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Introduction

• Knowledge of remaining propellant is essential to determine the operating life of spacecraft

• Instrumentation to gauge propellant is limited
  – Measurements of temperature & pressure most common

• Indirect methods must be developed to gauge propellant
  – Estimate uncertainty important

• NASA’s Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) spacecraft is one example that will rely on indirect propellant gauging
  – Uses a blow-down propulsion system
  – Carries 400 kg of propellant, contained within four propellant tanks
Motivation & Focus

• Motivation
  – Propellant knowledge important on MMS to:
    • Maintain closely spaced (10 km) formation
    • Change orbit half-way through mission
    • Determine mission length and decommissioning
  – Motivates need to develop a propellant load estimator to determine propellant load with low levels of uncertainty

• Focus
  – Developing and validating thermal model that is foundation of estimator
Thesis Objective

• Primary Objective:
  – Develop the thermal model of the MMS propellant tank
  – Validate model with thermal vacuum test data so that it is sufficient to make future propellant estimates on MMS

• Secondary Objective:
  – Provide specifics to create a TCM propellant estimator for diaphragm-style propellant tanks
  – Understand process of correlating thermal model to test data
Acceptance Criterion

- **Criterion:**
  
  Temperature predictions are within +/- 3°C of the test data at each sensor location

- **Justification:**
  - Criteria is considered industry baseline
  - Used by thermal analysts in Thermal Branch at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
  - Within flight acceptance thermal reliability margin of +/-5°C used by JPL/NASA

Thermal Margins from Gilmore. [1]
Background

- Mission goal: understand process of magnetic reconnection

- Have/will have following data sets:
  - Thermal Vacuum test data
  - Commissioning data
  - Mid-course correction
  - EOL propellant gauging

---

**Phases of the Project**

**Phase I**
- Creation of Initial Thermal Model
- Validation with other models

**Phase II**
- Refinement of thermal model
- Validation with TVAC test data

**Phase III**
- Estimation of propellant load using correlated model
- Application to mid-mission orbit change maneuver
- EOL propellant estimation

---

**MMS Development Stage**

- Design Stage
- Procurement Stage
- System Integration Stage
- Testing Stage: Vibration, Acoustic, Thermal Vacuum
- Launch
- Commissioning
- Mission Stage
- EOL/Decommissioning
Book Keeping Method (BKM)

• **Description:**
  – Estimate made from calculated propellant consumption of each maneuver
  – Amount of propellant is tabulated for each subsequent maneuver
  – F & Isp from test data for each engine

\[
\dot{m} = \frac{F(P_t)}{I_{sp}(P_t)}
\]

\[
m_p = \dot{m} t_m
\]

• **Advantages:**
  – Simple to implement
  – Low uncertainty in estimates at the beginning of life

• **Disadvantages:**
  – Pressure drop and thruster performance models do not account for changes in component performance
  – Uncertainty in estimate grows due to compounding of errors
  – Estimates of error at end-of-life range widely: 5% to 76%
Pressure-Volume-Temperature Method (PVT)

• **Description:**
  – Estimates from calculating the volume of propellant remaining using real or ideal gas models
  – Based upon measured temperature and pressure of the tank
  – Independent of previous measurements

• **Advantages:**
  – Accurate at beginning of life
  – Estimates independent of previous estimates
  – Simple to implement model

• **Disadvantages:**
  – Error increases over life of mission due to small changes in pressure compared to change in propellant volume & increased errors in sensor readings
  – Highly sensitive to uncertainties in pressure readings
    • Less than 1% uncertainty in pressure reading translates to ~10% or greater in estimated propellant volume
Thermal Capacitance Method (TCM)

- **Description:**
  - Propellant estimates based upon temperature response of tank to a known heat input

- **Advantages:**
  - Low uncertainties in propellant estimates at end of life
  - Less mass leads to higher temperature response which reduces errors

- **Disadvantages:**
  - Requires a complex thermal model
  - Not accurate at beginning of life due to large propellant mass that reduces the temperature time derivative

Simulated TCM results for different propellant masses are compared to flight telemetry values to obtain a propellant estimate.
Applications of Thermal Capacitance Methods

- TCM successfully implemented on multiple spacecraft over last 15 years
- Publically available reports published through AIAA by Boris Yendler & Co-Authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacecraft/System</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SkyPerfect (JSAT) /Boeing BSS 601 Bus</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>[3],[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstar 11</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOStar 1A &amp; 1B</td>
<td>2013, 2014</td>
<td>[8],[9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Papers outline highly generalized TCM estimation method
- Lack specifics about practical implementation of method
How do we model the system?

Real System

Model of System

Q_{in} Heat from heaters

Q_{out} Conduction Radiation

Diaphragm

Gas Side

Liquid Side

Tank

Ring

Image from [10]
Description of Tank System

• Tank divided into Gas & Liquid Sides:
  – Each side has 7 heaters, wired in parallel (14 heaters total)
  – Each circuit protected by an over-temperature TSTAT

• Tank filled with Ar + GN2 gas mixture for TVAC test
  – No propellant or simulant in tank during testing for safety and integration concerns

• Temperature measured by non-flight sensors
  – Digital 1-wire sensors, located throughout spacecraft
  – Some at same locations as flight thermistors
  – Flight thermistors limited in number and location
Thermal Vacuum Test Overview

- Thermal vacuum (TVAC) testing seeks to test entire spacecraft in a space-like environment
  - Allows for test verification & correlation of thermal models
  - All subsystems perform tests to verify operation of components/equipment

- Tank heater circuit over-temperature thermostat (TSTAT) test
  - Verify operation of the two thermostats that control heater circuits on tank
  - Duplicates conditions of thermal capacitance gauging operation on orbit
    - Heats tank until over-temperature TSTAT set-point of 43°C is reached
    - Duration of test is approximately 6900s

- Thermal model correlated with data from over-temp TSTAT test
  - Heater current & temperature data from test fed into model
  - Model output compared to temperature data recorded by 1-wire sensors on tank
TCM Theory

• Concept:
  – Heat is applied to tank and propellant via heaters
  – Heat is conducted away by the structure and lost through radiation
  – Monitor the temperature of the tank
  – Temperature of the tank a function of the amount of propellant within the tank

Where:
\[ \dot{Q} = \text{rate of energy input (power)} \]
\[ c = \text{specific heat} \]
\[ m = \text{mass} \]
\[ \frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = \text{change in temperature WRT time} \]
\[ k = \text{thermal conductivity} \]

\[ cm \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \dot{Q}_{\text{in}} - \dot{Q}_{\text{loss}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ \dot{Q}_{\text{in}} = Q_{\text{heaters}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

\[ \dot{Q}_{\text{loss}} = Q_{\text{cond}} + Q_{\text{rad}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)
TCM Theory (cont.)

- Energy conservation equation is solved using ANSYS Finite Element Analysis software
- Applies mesh to CAD solid model of system, creating finite elements
- Solver discretizes energy conservation equation at each node
- Equations form a linear system that is solved at each node at each time step in the model

\[
\begin{align*}
Q_{\text{in}} & \to 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow i \rightarrow i+1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow n \to Q_{\text{out}} \\
&
\end{align*}
\]

1-D Rod Showing Elements, Nodes, & Control Volume
Main Assumptions

• **Convection within Gas in tank is neglected**
  – Mass of tank drives time constant of system, not mass of gas
  – Account for the mass of the gas

• **Radiation to environment modeled; surface-to-surface radiation neglected**
  – Surfaces temperatures within same magnitude (20-43°C)
  – Tank designed to minimize surface-to-surface radiation (low $\epsilon$ coatings & MLI blankets)
  – Radiation losses are negligible compared to conduction losses

• **Perfect bonded contact between interfaces**
  – Done to practically implement model within ANSYS
  – Correlation process will focus on changing the conductive resistances at interfaces to match test data
Initial & Boundary Conditions

- **Initial Conditions**
  - Based upon 1-wire sensor readings
  - Average temperature of 31°C used if no 1-wire was on or near a component

- **Boundary Condition: Temperature**
  - Tank interface temperatures were monitored during by 1-wire sensors
  - Allowed model to be simplified by removing support structure

Location of Temperature Boundary Conditions
Boundary Conditions: Radiation

- Radiation transfer to environment modeled
- Applied emissivities of tank blankets and parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optical Properties</th>
<th>Emissivity</th>
<th>Ambient Temp (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axial Pin &amp; Receiver</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed Tank Tabs</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struts</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Blanket</td>
<td>4.50E-03</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Struts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tank Pin &amp; Receiver Plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tank Exposed Parts (tabs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boundary Conditions: Heat Flux

• Heat input provided by the tank heaters

• Uniformly distributed heat flux over upper & lower tank surfaces
  – Tank and heaters covered aluminum tape with conductive adhesive
  – Meant to evenly spread heat around tank

• Heater power and on-times determined using heater circuit current data
Mesh

- Created with ANSYS automatic mesh controls
- Generated patch-conforming/sweeping mesh
  - ~175,000 nodes and 88,400 elements
Sensor Locations

- Defined locations on tank model that matched as-bonded location of 1-wire sensors
Sensor Locations (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Location</th>
<th>1-Wire Sensor Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tank Belly Button Tab</td>
<td>PRP_051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomerang</td>
<td>PRP_053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Right Tank Strut by Ring</td>
<td>PRP_054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Left Tank Strut at Tank Tab</td>
<td>PRP_056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Left Tank Strut by Ring</td>
<td>PRP_057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Thermistor</td>
<td>PRP_068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Thermistor</td>
<td>PRP_072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation Process

- Translate: real tank → model of tank
  - Model approximation of reality
  - Account for approximation by adjusting thermal resistances in model to match test data

- Thermal Conductance, $U$: adjust thermal resistance

\[ Q = -U \Delta T \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

\[ U = \frac{kA}{L} \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

- Match test data by modifying thermal contact conductance (TCC) of tank parts
- Limitation with ANSYS:
  - Modify TCC at contact regions only, but not for group of parts
  - Modified conductance by using a conductivity multiplier

Tank Strut is composed of multiple parts

[Diagram showing tank strut with parts labeled: Strut, Tab Itfc, Clevis, Pin, Contact]
Conductance Studies: Study #1

1) Lower Tank Strut at Tab Interface
2) Goal: match temperatures at Lower Left Strut Tab and Liquid Sensor
   - Altered TCC at strut tabs
   - Altered lower hemisphere conductivity multiplier to account for tape on tank
   - Increased strut overall conductivity multiplier to account for electrical harness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev</th>
<th>Right TCC</th>
<th>Left TCC</th>
<th>Lower Hemi k</th>
<th>Liq (PRP_072)</th>
<th>Belly Button Tab (PRP_051)</th>
<th>LL Strut Tab (PRP_056)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>3.711</td>
<td>4.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td>5.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>3.389</td>
<td>3.706</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0x</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>3.815</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0x</td>
<td>2.439</td>
<td>0.473^a</td>
<td>1.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a In this Rev, results were queried from a patch area instead of a full selected area
Conductance Studies: Study #2

- **2) Boomerang**
  
  **Goal**: Increase heat flux into upper hemisphere and match temperatures at Boomerang
  
  - Altered TCC
  
  - Altered upper hemisphere conductivity multiplier to account for effect of tape on tank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev</th>
<th>Right TCC</th>
<th>Left TCC</th>
<th>Upper Hemi k</th>
<th>Liq (PRP_072)</th>
<th>Belly Button Tab (PRP_051)</th>
<th>Upper Strut (PRP_054)</th>
<th>LL Strut Tab (PRP_056)</th>
<th>Boomerang (PRP_053)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>-2.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>-0.747</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>-1.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>-0.773</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>-1.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>-0.756</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>-1.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conductance Studies: Study #2

- 2) **Boomerang (cont.)**
- Found that physics were not matched at Upper Strut
Conductance Studies: Study #3

• 3) Upper Strut End Conductance Study
• Goal: Match physics at Upper Struts
  – Reduced TCC on pins caused temperature difference was getting larger
  – Increased TCC on pins & adjusted strut conductivity multipliers: marked improvement in physics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev</th>
<th>Right TCC</th>
<th>Left TCC</th>
<th>Upper Right Strut k</th>
<th>Upper Hemi k</th>
<th>Liq (PRP_072)</th>
<th>Upper Strut (PRP_054)</th>
<th>LL Strut Tab (PRP_056)</th>
<th>Boomerang (PRP_053)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.374</td>
<td>-2.482</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>-2.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.374</td>
<td>-2.951</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>-2.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>-3.757</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>-2.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5x</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>-3.468</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>-2.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.5x</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>-2.686</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.5x</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
<td>2.447</td>
<td>-2.212</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>-2.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Upper Strut End Conductance Study (cont.)
   - Able to improve trend in modeled temperature response, particularly after ~1000s of sim. time
   - Larger temperature difference than previously, but better match test data overall

~2°C difference
**Results: Gas (Top) Side**

**MMS TCAP Model**
**TVAC Correlation**
Gas Thermistor-PRP_068

**MMS TCAP Model**
**TVAC Correlation**
Boomerang-PRP_053
Results: Gas (Top) Side

MMS TCAP Model
TVAC Correlation
Upper Right Tank Strut by Ring-PRP_054

Temperature [degC]

Elapsed Time (s)

Test Data
Model
Discussion: Gas (Top) Side

- Model output within +/- 3°C for all sensors
- Under predicted temperatures at all sensor locations
- Trends in temperature rise in time match trends in test data
  - Main physics are being captured
- Analyzed results at Gas Thermistor Location (PRP_068)
  - Approached -3°C limit at 5000-6000s
  - Peak temperature: 2.7°C lower & ~900s earlier
  - Slope of simulated temperature: ~0.15°C/min (Test data: ~0.19°C/min)
- Boomerang Location (PRP_053) show similar trends to Gas Location
- Likely Cause:
  - Uniformly applied heat flux removes higher localized heat flux → lower temperatures
  - Further investigation of this is subject of future work
Results: Liquid (Bottom) Side

MMS TCAP Model
TVAC Correlation
Liquid Thermistor-PRP-072

MMS TCAP Model
TVAC Correlation
Tank Belly Button Tab-PRP_051
Results: Liquid (Bottom) Side

MMS TCAP Model
TVAC Correlation
Lower Left Tank Strut at Tank Tab-PRP_056

MMS TCAP Model
TVAC Correlation
Lower Left Tank Strut by Ring-PRP_057
Discussion: Liquid (Bottom) Side

- Model output within +/- 3°C for all sensors
- Trends in temperature rise in time match trends in test data
  - Main physics are being captured
- Model over-predict results at half of the sensor locations
  - Exceptions: PRP_056 and PRP_057, showed good agreement with test data
- Slopes better matched test data:
  - PRP_072: 0.16°C/min (Test data: 0.15°C/min)
- Over-predictions likely due to larger heat flux in bottom half of model
  - Consistent with gas side, where opposite affect was observed
  - Further investigation of this is subject of future work
Uncertainty Analysis

• Conducted to understand impacts on predicted temperature results

• Heat Flux:
  – 9.6% uncertainty due to worst-case heater & current measurement error

• Mass of Tank:
  – Crane scale measurement (1.13 kg worst case error)

• Temperature Boundary Conditions:
  – Lack of flight sensors at each strut to ring interface
  – Bounded worst-case range of +/- 10°C
Uncertainty Analysis Results

Effect of Uncertainty in Heater Power, Mass & Temperature BC on Results at Each Sensor Location

Percent Deviation

Location on Tank

Gas (PRP_068) | Boomerang (PRP_053) | Upper Strut (PRP_054) | Liq (PRP_072) | Belly Button Tab (PRP_051) | LL Strut Tab (PRP_056) | LL Strut by Ring (PRP_057)

T | M | Q

0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30
Uncertainty Analysis Results (cont.)

Sensitivity Coefficients for Uncertainty in Heater Power, Mass and Temperature BC for Each Sensor Location

Location on Tank:
- Gas (PRP_068)
- Boomerang (PRP_053)
- Upper Strut (PRP_054)
- Liq (PRP_072)
- Belly Button Tab (PRP_051)
- LL Strut Tab (PRP_056)
- LL Strut by Ring (PRP_057)

Sensitivity Coefficients:
- T
- M
- Q
Uncertainty Analysis Discussion

• Percent Deviation:
  – Uncertainty in applied heater power has largest effect
  – Temperature BC uncertainty has largest effect only near tank interface locations

• Sensitivity:
  – Model is sensitive to uncertainties in applied heater power & Mass
  – ~10% change in heater power results in 1-2°C difference in predicted temperatures at tank poles
  – 0.9°C per 1 kg of mass uncertainty

• Conclusions:
  – Uncertainties in heat flux lead to higher percent deviations in the model, with uncertainties in temperature BC only affecting predictions of interface temperatures
  – Model most sensitive to uncertainties in heat flux and mass
Conclusions

• The project objective has been met:
  – The thermal model developed was able to predict temperatures within the acceptance criterion of +/- 3°C.
  – It is therefore sufficient to make future propellant estimates for the MMS spacecraft

• Model found to be sensitive to uncertainties in applied heater power and total tank mass

• The cause of the discrepancy in under-predicted temperatures on the gas side of tank and over-predicted temperatures on the liquid side of the tank needs to be investigated further and addressed in future work
Issues

• Over-complexity of ANSYS model
  – Details of CAD model of MMS tank system can only be reduced so much within ANSYS
  – Grouping of parts to address issues with modeling contact and thermal conductance was cumbersome

• Simulation Solve Time
  – High level of detail resulted in dense mesh; this increased solve time significantly
  – Solve times: 45 min per run (over 65 runs were completed, or over 48 hours of continuous solve time)
  – Comparison: entire MMS spacecraft thermal model (made in Thermal Desktop) took 20 minutes to solve
Key Lesson Learned

• Model is an approximation of reality
  – Have to make assumptions to practically implement model and account for behavior of real model

• Add complexity incrementally, rather than remove complexity

• Understand how software queries results from model
Future Work

- Address uniform heat flux BC to improve Gas-Side temperature results
- Address model complexity: Thermal Desktop implementation
- Add surrounding structure: Account for uncertainties in temperature boundary conditions
- Start Phase III of project: flight calibration and propellant estimations
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Propellant Estimator Development Road Map

- **Phase I:**
  - Initial development of thermal model
  - Verification made by comparison to other thermal models
  - Provide foundation for Phase II

- **Phase II:**
  - Focus of thesis
  - Refinement of Phase I thermal model
  - Validation/correlation with thermal vacuum test data from MMS spacecraft

- **Phase III:**
  - Calibration of thermal model with flight data
  - Estimations of propellant load on MMS
    - After mid-course orbit change burn
    - At EOL/Decommissioning stage of mission
Book Keeping Method Details

- Use of Thrust Scale Factor (TSF) to decrease Uncertainty
  - Used on NASA’s Tropical Rainfall Measurement Mission
  - TSF acts as learning variable to better predict thruster performance
  - Corrects for differences in thruster performance based on predicted and actual final semi-major access of spacecraft orbit

- TSF was found to only marginally improve uncertainties in estimates compared to other book keeping methods, but those uncertainties were still relatively large
TRMM BKM vs PVT

- BKM and PVT estimates from NASA’s TRMM spacecraft
- BK tends to estimate larger amounts of remaining propellant than predictions made by PVT
- Maneuver number shown is relative to start of blowdown operation of TRMM propulsion system

TRMM end of life propellant estimates using BKM and PVT. Maneuver no. relative to beginning of blowdown operation of propulsion system. From Miller, et al [3].
PVT Method: Details

• PVT relies on 5 key parameters:
  – Mass of propellant initially loaded
  – Volume & expansion (“stretch”) of propellant tank
  – Tank pressure & temperature

• More sophisticated models also estimate the leak rate of pressurant gas from system (typically assume worst-case leak rate for whole mission)

• Each used to determine propellant mass in following Equations:

\[ V_{prop} = V_T(P, T) - V_g(P, T) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B3)

\[ PV_g = (n_{init} - n_{leak})RT \]  \hspace{1cm} (B4)

\[ m_p = \rho_p(T)V_{prop} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B5)
PVT Method: Pressure Sensitivity

• Lal & Raghunandan performed statistical analysis using Monte Carlo methods to determine how sensitive PVT was to uncertainties in pressure readings

• Branched off of previous work by Chobotov & Purhohit, who developed a method to estimate propellant volume by re-pressurizing a propellant tank [11].
  – Derived following equation to estimate propellant volume:

\[
V_L = \left[ V_T + (P_u) f \left( \frac{dV_T}{dP_u} \right) \right] - \left[ V_p + (P_p) f \left( \frac{dV_p}{dP_p} \right) \right] \left( \frac{T_u}{T_p} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta P_p}{\Delta P_u} \right)
\]  (B6)

Where:

- \( V_L \): Estimated mean propellant volume present
- \( V_T \): Unstressed propellant tank volume
- \( V_p \): Unstressed pressurant tank volume
- \( T_u \): Propellant tank temperature
- \( T_p \): Pressurant tank temperature
- \( (P_u) \): Propellant tank pressure after re-pressurization
- \( (P_p) \): Pressurant tank pressure after re-pressurization
- \( \frac{dV_T}{dP_u} \): Pressurant tank stretch coefficients
- \( \frac{dV_p}{dP_p} \): Propellant tank stretch coefficients
- \( \Delta P_p \): Pressurant tank pressure decrease due to re-pressurization
- \( \Delta P_u \): Propellant tank pressure increase due to re-pressurization
Sensitivity studies performed by Lal & Raghunandan found:
- Estimated propellant volume, $V_L$, was highly sensitive to uncertainties in pressure readings.
- This contributed to high error in subsequent estimates of propellant volume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propellant tank pressure sensor</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurant tank pressure sensor</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propellant tank volume</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurant tank volume</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurant tank temperature sensor</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propellant tank temperature sensor</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressurant tank stretch</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propellant tank stretch</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity of propellant volume estimates to different parameters. Values from Lal, et al [12].

Propellant volume estimate as a function of pressure Transducer uncertainty. From Lal, et al [13].
PVT Method: Pressure Sensitivity

• Deviation of $V_L$ from propellant volume found direct measurement ($V_{L0}$) caused since:
  - $\Delta P_U$, $P_{ui}$ and $P_{uf}$ are normally distributed about their mean values
  - As uncertainty in pressure measurement increases, term B in $V_L$ equation increases faster than term A
  - This results in estimated propellant volume decreasing away from measured or “true” propellant volume

• High variations (error bars shown) caused because:
  - $\Delta P_U$ is typically small (~1 psia) and appears in denominator
  - Probability of $\Delta P_U$ being zero increases as uncertainty in tank pressure sensor measurement increases

\[ V_L = \left[ V_T + (P_u)f \left( \frac{dV_T}{dP_u} \right) \right] - \left[ V_p + (P_p)f \left( \frac{dV_p}{dP_p} \right) \right] \left( \frac{T_u}{T_p} \right) \left( \frac{\Delta P_p}{\Delta P_u} \right) \]
TCM Theory (cont.)

• Illustrative Example:
  – If specific heat of a material are constant, amount of time to change temperature of a given quantity of matter is a function of the mass of that matter:

• TCM takes advantage of this fact to estimate propellant load
  – Propellant tank is heated by turning on tank heaters
  – Temperature of the tank is recorded over time
  – Recorded T vs. t curves compared to T vs. t curves from thermal model for different propellant loads
Main Assumptions

• 1): Convection within Gas in tank is neglected
  – Natural convection does occur in tank (Rayleigh number > 10e8), but is not the dominant mode of heat transfer
  – Thermal resistance of gas is much greater than the thermal resistance due to conduction through tank wall
  – Mass of gas is small compared to the mass of the tank wall; therefore the heat capacitance of the gas is smaller than that of the tank wall
    • Causes temperature gradient to form on tank wall more readily than within gas

• Heat transfer is therefore dominated by conduction through tank wall and other parts, and not through convection within the gas
Main Assumptions (cont.)

• 2): Radiation to environment modeled; surface-to-surface radiation neglected
  – Radiation was modeled such that the tank radiated to the average environmental temperature of 31°C achieved at TVAC steady-state
  – Emissivity of tank blanket and surfaces were included in model
  – Surface-to-surface radiation is minimized by the thermal design of tank
    • Tank and nearby components covered with blanket with an effective emissivity on order of 1e-4
  – Parts of tank not blanketed had small surface areas compared to blanketed portions of tank
  – Phase I thermal model revealed:
    • Radiative transfer is small compared to conductive transfer within tank wall after 7000s
Main Assumptions (cont.)

• **3): Perfect bonded contact between interfaces**
  – Reflects actual construction of tank
    • Tank hardware, struts, tab interfaces, etc. all machined and smooth
    • Parts fastened together with multiple fasteners that are torqued
    • Thermal hardware is bonded to tank per NASA standards with adhesive that has minimal discontinuities
  – Rooted in how ANSYS models thermal contact
    • All contacts are defined as “bonded” or “perfect” by default (no conductive losses between connected parts)
    • Thermal conductance coefficients (TCC) can be defined at all contacts
    • Defining TCC’s at key interfaces was focus of model correlation process
    • Majority, however, left as “bonded/perfect”
  – Not possible to physically characterize all contacts within a real system
    • Limited time and money
Assumptions

1. Convection within the Nitrogen/Argon mix inside of the tank was neglected. In order for the ANSYS model to close, heat transfer through the gas was modeled as conduction as if the gas were a solid.
2. Radiation is modeled, but surrounding spacecraft enclosure was not.
3. A “perfect” bonded contact existed between all interfaces in the model.
4. The diaphragm within the tank is not physically modeled, but its mass is accounted for.
5. The tank blanket and tape were not physically modeled, but the mass and thermal properties of each were accounted for.
Assumption: Neglect Convection

- Rayleigh number was calculated first to determine if heat transfer within gas is primarily conduction or convection:
  - Idealized tank system as vertical flat wall. Reasonable since tank is longer than it is wide
  - $T_w = 43{\degree}C$ (set point of over-temp TSTATS)
  - $T_\infty = 31{\degree}C$ (steady-state temperature of tank prior to start of over-temp TSTAT test)
  - $\beta = \frac{1}{T_\infty}$ (for gases)
  - $\nu = \text{kinematic viscosity of gas at } T_\infty$
  - $\alpha = \text{Thermal diffusivity of gas}$
  - $L = \text{length of wall (height of tank in this case)}$

- $Ra = 1.13e8$. This greater than $10e8$, so natural convection is occurring in gas within tank
Assumption: Neglect Convection

- Analyzed thermal resistance of composite system: tank wall, heater adhesive, and pressurant gas

\[
q = \frac{T_1 - T_4}{\frac{x_{adh}}{k_{adh}A} + \frac{x_{T_1}}{k_{T_1}A} + \frac{1}{h_{gas}A}} \quad (B8)
\]
Assumption: Neglect Convection

- Equation B8 can be written as

\[ q = \frac{T_1 - T_4}{R_{adh} + R_{Ti} + R_{gas}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B9)

- To find the convective heat transfer coefficient, the following relations were used:

\[ h = \frac{Nuk}{L} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B10)

\[ Nu = 0.678Ra^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \frac{Pr}{0.952 + Pr} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B11) (Lienhard)

\[ Nu = 0.508Pr^{\frac{1}{2}}Gr^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \frac{1}{0.952 + Pr} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B12) (Rohsenhow)

\[ Pr = \frac{C_p\mu}{k} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B13)

\[ Gr_L = \frac{g\beta(T_w - T_\infty)L^3}{\nu^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B14)
Assumption: Neglect Convection

- Equations B9 – B14 yielded the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Calculated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grashof Number, $Gr$</td>
<td>1.7e8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prandtl Number, $Pr$</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusselt Number via Eq. B11</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusselt Number via Eq. B12</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convection Coefficient, $h_{gas}$ (Nu via Eq. B11)</td>
<td>9.8 W/m^2 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convection Coefficient, $h_{gas}$ (Nu via Eq. B12)</td>
<td>7.4 W/m^2 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{Gas}$</td>
<td>4.6 K/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{cond} = R_{Adh} + R_{Ti}$</td>
<td>0.03 K/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resulting $R_{gas}$ is 2 orders of magnitude greater than $R_{cond}$
  - Heat will tend to flow within the tank wall and heater adhesive more readily than in the gas
  - Flight thermistors (and 1-wire sensors used in the TVAC test) will see temperatures that are representative of wall, rather than gas
  - Convection within gas is not the primary driver affecting the temperature of tank
Assumption: Neglect Convection

- Mass of gas and titanium also play a key role in heat transfer
- Can define a ratio of volumetric heat capacity of two materials using Eq. 7

\[ \psi = \frac{m c_i}{m C_p |_{AR+N2}} \]  

(B15)

- \( \psi = 9 \). Since greater than 1, overall heat transfer for system will be dominated by titanium
### Description of Tank System (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper Right Strut</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Axial (Belly Button) Pin (inside of Receiver plate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gas Inlet Tube</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lower Right Strut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gas Side Tank Boss</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tank Tab (strut tabs on left/right of tank; belly button tab towards front)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Left Strut</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Boomerang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upper Hemisphere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gas Side Heater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lower Hemisphere</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Liquid Side Heater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lower Left Strut</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Liquid Outlet Tube</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagrams:**

1. [Diagram of Tank System](#)
2. [Diagram of Tank System](#)
Mass Smearing

- Method to account for differences in mass of real part to mass of part in CAD model
- Correct mass of parts by changing density of part in ANSYS
  - Volume of part is fixed via the CAD model
- Accounts for mass of parts that were distributed around tank or not know explicitly
  - Tape (distributed around tank)
  - Tank diaphragm, heaters, tank blanket (not known explicitly)
- Account for small parts removed during de-fetauring process
  - Nuts, bolts, lock-wire, washers, etc.
- Use mass ratios based upon detailed Flight CAD model of tank to properly distribute part masses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part: Lower Strut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Volume:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Initial Density:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Initial Mass:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Mass:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Density:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Model Mass:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mass Ratios used to distribute mass:

\[
MR_{Mod} = \frac{MCAD,\text{Lower} + X_{mod}}{MCAD,\text{Upper} + Y_{mod}} = 0.95 \tag{B16}
\]

\[
\Delta m = m_{\text{actual}} - m_{\text{model}} \tag{B17}
\]

\[
X_{mod} + Y_{mod} = \Delta m \tag{B18}
\]
Effective Thermal Conductivity of Grouped Parts

- Solid parts in CAD model grouped to ease correlation process & model losses through a thermal conductance coefficient (TCC)
- ANSYS not allow easy way to apply thermal conductance to a grouped part
  - TCC only applied to specific contact
  - Have to change TCC at every contact within grouped part, which becomes cumbersome in a large model
  - Specific information about TCC at every contact may or cannot be known
- Alleviate problem by defining groups of parts that share thermal properties based upon mass fraction of parts within the group
- Properties of grouped part are made into a new “material” which is assigned to the grouped part
- Thermal conductance of part changed by modifying thermal conductivity of grouped part since:
  - Cross sectional area of part is fixed and based upon the CAD model of the part
  - Length of part is fixed and based upon the CAD model of the part
Effective Thermal Conductivity of Grouped Parts

- Example: Tank Strut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Material</th>
<th>Mass Fraction</th>
<th>Thermal Conductivity (W/m K)</th>
<th>Specific Heat (J/kg K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-4 PH: Pin</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>460.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4 Ti: Tab Itfc</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>554.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4 Ti: Clevis</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>554.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2.5 Ti: Strut</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>554.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>534.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model De-featuring

- Refers to removing extraneous parts from model that do not play a large role in heat transfer
- If left in, would greatly increase size and complexity of mesh
- Examples of parts removed:
  - Small sensors, bolts, nuts washers
  - Fill bolt holes, correct CAD importation errors such as slivers and small faces
Model De-featuring (cont.)

Before

After
Thermal Error

- Thermal error provides a *relative* measure of difference in flux between elements.
- Difference calculated by subtracting thermal flux vector in each node from the nodal average thermal flux. (Eq. B19)
- Error per element is found by numerically integrating all of the nodal flux differences and then summing them (Eq. B20 – B21)

\[
\Delta q = q^a - q^i \quad (B19)
\]

\[
e_i \propto \int \Delta q \, dV_{elem} \quad (B20)
\]

\[
e = \sum_{i}^{N} e_i \quad (B21)
\]

- More nodes model has, the smaller \(e_i\) is.
- Relative measure since only compares fluxes from element to element, and not compare all elements simultaneously.
- ANSYS recommends the use of thermal error to determine which parts of the model need mesh refinement.
Thermal Error

A: Transient Thermal
Thermal Error
Type: Thermal Error
Time: 6900
2/11/2016 12:53 PM

0.0045673 Max
0.0040598
0.0035523
0.0030448
0.0025374
0.0020299
0.0015224
0.0010149
0.00050747
3.6372e-28 Min
Correlation Study Results

- **Final Configuration:**
  - Used to generate correlated model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TCC</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>k Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Right Strut at Pin</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Upper Hemisphere k Mult</td>
<td>1.5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Left Strut at Pin</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Lower Hemisphere k Mult</td>
<td>2.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Right Strut at Tab</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Upper Right Strut k Mult</td>
<td>2.5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Left Strut at Tab</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Upper Left Strut k Mult</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Right at Boomerang</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Lower Right Strut k Mult</td>
<td>2.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Left at Boomerang</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Lower Left Strut k Mult</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Inlet &amp; Outlet Tube</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Axial pin</td>
<td>1.0x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uncertainty Analysis Details

• Uncertainty in Heat Flux (function of resistance and circuit current)

Heat flux from heater circuit:

\[ q_g = \frac{(i_c R_c)^2}{R_g A} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B22)

\[ R_{circ} = \frac{R_L R_g}{R_L + R_g} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B23)

Combining Eq. B13 - B14:

\[ q_g = \frac{i_c^2 R_g R_L^2}{(R_L + R_g)^2 A} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B24)

Uncertainty in heater circuit heat flux:

\[ \frac{U_q}{q_g} = \frac{1}{U_{R_g}} + \frac{1}{U_{R_L}} + \frac{4}{U_{i_c}} + \frac{(R_L - R_g)^2}{U_{R_g} R_L} + \frac{2 R_g}{R_g + R_L} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B25)

Where:

\[ U_{R_g} = U_{R_L} = \frac{1}{N \left( \frac{1}{\Delta R_{\text{wst}}} \right)} \]

\[ N = 7 \]

\[ \Delta R_{\text{wst}} = 2.5 \Omega \]

\[ U_{i_c} = 2\% FS + \epsilon_{\text{bit}} = 0.041 \]
Key Lesson Learned

• Understand how software queries results from model
  – Temperature probe tool returns maximum of selected area, not average temperature

• Add complexity incrementally, rather than remove complexity
Key Lessons Learned

• Reduce complexity of solid model
  – Results in a less complicated correlation process
  – Faster solve times
  – More control can be achieved by adding complexity, rather than working backwards to reduce complexity

• Document changes to model and corresponding results in one place
  – Changes were all documented, but initially organization was not good
  – Compilation of changes was done later, which cost time