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International Space Station

Created by a partnership of 5 space agencies

10 years and over 100 missions to assemble

A laboratory for **Microgravity** and **Astrophysics** research at a scale that has not been achieved before and that no one agency or country could sustain

Creating knowledge that improves life here on earth and provides a stepping stone for humans to push further into space
A collaboration of 5 space agencies
Global Ground-Based Infrastructure

MSS Control
Saint-Hubert, Canada

ISS Mission Control
Moscow, Russia

Columbus Control Center
Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany

JEM/HTV Control Center
Tsukuba, Japan

ISS Mission Control
Houston, Texas

H-IIB Launch Control
Tanegashima, Japan

Payload Operations Center
Huntsville, Alabama

ATV Control Center
Toulouse, France

Space Shuttle Launch Control
Kennedy Space Center, Florida

Russian Launch Control
Baikonur, Kazakhstan

Ariane Launch Control
Kourou, French Guiana
Biology and Biotechnology, Earth, *Space Science*, Educational Activities, Human Research, Physical & Material Sciences and Technology Demonstration
International Space Station Key Features

- Sustainable microgravity and space research platform for long term studies
- Permanent Crew presence
- Access to vacuum of space
- **External (space) and internal research**
- Automated, human, and robotic operated research
- Exposure to the thermosphere
- Earth observations at high altitude and velocity
- Habitable environmentally controlled environment
- Nearly continuous data and communication link to anywhere in the world
- Payload to orbit and return capability (**for some external payloads**)
- Modularity and maintainability built into the design ensures mission life, allows life extension, vehicle evolution and technology upgrades
ISS Payload Philosophy

Our goal is to fly and operate a payload as soon as it is ready.

To operate the ISS like a laboratory to enable the flexibility for investigators to adapt their research plan based on new and unexpected findings.

To continue to make the integration and operation of payloads on ISS as simple and ground lab like as possible.
Current and Future **External** Payloads

- **MUSES** (on-orbit)
- **SAGE III** (on-orbit)
- **OCO-3** (on-orbit – May 3rd)
- **CATS** (on-orbit)
- **CREAM** (on-orbit)
- **GEDI** (on-orbit)
- **ECOSTRESS** (on-orbit)
- **MAXI** (on-orbit)
- **CALET** (on-orbit)
- **HREP** (on-orbit)
- **SEDA AP** (on-orbit)
- **iSEEP1** (on-orbit)
- **SDS** (on-orbit)
- **Bartolomeo** (up 2020)
- **SOLAR** (on orbit)
- **Nicer** (on-orbit)
- **MISSE-FF** (on-orbit)
- **HDEV** (on orbit)
- **ASIM** (on orbit)
- **ACES** (up in 2020)
- **STP-H6** (on orbit—May 3rd)
- **TSIS** (on-orbit)
- **LIS on STP-H5** (on-orbit)
- **RRM3** (on-orbit)

**External Logistics Carriers** – ELC-1, ELC-2, ELC-3
**External Stowage Platforms** – ESP-3
**Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer**
**Columbus External Payload Facility**
**Kibo External Payload Facility**

**Current and Future External Payloads**

- **ELC-2**
- **AMS**
- **ELC-3**
- **ELC-4**
- **Columbus EF**
- **JEMEF**
- **ELC-1**

**Notes:**

- LIS on STP-H5 (on-orbit)
- RRM3 (on-orbit)
- Nicer (on-orbit)
- MISSE-FF (on-orbit)
The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) has demonstrated small satellite deployment from the Japanese Experiment Module "Kibo" of the International Space Station (ISS) in order to enhance the capability of Kibo's utilization and to offer more launch opportunities to small satellites.
ISS External Attached Sites for Astrophysics Experiments

Best External Sites For Astrophysics Instruments
Express Logistics Carriers Overview

Payload Locations Circled

ELC-2 (Both Ram)  
Starboard upper  
2 Zenith payload sites

ELC-3 (3-Ram; 5-Wake)  
Port upper  
2 Zenith payload sites
Express Pallet Adapter (ExPA) Assembly (GFE)

Express Pallet Adapter (ExPA) Assembly

- ExPA overall Mass: 255 lb
- ExPA overall dimension: 46.05” x 47” x 13.06” (H)
- ExPA payload carrying capability: 34” x 46” x 49” (H) and 500 lb"
- Payload electrical interface: Power(120VDC & 28VDC): Four NATC connectors, Data (1553, Ethernet): Six NATC connectors
- Payload thermal interface: Active heating, passive cooling
- Payload structural interface: 2.756” X 2.756” Grid with 250-28 UNF Locking Inserts and 1.625” diameter Shear Boss Provisions
- EVA compatibility: EVA handrail provisions
- EVR compatibility: All EVR interfaces on ExPA
Placement of “Eye” Point for Sensor Viewing for Field of View Analysis
Inboard Side

- P/L PFRAM
- Site 3
- HPGT FSE
- PFRAM
- CTC-3
- CMG

ELC-2 (Ram)/Site 3
Starboard upper
Zenith site
Outboard Side

ELC-2 (Ram)/Site 7
Starboard upper
Zenith site
ELC-3 (Ram)/Site 3
Port upper
Zenith site
ELC-3 (Wake)/Site 5
Port upper
Zenith site
Columbus External Research Accommodations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Columbus External Resources</th>
<th>Mass capacity</th>
<th>230 kg (500 lb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>1 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.5 kW total to carrier (shared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-rate data</td>
<td>1 Mbps (MIL-STD-1553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-rate data</td>
<td>2 Mbps (shared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites available to NASA</td>
<td>2 sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Columbus EF Overview

**Location**
- SOZ
- SOX
- SDX
- SDN

**Viewing**
- Zenith
- Ram
- Nadir

**Payload Size**
- 226 kg + CEPA

**Power**
- 1.25 kW at 120 VDC
- 2.5 kW max
  - (Shared)

**Data**
- Ethernet, 1553
Columbus External Payload Envelope Dimensions
Columbus/SOX
Overhead
Zenith site
Mass capacity
550 kg (1,150 lb) at standard site
2,250 kg (5,550 lb) at large site

Volume
1.5 m³

Power
3-6 kW, 113 – 126 VDC (Shared resource)

Thermal
3-6 kW cooling (Shared resource)

Low-rate data
1 Mbps (MIL-STD-1553, two way)

Medium-rate data
1EEE-802.3(10BASE-T, two way) *

High-rate data
43 Mbps (shared, one way downlink)

Sites available to NASA
5 sites

- Ethernet bus is tested to 100BASE-T capacity.
- Upgrade to 100BASE-T is being worked by JAXA
Both power and active cooling are shared resource for all operating payloads during an increment
• Due to the JEM-EF system constraint to meet the external payload complement needs for power and fluid flow rate during the 2019-2024 timeframe to allow all of the payloads located on that platform to operate continuously at the same time, ISSP is directing PDs to design their instruments to perform within the limitation of the JEM-EF system capability in order to minimize payloads real time operation timelining.

• *JEM-EF system can support the following resource utilization per payload during the 2019-2024 timeframe:
  – Maximum fluid flow per payload: **151 kg/hr**
  – Maximum Power draw per payload: **500 W**
  – Maximum accumulator volume: **2L**

  * Deviation from these values above will significantly increase the likelihood of that payload complement to be timeline during real time operations of that increment, which means less continuous on-orbit operation of all the payloads in that increment at the same time.
Due to a design flaw uncovered recently in the ELC 28 dc power interface, which limits the Experiment Control Module (ECM) in the EXPRESS Carrier Avionics (ExPCA) to operate 40 degrees Celsius when two instruments are operating simultaneously on that ELC, the ISS Program recommends that all future ELC proposed instruments be designed to interface with the ISS 120 Vdc power interface.

Payload Developers (PDs), however, still have the option to design their instruments to interface with the 28 Vdc power feed at the risk of that payload being operations constraint (timeline constraint) whenever the 40 degrees Celsius limit is reached, which will trigger a power shed situation to balance total power draw across that ELC. This is being done to prevent total loss of science operation on that ELC if the ECM fails. Current analysis shows that when two payloads operating on the ELC simultaneous and both are using the 28 dc power, the 40 degrees Celsius limit is reached faster compared to if one is using the 28 dc power and the other the 120 Vdc power interface.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Viewing</th>
<th>Payload Size</th>
<th>Description / Notes</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ram, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Ram field of View (FOV) obstruction by JEM module</td>
<td>Ethernet, 1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ram, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Clear view</td>
<td>Ethernet, 1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ram, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>ICS System back-up site (negotiable?)</td>
<td>1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ram, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>ICS-dedicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Port, Zenith, Nadir</td>
<td>2.5 MT</td>
<td>Best volumetrically for large payloads (up to 2.5 MT), but not necessarily the best viewing</td>
<td>Ethernet, 1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wake, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>2.5 MT</td>
<td>Can hold large payloads, but has an FOV obstruction by JEM module</td>
<td>Ethernet, 1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wake, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Clear view</td>
<td>1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wake, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Clear view</td>
<td>Ethernet, 1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wake, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Obstruction during EP berthing, slight obstruction from camera mount</td>
<td>1553, Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wake, Nadir, Zenith</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>EPMP berthing site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zenith only</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Good Zenith viewing</td>
<td>Ethernet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zenith only</td>
<td>500 kg</td>
<td>Temporary stowage location</td>
<td>Ethernet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JEM-EF External Sites Locations
Placement of Eye-Point for Sensors Located on a Generic EFU Payload Box
JEM EFU 2 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 4 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 5 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 8 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 9 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 10 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 11 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
JEM EFU 12 Payload Zenith Face Fish-eye FOV
Payload Allowable Up-Mass & Volume Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attach Payload Location</th>
<th>Allowable Payload Weight (including Flight Support Equipment)</th>
<th>Accommodation Weight (including adapter plate)</th>
<th>Total Weight</th>
<th>Payload Volume (W x H x L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTV Exposed Pallet (JEM EF Payload)</td>
<td>979 Lb (445 Kg)</td>
<td>121 Lb (55 Kg)</td>
<td>1100 Lb (500 Kg)</td>
<td>31.5” x 39.4” x 72.8” (800mm x 1000mm x 1850 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTV Exposed Pallet (ExPA, CEPA Payload)</td>
<td>See ExPA &amp; CEPA payload specification for ELC &amp; CEF</td>
<td>See ExPA &amp; CEPA payload specification for ELC &amp; CEF</td>
<td>*See ExPA &amp; CEPA payload specification for ELC &amp; CEF</td>
<td>*See ExPA &amp; CEPA payload specification for ELC &amp; CEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC (ExPA)</td>
<td>490 Lb (222 Kg)</td>
<td>250 Lb (114 Kg)</td>
<td>740 Lb (336 Kg)</td>
<td>34” x 49” X 46” (863mm x 1244mm x 1168 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus (CEPA)</td>
<td>388 Lb (176 Kg)</td>
<td>250 Lb (114 Kg)</td>
<td>638 Lb (290 Kg)</td>
<td>34” x 49” X 46” (863mm x 1244mm x 1168 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM-EF</td>
<td>979 Lb (445 Kg)</td>
<td>121 Lb (55 Kg)</td>
<td>1100 Lb (500 Kg)</td>
<td>31.5” x 39.4” x 72.8” (800mm x 1000mm x 1850 mm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Location constraint applies in HTV Exposed Pallet
SSRMS attachment which the ground team or on-orbit crew can use robotically to install, remove and replace payloads and failed components
Robotic Installation of Instrument to ISS
ISS Visiting Vehicles Post-Shuttle

- Cygnus (Orbital)
- Dragon (SpaceX)
- ATV (ESA)
- Progress/Soyuz (Energia)
- HTV (JAXA)
Space X Dragon Launch Vehicle

- **Space X Dragon Launch Vehicle**
  - The Commercial Resupply Contract (CRS) is a vehicle to provide up-mass to ISS using commercial services Space X “Falcon 9” rocket and Dragon spacecraft
  - Trunk behind Dragon for unpressurized cargo (no return capability – disposal only)
  - Dragon Trunk Capacity is ~ 1700 Kg.
  - Total Dragon cargo heater power is 200 watts (*shared* between payloads in the launch vehicle trunk)
SpaceX Dragon External Payload Trunk JEM-EF Lay-out
Launch and Installation

Dragon Launch

Dragon travels in lower rendezvous orbit for 2-3 days

Dragon rendezvous with ISS; captured and berthed at Node 2

Instrument is removed from Dragon trunk by the SSRMS

Instrument is moved over to JEM

Instrument is handed off to JEM-RMS

Instrument is berthed at EFU
In performing the accommodation feasibility assessments, the ISS Integration Research office (RIO/OZ) looks at whether or not the proposed instrument meets the standard interfaces or requires significant non-standard integration re/work.

For example, the volumes are defined for each platform but there are specific dimensions that make up those volumes.

- Working with the proposer, we will evaluate the dimensions and determine if the instrument is within the standard dimensions or exceeds those dimensions in one or more areas.
- If it exceeds the standard interfaces, we will provide an evaluation of how simple or hard it will be to accommodate those non-standard interfaces.
- The proposers will be made aware of any non-standard interfaces to determine if they can modify their design to stay within the standard interfaces.
- A lot of times, non-standard interfaces CAN be accommodated but it requires additional work during the integration process.
Nominal Data Required From Proposer Team

- Payload Upmass (Includes both instrument and ISS Interface Hardware)
- Volumetric Dimensions (both static and dynamic)
- Power consumption (includes peak power)
- Data rates (includes any data latency requirements)
- Pointing/viewing needs
- Lifetime required on orbit
- Instrument readiness date (date payload is ready to fly to ISS)
- Return plan
1. Contact the Space Station Research Integration Office (RIO/OZ) at the NASA Johnson Space Center to start a dialogue and arrange for a feasibility assessment telecon:

   • Kenol Jules (Kenol.jules-1@nasa.gov, 281-244-5516)

2. Provide background information on the AO that your team is responding to, HQ Program Scientist (PS) and Program Executive (PE) names and your instrument technical information, such as:

   • Description of instrument concept and preliminary design approach
   • Estimate of launch/on-orbit mass, on-orbit volume/dimensions, power, data downlink requirements, need for cooling, and your preliminary assessment of possible ISS site locations for your proposed instrument
   • Any mass or volume/dimensions that exceed ISS standard operational instrument envelopes for a particular site will require a waiver---small deviations can often be accommodated
   • RIO will assess your overall design approach and let you know the suitability of your proposed design concept for accommodation on ISS. If your design concept has envelope exceedances, we will let you know possible options related to them.
3. To complete the assessment several follow-up telecons may be needed, email exchanges and additional data requests are to be expected.

4. Once the ISS assessment team has reviewed all potential ISS accommodations and interfaces issues and had had discussions about them with the proposer team, a draft preliminary ISS accommodation feasibility letter will be generated by RIO.

5. The draft feasibility letter will be reviewed with the proposer team for any comment. The content of the letter focuses on the issues identify by the assessment team, which were discussed with the proposer team and it is solely based on the information provided by the proposer at that time.

6. The feasibility letter is signed by the RIO manager and issued to the proposer team.

7. The whole process can take 6 to 10 weeks, depending on the complexity and maturity of the design concept from the proposer team.
8. Once the proposals are submitted to NASA, the ISS specific proposals will be reviewed again (in depth this time around) by the ISS RIO in order to issue a final ISS accommodation feasibility letter to the PS, using information provided in the proposals.

9. When a proposal is selected for funding, SMD will initiate contact with RIO, which in turn will initiate contact with the proposer team or vice versa to start discussion leading to the instrument integration process to be flown to ISS.

10. An authorization to proceed (ATP) will be provided to the ISS office by SMD to official assigned that instrument on ISS at a specific site, launch vehicle with readiness to fly date.

11. An ISS integration team will be activated to support the integration process of that instrument on ISS.

12. Once the proposer/PI/PD team is under contract with SMD, an ISS kick-off meeting will be held at the Johnson Space Center to start the ISS integration process.
Questions?

Contact Information:

Kenol Jules
NASA Johnson Space Center
Email: Kenol.jules-1@nasa.gov
Tel.: 281-244-5516