

# Standard

## Standard/Handbook for Multipactor Breakdown Prevention in Spacecraft Components

AIAA standards are copyrighted by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), 12700 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, VA 20191-5 USA. All rights reserved.

AIAA grants you a license as follows: The right to download an electronic file of this AIAA standard for storage on your computer for purposes of viewing, and/or printing one copy of the AIAA standard for individual use. Neither the electronic file nor the hard copy print may be reproduced in any way. In addition, the electronic file may not be distributed elsewhere over computer networks or otherwise. The hard copy print may only be distributed to your employees for their internal use within your organization.



# Standard/Handbook for Multipactor Breakdown Prevention in Spacecraft Components

## Sponsored by

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics

## Approved 20 September 2016

American National Standards Institute

## Approved 21 October 2016

## Abstract

This document is intended to provide a standardized process for mitigation of multipactor breakdown within spacecraft components. It is directed toward component designers, satellite system engineers, as well as the customer community to provide worst-case conditions, margin requirements, and verification of these requirements using state-of-the-art methodologies. In addition, recommended methods are provided with examples, to ensure proper requirement verification for all satellite RF components susceptible to RF breakdown.

Published by  
**American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics**  
**12700 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, VA 20191**

Copyright © 2016 American Institute of Aeronautics and  
Astronautics  
All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system  
or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

**Contents**

<b>FOREWORD</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>1 SCOPE</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose	1
1.2 Document Applicability and Features	1
1.3 Document Tailoring	2
1.4 General Document Structure and Process Overview	2
<b>2 MINIMUM MULTIPACTOR CRITERIA AND DEVICE CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 Minimum Multipactor Criteria</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1.1 Multipactor Susceptible Frequency Selection	5
2.1.2 Multipactor Gap	6
2.1.3 Multipactor Frequency-Gap (fd) Product	6
2.1.4 Minimum Frequency*Gap (fd <sub>min</sub> ) Product Criteria	6
<b>2.2 Device Type</b>	<b>7</b>
2.2.1 Type 1 Component	7
2.2.2 Type 2 Component	7
2.2.3 Type 3 Component	7
<b>2.3 Device Analysis Level</b>	<b>8</b>
2.3.1 Analysis Level 1	9
2.3.2 Analysis Level 2	9
2.3.3 Analysis Level 3	9
2.3.4 Analysis Level Considerations	10
2.3.5 Special Cases and Examples	10
<b>2.4 Process Flow Chart for Multipactor Qualification/Acceptance and Verification</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3 SYSTEM ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.1 Definition of Failure Modes</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.2 Worst-Case Amplifier Power</b>	<b>12</b>
3.2.1 Single Amplifier (Single Carrier, Modulated or Multicarrier)	12
3.2.2 Non-resonant Combining of Amplifiers (Example: Multiport Amplifier)	13
3.2.3 Resonant Combining of Amplifiers (Example: Output Multiplexers)	13
<b>3.3 Component Loss</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.4 VSWR/Reflected Power Enhancement</b>	<b>13</b>

<b>3.5</b>	<b>Effective Component Power for Analysis and Test</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Other Requirements and Considerations</b>	<b>14</b>
3.6.1	Test VSWR Environment	14
3.6.2	Other Ground Test Considerations	14
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Venting Requirements</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>MULTIFACTOR MARGIN REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Margin Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Factors Influencing Margin Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Margin Verification Methods</b>	<b>16</b>
4.3.1	Component Qualification	16
4.3.1.1	Lot Acceptance by Qualification	16
4.3.1.2	Qualification by Similarity	16
4.3.2	Component Proto-qualification Testing	17
4.3.3	Flight Component Acceptance Testing	17
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Risk Management Process</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>VERIFICATION BY ANALYSIS</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Geometric Evaluation</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Frequency Selection</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Implementing System Parameters into Analysis</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Local Electric Field/Voltage Analysis</b>	<b>18</b>
5.4.1	Analysis Level 1	18
5.4.2	Analysis Level 2	19
5.4.3	Analysis Level 3	19
5.4.4	Analysis Level Considerations	19
<b>5.5</b>	<b>Analytical Margin Determination</b>	<b>19</b>
5.5.1	Analysis Level 1 and 2 Components	19
5.5.2	Analysis Level 3 Components	20
<b>5.6</b>	<b>Material/SEY Evaluation</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>Components Not Eligible for Qualification by Analysis</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5.8</b>	<b>Analysis Process</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>VERIFICATION BY TEST</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Documentation</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Breakdown Detection Methods</b>	<b>25</b>

<b>6.3 Test Setup Verification</b>	<b>26</b>
6.3.1 Setup Verification	26
6.3.2 Known Breakdown Device	26
<b>6.4 Duty Cycle</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6.5 Pulse Length</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6.6 Electron Seeding</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6.7 Vacuum</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6.8 Thermal</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6.9 Data Acquisition</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6.10 Pass/Fail Criteria</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>7 ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7.1 Analysis Level 1 and 2</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>7.2 Steps for Verification Analysis using Worst-case Power (Section 3)</b>	<b>29</b>
7.2.1 Steps for Determining Expected Breakdown Power	30
7.2.2 Gap Selection for Field Integration	30
7.2.3 Limitations and Considerations	30
<b>7.3 Analysis Level 3</b>	<b>31</b>
7.3.1 Recommended Steps for Analysis	31
7.3.2 Particle Simulation Guidelines	31
7.3.2.1 Considerations for Initial Electron Seeding	31
7.3.2.2 Determining Power Levels for Analysis	31
7.3.2.3 SEY inputs	32
7.3.2.4 Multipactor Breakdown Criteria and Accuracy	32
<b>7.4 Analysis for Risk Assessment</b>	<b>32</b>
7.4.1 Hybrid RF Circuit Model Approach	32
7.4.2 RF Hybrid Model Limitations	33
<b>8 TEST METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>8.1 Test Equipment Considerations</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>8.2 Test Setup Validation</b>	<b>37</b>
8.2.1 Multipactor-Free Verification	37
8.2.2 Ability To Detect Multipactor	37
<b>8.3 Multipactor Diagnostic Methods</b>	<b>37</b>
8.3.1 Local Diagnostics	38
8.3.1.1 Current Probe	38
8.3.1.2 Photon Detector	38
8.3.2 Global Diagnostics	39
8.3.2.1 Phase Null	39
8.3.2.2 Near Carrier Noise	40

8.3.2.3	Third Harmonic	41
8.3.2.4	Transmitted/Reflected Power	41
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Multipactor Breakdown Observations</b>	<b>41</b>
8.4.1	Chamber Pressure Increase	41
8.4.2	DUT Temperature Increase	42
8.4.3	Visual Indication	42
8.4.4	RF Performance Changes	42
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Relative Diagnostic Sensitivity</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>8.6</b>	<b>RF Shut-down Protection System</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>8.7</b>	<b>Electron Seeding</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>8.8</b>	<b>RF Test Operation</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>8.9</b>	<b>Data Acquisition and Reporting</b>	<b>43</b>
8.9.1	Data Recording	43
8.9.2	Sampling Rates	44
8.9.3	Minimum Data Items Required	44
8.9.4	Test Report Guidelines	44
<b>9</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>ANNEX A</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>A-1</b>
A.1	Background	A-1
<b>ANNEX B</b>	<b>COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT MULTIPACTOR RISK MITIGATION PROCESSES</b>	<b>B-1</b>
<b>ANNEX C</b>	<b>REFERENCE GEOMETRIES FOR ANALYSIS AND TEST SETUP VALIDATION</b>	<b>C-1</b>

**Figures**

Figure 1.1 — Simplified schematic of an RF system.....2

Figure 1.2 — Applicability and document implementation for a typical RF system. ....4

Figure 2.1 — Illustration depicting the “no multipactor region” below  $f_{dmin}$ . Actual values of  $f_{dmin}$  will depend on the first cross over energy of the SEY,  $E_1$ . ....7

Figure 2.2 — Flow chart for margin determination and verification process..... 11

Figure 3.1 — Example of a single carrier RF system for which component N must be evaluated for multipactor breakdown. ....14

Figure 5.1 — Baseline multipactor threshold curves for analysis. RF voltage shown is peak RF voltage..... 20

Figure 5.2 — Worst-case secondary electron yield.....22

Figure 5.3 — Minimum analysis verification process. ....24

Figure 8.1 — Example of a multipactor test block diagram. ....35

Figure 8.2 — Ring resonator test block diagram.....36

Figure 8.3 — Example block diagram for a phase null diagnostic.....40

Figure A.1 — Cartoon representation of simple, parallel plate multipactor breakdown..... A-1

Figure A.2 — A general secondary electron yield (SEY) curve showing the theoretical multipactor region for electron density growth. .... A-2

Figure B.1 — Comparison between AIAA and ECSS multipactor threshold..... B-3

Figure C.1 — Annotated cross section of coaxial device. .... C-1

Figure C.2 — Dimensional drawing of outer conductor piece. .... C-2

Figure C.3 — Dimensional drawing of inner conductor piece. .... C-2

Figure C.4 — Device geometry..... C-3

Figure C.5 — Calculated gap voltages from electromagnetic analysis. .... C-3

Figure C.6 — Breakdown power versus frequency for Regions 2 and 3. .... C-4

Figure C.7 — Test schematic for multipactor testing on the coaxial KBD. .... C-5

Figure C.8 — S-parameters for coaxial KBD. .... C-6

Figure C.9 — Breakdown power test data in coaxial KBD. .... C-7

**Tables**

Table 2.1 — Device types for Multipactor Test and Analysis ..... 7

Table 2.2 — Summary of Device Analysis Levels used for Analysis Verification ..... 8

Table 4.1 — Multipactor Margin Requirements for Analysis and Test..... 15

Table 5.1 — General List of Analysis Verification Requirements ..... 18

Table 5.2 — Threshold Voltage Equations by Frequency-Gap Product.....20

Table 6.1 — Summary of Minimum Test Requirements for Margin Verification .....25

Table 7.1 — Summary of Analysis Verification by Analysis Level.....29

Table 8.1 — Local Diagnostic Methods.....38

Table 8.2 — Global Diagnostic Methods.....39

Table B.1 — Comparison of Margin Requirements for Analysis Between AIAA and ECSS..... B-2

Table B.2 — Comparison Of Margin Requirements for Test Between AIAA and ECSS ..... B-2

Table C.2 — Breakdown Power Test Data in Coaxial KBD. .... C-7

Currently in preview, click buy full version

## Foreword

This document was created by multiple authors throughout the government and the aerospace industry. At the time of approval, the members of the AIAA Materials CoS were:

Kevin Campbell, Exelis Incorporated  
Will Caven, Space Systems/Loral  
James Farrell, The Boeing Company  
Robert Frankievich, Lockheed Martin Corporation  
Timothy Graves, The Aerospace Corporation  
Aimee Hubble, The Aerospace Corporation  
Thomas Musselman, The Boeing Company  
Preston Partridge, The Aerospace Corporation  
Mike Settember, Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
Jian Xu, Aeroflex Incorporated

For their content contributions, we thank the contributing authors for making this collaborative effort possible.

A special thank you for co-leading this team and efforts to ensure completeness and quality of this document goes to Dr. Jeffrey Tate, Raytheon Space and Airborne Systems.

The Topic Team would like to acknowledge the contributions and feedback from the subject matter experts who reviewed the document:

Stefan Vincent, Orbital  
Douglas Dawson, JPL  
Luigi Greco, Exelis  
Dennis Mlynarski, Lockheed Martin Corporation  
Larry Arnett, SSL  
Ghislain Turgeon, SSL  
Steve Holme, SSL  
Rick Bennett, Flight Microwave Corporation  
Joseph Roubal, Aeroflex  
Jerry Michaelson, The Aerospace Corporation  
Lee Olson, The Aerospace Corporation  
John Walchak, Harris Corporation

The Materials CoS approved this document in August 2016.

The AIAA Standards Executive Council (Allen Arrington, Chairman) accepted the document for publication in September 2016.

The AIAA Standards Procedures dictates that all approved Standards, Recommended Practices, and Guides are advisory only. Their use by anyone engaged in industry or trade is entirely voluntary. There is no requirement to adhere to any AIAA standards publication and no commitment to conform to or be guided by standards reports. In formulating, revising, and approving standards publications, the committees on standards will not consider patents that may apply to the subject matter. Prospective users of the publications are responsible for protecting themselves against liability for infringement of patents or copyright or both.

## Introduction

This document is intended to provide a standardized process for mitigation of multipactor breakdown within spacecraft components. It is directed toward component designers, satellite system engineers, as well as the customer community to provide worst-case conditions, margin requirements, and verification of those requirements using state-of-the-art methodologies. In addition, recommended methods are provided, with examples, to ensure proper requirement verification for all satellite RF components susceptible to RF breakdown.

The importance of applying the processes and risk mitigation strategies of this document continue to grow with the increase in component power levels. Multipactor and ionization breakdown can lead to device damage and/or significant mission impact; as such, this document provides methodologies to minimize potential risks in applicable RF systems and components. Many of the recent RF breakdown-related issues can be traced back to a lack of standard processes for analysis and test. The processes described in this document are focused on predicting bounding, worst-case conditions for known system parameters and applying these conditions to a broad range of components and RF systems. This new and alternative approach removes excessive, hidden, or stacked margins by using bounding case calculations and measurable/available data for the particular system and component under investigation. Worst-case conditions are combined with standard analysis and test processes to minimize device susceptibility to multipactor.

The document is organized to follow this process in a typical component development flow, starting with high-level component definitions and determination of worst-case system parameters. Subsequent sections continue the process by providing margin requirements and then minimum requirement verifications. These minimum verification requirements utilize state-of-the-art tools for both analysis and test, and they are necessary to avoid many of the failures observed in recent history. Lastly, recommended analysis and test guidelines are provided to illustrate industry best practices and considerations for different component types. A reference geometry for analysis and test validation is also provided as a standard to the industry for comparison purposes.

This document provides new benefits to customer, contractor, and supplier groups by providing clear margin definitions and requirements, while removing excessive margin through the application of this bounding case process. Proper implementation of the latest analysis techniques can, in some cases, eliminate the need for expensive qualification/acceptance testing with more accurate and representative numerical analysis. Adherence to test requirements will provide risk reduction and early issue identification and prevent expensive failures late into the integration cycle. By following the requirements and process outlined in this document, multipactor risk within spacecraft components should be minimized throughout the component life cycle.

In summary, multipactor risk mitigation is made possible via this document through proper and careful analysis processes, test methods, and application of the process detailed in this document.

# 1 Scope

## 1.1 Purpose

This document is intended to serve as a standard and handbook for the prevention of multipactor breakdown in spacecraft components and systems. The document provides minimum requirements for risk definition, system analysis, and component analysis and test. Supporting documentation describes proper design, analysis, and test guidelines while also providing the requirements for defining the proper system engineering to identify RF breakdown risks within susceptible components. The document framework is based on defining worst-case parameters as general inputs to analysis or test criteria for all components within the RF system. Using hardware-specific values, these worst-case parameters are defined separately from margin requirements.

With properly defined worst-case conditions, the document addresses required margins for analysis and test for multiple device categories. Subsequent sections provide minimum verification requirements to demonstrate the margin recommendations for both analysis and test. Applicability of different analysis and test methods to the device class categories is provided, with special cases and considerations.

Multiple appendices based on state-of-the-art industry best practices are also provided as guidelines to aid manufacturers and contractors. Typical approaches including examples for both design and test are provided. A reference geometry is described along with corresponding analysis and test data. This information can be used as a benchmark standard, such that component vendors and manufacturers can have a standard example for RF breakdown.

Incorporating this document and its improved process into the development and test cycles of an RF component will reduce the risks associated with multipactor breakdown failure. The document goal is to concurrently reduce program risk as well as elevated cost of excessive margin requirements. This document shall serve as a baseline and minimum set of criteria for low-risk development and verification of RF spacecraft components.

## 1.2 Document Applicability and Features

This document is intended for RF and microwave satellite systems and component manufacturers. AIAA ABC provides an overall process approach for multipactor breakdown mitigation using new tools, data, and current industry best practices. Some of the highlighted features of AIAA ABC are:

- A device classification structure is given, allowing more specific margin requirements to be levied on the different groupings. The classifications are separated such that verification plans can be tailored to the analysis level of the device and certainty of the electric fields and multipactor regions.

- A system analysis process to determine the bounding input power for each device under consideration is provided. Parameters such as voltage enhancement due to voltage standing wave ratio (VSWR) can be accurately predicted, or evaluated, from the actual system hardware.

- Margin requirements for component analysis and test are given. Using a complete system and component process, over-conservatism is minimized using improved system knowledge, application of new simulation tools, and refined test methods.

- New and expanded minimum verification requirements for analysis and test are provided. Recommended methodologies using the latest technologies and tools are given for reference. Analysis verification requirements utilize classification by device analysis level to allow tailored application of different analysis methods and techniques