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

• Parts are categorized for flight acceptability and possible radiation lot acceptance testing by Radiation Design Margin (RDM).
  
  - $R_{\text{D}} = \frac{R_{\text{mf}}}{R_{\text{spec}}}$
  
  - $R_{\text{mf}}$ is mean failure level of part
  
  - $R_{\text{spec}}$ 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
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
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• 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

Low Inclination LEO

GEO
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
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.