy) under cold conditions. For thin arrays such as the APSA array (Module #5), temperature is an especially important arcing factor. While it was not biased beyond -300 V, Module #5's arcing was confined almost exclusively to eclipse periods where its temperature could reach -70Cdue to its very low mass and thermal isolation.



Fig. 3. Variation of Arc Rate with Applied Negative Voltage for Old Standard Si Module #2, Showing Data Points (filled circles) and Best-Fit Exponential Curve.



Fig. 4. Variation of Arc Rate with Ion Flux for Old Standard Si Module #2, Showing Data Points (open circles) and Best-Fit Exponential Curve.

These arc rates measured by PASP Plus have been compared with computer-generated simulations using a semi-analytic arc-rate code developed by M.I.T. for the experiment's conventional planar arrays.<sup>8</sup> The simulations were carried out using the measured "arc-rate determining" parameters (bias voltage, ion flux, array temperature, etc.) measured aboard APEX during negative biasing operations. Measured and simulated arcrate findings were compared, with favorable results. The findings were subsequently used to develop causeand-effect relationships and presented in a comprehensive report.<sup>9</sup>

## Analysis of Radiation-Induced Degradation

PASP Plus obtained over 600,000 I-V curves for analysis, taking an I-V curve every 30 seconds except for eclipse periods and down times caused by APEX problems. In deriving the plots of  $P_{max}$  (or  $I_{sc}$  or  $V_{oc}$ ) vs. days after launch for the different modules, we compensated for the 3.3% solar intensity variation (yearly earth-sun distance variation) and the variations caused by changes in array temperature. The latter was corrected using the  $P_{max}$ ,  $I_{sc}$  and  $V_{oc}$  temperature coefficients from ground tests conducted at the Boeing test chamber at Kent WA.<sup>10</sup> The array temperatures gradually increased over the initial months of flight and then stabilized. This increase was likely caused by the lowered reflectivity of the Z-93 thermal-control paint on the payload shelf and deployed panel.

There is also a variation in  $I_{sc}$  (and hence in  $P_{max}$ ) caused by variations in the "illumination" input from the earth's albedo. This illumination increase depends upon the angle between the satellite vertical and the earth-sun line. It also depends on the satellite altitude and earth surface viewed. Earth's albedo can add as much as 6% illumination to planar arrays. Because of their narrow viewing angle, concentrator arrays are immune to this effect. Albedo effects can lead to distortions in the day-to-day points on a  $P_{max}$  vs. daysfrom-launch plot, especially if the day's I-V curves are few (sometimes, only one). Nevertheless, the one-year trends display clear differences between the various PASP Plus arrays, as shown in Figures 5 through 9.

Modules #0 (Si), #4 (GaAs on Ge) and #10 (InP), shown in Figure 5, have similar cell-fabrication features (6-mil coverglasses and thick backs) but different cell materials.  $P_{max}$ , normalized to day zero (launch), shows a one-year degradation of 17% for the Si module and 13% for the GaAs on Ge module, but only 7.5% for the InP module, clearly showing InP's radiation hardness advantage.

Modules #3 (Space Station) and #5 (APSA) are examples of flexible Si-cell arrays. Each array is mounted on the deployed panel over a cut-out opening in the panel, causing them to have both their top and bottom surfaces open to the environment, as they would be in

operation as a prime power array on a large spacecraft. The one-year degradations for these modules, shown in Figure 6, were 21% for APSA and 24% for Space Station. For comparison, Figure 5 also shows the standard Si array, Module #0. The thin-cell (2.5 mil) APSA array degraded somewhat less than the thickercell (8 mil) Space Station array, even though APSA had less coverglass thickness (2.5 mil vs. 5 mil). It should be noted that the APSA and Space Station arrays were designed for lower orbits having much lower radiation.

The P<sub>max</sub> degradation curve for Module #9, amorphous Si, is shown in Figure 7. For compactness, the vertical (Pmax) scale of Figure 7 is compressed 2:1 compared to Figures 5, 6, 8 and 9. Module #9 showed the greatest  $P_{max}$  degradation: 42% in one year. While  $I_{sc}$  and  $V_{oc}$ each degraded about 12%, the majority of the P<sub>max</sub> degradation came from a 25% drop in the fill factor (ff =  $P_{max}/I_{sc} V_{oc}$ ). In contrast, the one-year degradation in fill factor for all the other test arrays was 1-2%or less. The P<sub>max</sub> of amorphous Si module diminished 20% in 25 days and 32% in 75 days. The early part and most of the overall degradation is attributable to the solar-UV induced Stabler-Wronski effect. However, with a triple-junction amorphous Si cell, there may be some current mismatch effects as well. With 20-mil coverglass, the radiation-induced degradation for Module #9 would not be expected to be so high.<sup>11</sup>

Figure 8 shows the  $P_{max}$  degradation for Modules #7 and #12, the two dual-junction planar arrays. The AlGaAs//GaAs array with monolithic cells and the GaAs//CuInSe<sub>2</sub> array with mechanically stacked cells showed excellent radiation resistance, 9-10% for the one-year exposure. Since the photovoltaically generated voltages of the two parts of a dual-junction cell are different, their outputs have to be coupled so they are current matched (by controlling the doping and thicknesses of both materials) for monolithically grown cells or voltage matched (by combining the separate parts of the cell in a non-unity (e.g., 3:1) voltage ratio for mechanically stacked cells. The PASP Plus results indicate that radiation did not cause any significant "mismatching" losses in these arrays.

Figure 9 shows the  $P_{max}$  degradation for Module #15, the dual-junction GaAs//GaSb Mini-Dome concentrator array. With its cells protected by their Fresnel lenses, the Mini-Dome concentrator showed the least degradation, 7% over one year. For Module #14, the Mini-Cassegrainian concentrator array, because of internal cell problems, proper I-V curves could not be obtained, so no radiation degradation assessment could be made.

## **Conclusions**

The PASP Plus experiment, despite the launch delays and the APEX problems in orbit, has provided outstanding space-research data to the solar-array community for the examination of space-plasma effects on high-voltage operation and space-radiation effects on long-term array power output. Through its August 1994 to August 1995 operation in space, PASP Plus collected an order of magnitude more data about environmental interactions on solar arrays than all previous space-borne photovoltaic experiments combined. The large data base gathered has allowed the development of cause-and-effect relationships. The experiment has permitted comparison of in-space measurements with analytic and computer-generated simulation models, leading to the use of the validated interaction codes to predict the performance of future solar arrays in particular space environments.

#### References

1. Grier, N.T., "Plasma Interaction Experiment II (PIX II): Laboratory and Flight Results", *Spacecraft Environmental Interactions Technology* – 1983, NASA CP-2359, AFGL-TR-85-0018, 1985, pp. 333-348.

2. Ferguson, D.C., "The Voltage Threshold for Arcing Solar Cells in LEO — Flight and Ground Test Results", AIAA 86-0362, <u>24th Aerospace Sciences</u> <u>Meeting</u>, Reno, NV, 6-8 Jan. 1986.

3. Guidice, D.A., "PASP Plus: An Experiment To Measure Space-Environment Effects on Photovoltaic Power Subsystems", Fifth Annual Workshop on Space Operations, Applications and Research (SOAR '91), NASA Conf. Publ. 3127, Vol.II, Feb. 92, pp. 662-668.

4. Guidice, D.A., Severance, P.S., Curtis, H.B., and Piszczor, M.F., "Investigation of Space-Environment Effects on Photovoltaic Technologies by the PASP Plus Experiment", AIAA 95-0371, <u>33rd Aerospace Sciences</u> <u>Meeting</u>, Reno, NV, 9-12 Jan 1995.

5. Adams, S.F., "Photovoltaic Array Space Power Plus Diagnostics Flight Experiment: Pre-Flight Description of Experimental Photovoltaic Modules", WL-TR-92-2080, Wright Laboratory, Oct. 1992.

6. Guidice, D.A., "High-Voltage Space-Plasma Interactions Measured on the PASP Plus Test Arrays", *Proc. of XIV Space Photovoltaic Research and Technology Conf. (SPRAT XIV)*, NASA Conf. Publ. 10180, Oct. 1995, pp. 286-295. 7. Smiddy, M. and Stuart, R.D., "An Analysis of the Behavior of a Multi-Grid Spherical Sensor in a Drifting Maxwellian Plasma", AFCRL-69-0013, A.F. Cambridge Research Labs, Jan. 1969, p. 53.

8. Cho, M., and Hastings, D.E., "Dielectric Charging Processes and Arcing Rates of High-Voltage Solar Arrays," J. Spacecraft & Rockets, Vol. 28, 1991, pp. 698-706.

9. Soldi, J.D., and Hastings, D.E., "Arc Rate Simulation and Flight Data Analysis for the PASP Plus Experiment", PL-TR-95-2126, Phillips Lab., Sept. 1995. 10. Curtis, H.B., Guidice, D.A., Severance, P.S., and Piszczor, M.F., "Results of Thermal Vacuum Tests for the PASP Plus Flight Modules", Proc. of XII Space Photovoltaic Research and Technology Conference, NASA Conf. Publ. 3210, May 1993, pp. 289-297.

11. Curtis, H.B., and Marvin, D.C., "One Year of Flight Data from the PASP Plus Experiment", Proc. of XIV Space Photovoltaic Research and Technology Conf. (SPRAT XIV), NASA Conf. Publ. 10180, Oct. 1995, pp. 268-273.



Fig. 5. Normalized P<sub>max</sub> (Sun-Distance and Temperature Corrected) vs. Days from Launch for PASP Plus Test Modules #0 (Standard Si), #4 (GaAs on Ge), and #10 (InP). They have similar 6-mil coverglasses and thick backs.







Fig. 7. Normalized P<sub>max</sub> (Sun-Distance and Temperature Corrected) vs. Days from Launch for Module #9, Amorphous Si. The vertical (P<sub>max</sub>) scale is compressed 2:1, compared to Figures 5, 6, 8 and 9.



Fig. 8. Normalized P<sub>max</sub> (Sun-Distance and Temperature Corrected) vs. Days from Launch for the Two Dual-Junction Planar Arrays. Module #7 is the AlGaAs//GaAs array with monolithic cells, and Module #12 is the GaAs//CuInSe<sub>2</sub> array with mechanically stacked cells.



Fig. 9. Normalized P<sub>max</sub> (Sun-Distance and Temperature Corrected) vs. Days from Launch for Module #15, the Dual-Junction GaAs//GaSb Mini-Dome Concentrator Array.