



Experiences from ESA Clean Space Training Course 2021

Greta Tartaglia





A little bit about me – Greta Tartaglia

- From Italy, born in 1998
- BSc in Aerospace Engineering at Politecnico di Milano
- Currently enrolled at KTH, MSc in Aerospace Engineering, space track
- Involved in the student project MIST











What is Clean Space?

- ESA initiative started in **2012** to analyse the environmental impacts of ESA activities both on Earth and in space
- Space industry has an important role in developing sustainable energy technologies and understand climate change
- Same moral must be used while approaching space missions
- Being "clean" in space is not optional anymore → number of debris increasing exponentially





Luisa Innocenti - Head of ESA Clean Space Office



Clean Space overview

ecodesign

→ REDUCING IMPACTS







Political and social context

- International context
 - Paris Agreement → increase in the global average temperature must be below 2°C above pre-industrial levels
- <u>European context</u>
 - European Green Deal
 - > No net emissions of greenhouse gasses by 2050
 - > Economic growth is decoupled from resource use
 - > No person and place is left behind
 - European Climate Law \rightarrow e.g. reducing greenhouse gasses emission by 55% by 2030
- <u>Space sector</u>
 - Non-binding requirements from the UN and non-specific legislations from Europe
 - National laws \rightarrow **French space law** mentions impact assessment (art. 8)



- Environmental impact → a change in the environment, negative or positive, resulting partly or totally from a human activity, product or service (ISO 14001)
- To decrease the environmental impact:
 - Change the behaviour of individuals and society
 - Reduce the consumption of goods
 - Produce differently
 - Prevent the environmental impact
- The Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is a tool used to measure the environmental performances of goods and services
 - Compiles and evaluates the inputs, outputs and the potential environmental impacts of a product or system throughout its life cycle (ISO 14 040/44)
 - Multi-step and multi-criteria process \rightarrow avoid **burden shifting**









- First step → definition of the objectives of the study and the system to be studied
- Functional Unit → reference value depending on the function of the product
 - Measurable → used to compare multiple scenarios
 - All flows depend on it
- System boundaries → all activities that contribute to complete the functional unit
 - Cradle-to-gate
 - Cradle-to-grave





- Compiling all elementary flows in and out of the system to fulfil the function unit → exchange of matter and energy
 - Resource extraction
 - Emissions to air, water, soil
- For complex systems, items with a negligible percentage with respect to the final product can be disregarded
- Databases are needed
 - Ecoinvent
 - ILCD, European commission
 - ESA LCA Database





- Elementary flows are linked to environmental mechanisms → visualized through impact indicators
 - Climate change
 - Ozone depletion
 - Acidification
 - Eco-toxicity
 - Human toxicity
 - Abiotic depletion
- Impact indicators are then linked to the various life cycle phases to better understand how to improve the system









 Hotspot analysis → identification of principal stages that contributes to the impact

Limitations

- Difficult to better all environmental impacts with one solution
- Uncertainties in the model
- Choice influenced by politics, product priorities



LCA applied to the space sector



- LCA for the space industry is difficult:
 - More complex system
 - Specific materials and components
 - Costly and massive manufacturing at low rate
 - Emission in different layers of the atmosphere

Source: ESA Clean Space Office



EcoDesign

- Aims to improve the environmental performance of products and services assessing their environmental impact at the design stage, without reducing their quality or performance
- EcoDesign must be applied if:
 - The targeted system has significant environmental impacts in the whole life cycle of the mission
 - The modifications applied to the system determines **good environmental gains**
- In the future, ESA aims to implement LCA and EcoDesign different projects:
 - Ariane 6
 - Copernicus Program
 - Earth Explorer
 - Galileo



EcoDesign





Space Debris Mitigation requirements

End-Of-Life measures

- Satellites in LEO must exit the protected region (< 2000 km) within 25 years from the end of the mission
- For controlled and uncontrolled atmospheric re-entry, casualty risk on ground must not exceed 10⁻⁴
- Satellites in GEO must be removed from the zone after the end of the mission
 → graveyard orbits
- The probability of successful post mission disposal (PMD) must be at least 0.9
- At the end of life, the satellite must permanently deplete or make safe all stored energy → passivation



Re-entry strategies

Protected zones

- LEO → under 2000 km → re-entry strategy
- GEO → graveyard orbit ~300 km higher





Re-entry strategies

Casualty risk:

- Defined as the probability of serious injury or death
- An object is considered deadly if it has an energy of **15 J**
- Casualty area is the total area impacted by a debris
- Mean population density → depends on year and orbit of the debris



- → Casualty risk = casualty area (for > 15 J debris) x mean population density
- The requirement of casualty risk $< 10^{-4}$ is very constraining



Uncontrolled re-entry

- Casualty risk must be < 10⁻⁴
- <u>Natural decay</u>
 - Satellite is slowed down by atmospheric particles
 - Decay velocity depends on altitude \rightarrow ~ 25 years for 600 km altitude
 - Easiest way → low impact on satellite and mission
 - No control over fallout zone, no collision avoidance manoeuvers
- Deorbiting system
 - **Drag sails** \rightarrow increase in area, increase in drag
 - Deorbiting tether → uses magnetic field to generate currents and create drag
 - Low impact on satellite and low cost
 - Little control, no collision avoidance manoeuvers
 - Needs detumbling after deployment



Source: ADEO, ESA



Source Emxys



Controlled re-entry

- If casualty risk > 10⁻⁴
- Target specific areas → South Pacific Ocean Uninhabited Area (SPOUA)
- Requires fuel to lower the altitude and high thrust engines for steep re-entry angles → combination of efficient electric engines with high thrust for the last burn



- Ensures a fast re-entry with respect to the uncontrolled passive decay
- Difficult to assess the **reliability** of the system at the end of life
- Higher costs and more complex system



Design for Demise

- Design for Demise (D4D) is to intentionally design a space hardware such that it will **disintegrate during re-entry**
- Necessary for mid and large systems → casualty risk requirements cannot be achieved → with D4D the 10⁻⁴ threshold can be reached
- Multi-level approach
 - System level \rightarrow configuration to allow higher exposure of equipment to heat flux
 - Equipment re-design \rightarrow aims to reduce the heat load necessary to demise the item
- <u>Critical elements</u>
 - Propellant tanks
 - Reaction wheels, magnetic-torquers
 - Large mechanisms
 - Optical equipment, lenses, mirrors
 - Batteries



Design for Demise

- Benefits and limitations
 - Simpler system, less cost and mass and more robust that planning a controlled reentry
 - Sustainable
 - Compromise between D4D and performance, with today's technologies
 - Requires re-entry simulations, on-ground tests and in-flight experiments → uncertainties due to lack of knowledge
- Design for Demise techniques
 - Minimise required heat \rightarrow lowering the mass, replacing the materials
 - Maximise available heat \rightarrow higher ballistic coefficient, exothermic reactions
 - Optimize heat transfer → early break-up fragmentation through dedicated mechanisms or demisable attachment points
 - Minimise casualty area \rightarrow keeping the fragments together
- A combination of techniques is usually required for full demisability



Passivation for power

- Passivation means **permanently depleting, deactivating or making safe** all on-board sources of stored energy capable of causing accidental break-up
- Power passivation is needed → at least 10 spacecrafts broke up due to battery and explosive failure modes cannot be excluded
- Battery break-up causes
 - Over-temperature
 - Over-charge/over-discharge
 - Short circuit
 - Structural issues or damage
- Thermal runaway → once reached the onset temperature, very fast increase in temperature and pressure → protection systems do not react in time
- To passivate, the battery must be discharged and isolated from the power source (solar array), then kept within an acceptable temperature range

Passivation for propulsion

- Propulsion system is the main cause of spacecraft break-ups
- <u>Risks</u>
 - **Propellant dissociation** \rightarrow exothermic reaction that can lead to tank burst
 - Hypervelocity impacts → change in pressure can cause ignition
- Passivation through thrusters (requires power) and valves
- Equipment
 - Shape-memory alloy valves → can be deformed by force and get back to original form when heated
 - Microperforators
 - Pyrotechnic valves
- New equipment and methods are still under development \rightarrow complex system



In-orbit servicing

- In-orbit servicing is an important tool for a clean space:
 - To solve issues with existing space objects \rightarrow repair, debris removal
 - To increase the utility of existing space objects \rightarrow refuelling, life extension
 - − To develop new systems on-orbit → manufacture and assembly
 - To assist human exploration
- A paradigm shift is needed





Non-flexible and **dedicated design** of spacecraft

Flexible systems with adaptable equipment



In-orbit servicing

ADRIOS: Active Debris Removal/In-Orbit Servicing

- Mission planned for 2025, part of ClearSpace-1
- Objectives
 - Remove ESA debris with a mass greater than 100 kg by 2025



Source: ClearSpace

- Demonstrate feasibility of critical technologies for in-orbit servicing opportunities
- Provide business model for in-orbit servicing beyond ESA
- Comply with space debris mitigation requirements
- ADRIOS project will include advanced guidance, navigation and control systems, vision-based AI and robotic arms → chaser can safely approach and capture target



- Active Debris Removal (ADR) is a type of mission aimed at targeting a debris and removing it from the protected areas with the use of a chaser satellite
- Active debris removal has never been done yet
 - Legal issues → each nation is responsible of its own debris, the damages caused at reentry and any in-orbit collision
 - − Requires new technologies → many tests needed
 - High costs \rightarrow no company dares to invest
 - No law obligates active debris removal
- Benefits
 - Clean
 - **Prevents liability issues** due to collisions or re-entry
 - **Prevents impacts** on services
 - Ensures access to space \rightarrow there's the need to go against the **Kessler syndrome**



- <u>Steps to perform ADR</u>
 - Monitor from ground → determine attitude, spin rate and rotation axis of the debris
 - Far range rendezvous → line of sight and distance to target (8 km to 1 km)
 - Close range rendezvous → line of sight, distance to target and target attitude (1 km to 2 m)
 - Capture → track a capture point, approach safely the target and obtain a physical link
 - Disposal → support transfer of loads and the control of the thrust vector



Source: ESA



- Removing small debris with propulsion → lower their orbit to re-enter in 25 years
 - "Shuttle approach" → the chaser catches the debris, brings it to a different orbit and releases it
 - "Mothership approach" → the chaser catches the debris, attaches a de-orbit kit and activates it → kit must include
 - > Solid rocket propulsion system
 - > Attitude and Orbit Control Systems
 - > Power
 - > Sensors
 - Some non successful tests have been carried out





- Removing large debris with propulsion → controlled re-entry
 - The chaser must re-enter with the debris
 - Requires high reliability
 - Requires high thrust → lots of propellant
- Technical problems when studying ADR
 - Numerically simulate touch dynamics in space is extremely difficult
 - Simulating 0 g on Earth for enough time is impossible
 - Debris in space doesn't stand still \rightarrow simulations with hanging systems are not reliable



Capturing

- Capturing a debris is very different from docking or berthing in space
- The debris is not necessarily cooperative and has dedicated capture points
- Capture equipment can be both rigid or flexible
- <u>Robot arm</u>
 - Complex machine but versatile (can be used for in-orbit servicing)
 - Can be tested on ground
 - Allows for re-tries
 - Requires a gripper → can be changed for different targets



SS011E11416

Source: NASA



Capturing

- <u>Clamping mechanism</u>
 - Less complex, similarities to docking system
 - Ensures closing on the target before touch \rightarrow target cannot escape
 - Allows for re-tries
 - Centre of gravity of the debris must be aligned with the thrust force
- <u>Net</u>
 - Independent from the shape of the debris
 - Chaser can stay at distance
 - Complex GNC system to keep tether in tension
 - Cannot be tested on ground
 - Does not allow for re-tries
 - If debris is rotating, must stabilize it with thrust







Capturing

- Harpoon
 - Mix of robot arm and net
 - Chaser can stay at greater distance with respect to the robot arm but closer than the net system
 - Same tether problems as the net
 - Does not allow for re-tries
 - Impact with the debris could cause breakings or explosion
 - Successful capture test with harpoon in 2019 (RemoveDebris project)





Design for Removal

- Future targets and the chasers must be designed so to ease ADR → Design for Removal (D4R) technologies
- Chaser satellite must be designed together with the target satellite for what concerns the capture interface, even if its actual use is at the end of life of the target satellite
- D4D technologies
 - Markers to Support Navigation (MSN)
 - Mechanical Interface for Capture (MICE)
 - Passive Magnetic De-tumbling (PMD)
 - Retroreflector-based Attitude
 Determination System (RADS)





Clean Space techniques summary



Source: ESA Clean Space Office



Conclusions – what I learnt

- Making the space industry clean is **not an easy process** and **there is not one solution** to solve every aspect of it
- Compromises are needed to meet the Space Debris Mitigation requirements without affecting the performance of the missions
- There is still so much **unknown** in this area that we must continue studying to improve the space industry
- Space is awesome, but **we must act to protect it** as much as we need to do with Earth!



If you want to know more

- ESA Academy organises different courses every year aimed at Bachelor, Master and PhD level students → KTH is always promoting them so check out the announcements!
- Related links:
 - <u>https://www.esa.int/Enabling_Support/Space_Engineering_Technology/Clean_Space</u>
 - <u>https://www.esa.int/Education/ESA_Academy</u>
 - <u>https://www.esa.int/Education/ESA_Academy/Online_Clean_Space_Training</u>
 <u>Course_2021_challenges_university_students_to_clean_a_Mega_Constell</u>
 <u>ation</u>
- Contact me: gretat@kth.se



Thank you for the attention! Questions?

All credits for the content of this presentation to ESA Clean Space Office