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Radiation Hardness Assurance Overview

• Starting with mission requirements, methodology consists of 2 branches of analyses that lead to parts categorization
  ▪ Parts analysis
  ▪ Environment analysis
Radiation Hardness Assurance Overview

- Parts are categorized for flight acceptability and possible radiation lot acceptance testing by Radiation Design Margin (RDM).
  - \[ \text{RDM} = \frac{R_{mf}}{R_{spec}} \]
  - \( R_{mf} \) is mean failure level of part
  - \( R_{spec} \) is total dose level of space environment
- Difficulties can arise because
  - Part failure levels can vary substantially from the mean, especially COTS
  - Environment is dynamic and must be predicted years in advance
- RDM based approach results from use of deterministic AP8/AE8 trapped particle models
- RDM used as a “catch-all” to cover all uncertainties in environment and device variations
- Propose modified approach
  - Use device failure probability during a mission instead of RDM
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Devices Tested

- **Solid State Devices, Inc. SFT2907A bipolar transistors**
  - Used for high speed, low power applications
  - 10 devices TID tested for MMS project at NASA/GSFC gamma ray facility to 100 krad(Si)

- **Amptek, Inc. HV801 optocouplers**
  - GaAlAs parts manufactured in liquid phase epitaxially grown process
  - 6 devices DDD tested for JUNO project at UC Davis Cyclotron with 50 MeV protons

Credit: http://mms.gsfc.nasa.gov
Device Failure Distribution
SFT2907A Bipolar Transistors

10 V collector-emitter bias
1 mA collector current
Total Dose Probability Distribution Calculations

- TID and DDD probability distributions were calculated for each orbit and mission duration for confidence levels ranging from 1 to 99%
  - AP9/AE9 Monte Carlo code used to simulate 99 histories for each case
  - ESP solar proton calculations done for 1 to 99% confidence levels
  - All energy spectra were transported through shielding levels from 10 to 1000 mils Al using NOVICE code and converted to doses
  - TID and DDD for each radiation were separately ranked for confidence levels ranging from 1 to 99% and summed for same confidence and shielding levels
TID Probability Distributions for 1 Year
10 – 1000 mils Aluminum
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Failure Probabilities
SFT2907A Bipolar Transistor

\[ P_{\text{fail}} = \int [1 - H(x)] \cdot g(x) \, dx \]

\( H(x) = \text{CDF for environment dose} \)
\( g(x) = \text{PDF for device failure} \)

Failure probability \( (P_{\text{fail}}) \) is the probability of a total dose failure during a mission.
Confidence Level vs. RDM for 10 years in GEO
200 mils Al shield
Conclusions

• An approach to total dose radiation hardness assurance was developed that includes variability of the space radiation environment.

• Examples showed radiation environment variability is at least as significant as variability of total dose failures in devices measured in the laboratory.
  ▪ New approach is more complete
  ▪ Uses consistent evaluation of each radiation in the space environment through use of confidence levels

• Advantages of using $P_{\text{fail}}$ instead of RDM are:
  ▪ $P_{\text{fail}}$ is an objectively determined parameter because complete probability distributions are used to calculate it; gives designers more trade space
  ▪ Better characterization of device radiation performance
  ▪ Allows direct comparison of the total dose threats for different devices and missions, regardless of whether degradation is due to TID or DDD
  ▪ More amenable to circuit, system and spacecraft reliability analysis
Acronyms

- **AE9** – Aerospace electron model-9
- **AP9** – Aerospace proton model-9
- **CDF** – cumulative distribution function
- **COTS** - commercial off the shelf
- **DDD** – displacement damage dose
- **ESP** – Emission of Solar Protons (model)
- **FP** – failure probability
- **GEO** – geostationary Earth orbit
- **HST** – Hubble Space Telescope
- **JUNO** – JUpiter Near-polar Orbiter
- **LEO** – low Earth orbit
- **MMS** – Magnetospheric MultiScale
- **NOVICE** – Numerical Optimizations, Visualizations and Integrations on Computer Aided Design (CAD)/Constructive Solid Geometry (CSG) Edifices
- **PDF** – probability density function
- **RDM** – radiation design margin
- **TID** – total ionizing dose
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Device Failure Distribution
HV801 Optocoupler
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DDD Probability Distributions for 1 Year 10 – 1000 mils Aluminum
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Failure Probabilities
HV801 Optocoupler

\[ P_{\text{fail}} = \int [1 - H(x)] \cdot g(x) \, dx \]

\( H(x) = \text{CDF for environment dose} \)
\( g(x) = \text{PDF for device failure} \)

Failure probability \( (P_{\text{fail}}) \) is the probability of a total dose failure during a mission.