

VERIFICATION AND OPTIMIZATION OF THE PHYSICS PARAMETERS OF THE ONBOARD GALILEO PASSIVE HYDROGEN MASER

Qinghua Wang, Pierre Mosset, Fabien Droz, Pascal Rochat
Temex Time
Vauseyon 29, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland
E-mail: qinghua@temextime.com

Giovanni Busca
Kytime
Ecluse 11, 2022 Bevaix, Switzerland

Abstract

Atomic clocks represent critical equipment for the satellite navigation system. The Passive Hydrogen Maser (PHM), with its excellent frequency stability performance has been chosen as the master clock in the Galileo navigation satellite payload, and will be the first one of its type ever to fly. Temex Neuchâtel Time is responsible for the industrialization of the Physics Package (PP) of PHM and has been developing numbers of PP including Engineering Qualification, Qualification, Proto-Flight, and Flight Models in the frame of the Galileo Satellite Test Bed (GSTB-V2) and the In Orbit Validation (IOV) phase.

This paper provides the verification results of PHM physics parameters, according to the measurement data and the theoretical analysis, for all the PP produced up to now. A theoretical PHM physics model has been developed to extract inherent physics parameters (such as oscillation parameter, saturation factor, natural line width, various relaxation rates and useful atomic flux) which cannot be measured directly, but are of great importance in order to evaluate the instrument performance.

I. DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE SPACE PASSIVE HYDROGEN MASER

Atomic clocks represent critical equipment for the satellite navigation system. The Rubidium Atomic Frequency Standard (RAFS) and Passive Hydrogen Maser (PHM) are the baseline clock technologies for the Galileo navigation payload. The adoption of a "dual technology" for the onboard clocks is dictated by the need to insure a sufficient degree of reliability (technology diversity) and to comply with the Galileo lifetime requirement of 12 years. The PHM with its excellent frequency stability performance has been chosen as the master clock, and will be the first one of its type ever to fly.

Temex Neuchâtel Time (TNT) is not only the supplier of the RAFS, but it is also responsible for the industrialization of the Physics Package (PP) of the PHM. Galileo Avionica (GA), who designs the Electronics Package (EP), is responsible of the integration of the PP with the instrument (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Picture of Galileo PHM (18kg). The Physics Package (PP) is on the top of the Electronic Package (EP)

The industrialization activity aimed at PHM design consolidation for flight production was started in January 2003, based on the Engineering Model (EM) design led by the Observatory of Neuchatel since 2000. Main efforts for the PP in the industrialization frame focused on the definition of repeatable and reliable manufacturing processes and assemblies, as well as the parts number and cost reductions, while keeping the critical performances unchanged (e.g. Allan deviation $\sigma_y(\tau) \leq 1 \times 10^{-12} \tau^{-1/2}$ for $1s \leq \tau \leq 10000s$).

Two technological models (Figure 2), a Structural Model and numbers of PP have been developed at TNT for these objectives and to qualify the new upgraded design. In the frame of the Galileo Satellite Test Bed (GSTB-V2) and the In Orbit Validation (IOV) phase, TNT has manufactured two Engineering Qualification Models (EQM), a Proto-Flight Model (PFM), and a Flight Model (FM), which were delivered and tested at payload level. In addition, four Qualification Models (QM) are being manufactured and will be submitted to the prolonged testing for the life time demonstration. The first in-orbit PHM will be validated in the Galileo experimental satellite GIOVE-B, which is now planed for launching in early 2007.



Figure 2. Technological Model with / without cover

II. MEASUREMENTS OF THE PP PARAMETERS

Before the integration with EP, the PP is tested and characterized under the thermal vacuum chamber by the Maser Test Bench which supplies the electrical controls for the PP and monitors all operating parameters (Figure 3 and Figure 4).




Figure 3. Test setup




Figure 4. Maser Test Bench with Thermal Vacuum Chamber

In order to extract the relevant physics parameters using the theoretical PHM physics model, the maser gain and the operational linewidth as the function of the interrogation power for different purifier currents have to be measured, while keeping other operating parameters at nominal settings.

The maser gain and the operational linewidth are measured by the dedicated Atomic Signal Acquisition System (ASAS). The system is constituted by a RF signal processing unit controlled by two synthesized function generators in order to scan the useful frequency range step by step with the resolution of 0.001Hz. The system gives the output level of the atomic signal vs. the

interrogation frequency from which the two quantities G_0 (amplitude gain at resonance) and LW (the operational full linewidth measured at the half value of the power gain) are determined.

Figure 5 shows the atomic response of the PHM IOV-EQM PP, measured with 15Hz span exhibiting an atomic signal gain of 3.6dB and an operational atomic linewidth of 2.6 Hz.




Figure 5. PHM atomic signal measured by Atomic Signal Acquisition System for IOV EQM

III. EXCTRACTION OF THE RELEVANT PP PARAMETERS

Based on above measurements, a theoretical PHM physics model has been developed to extract the relevant physics parameters (the oscillation parameter, the saturation factor, the natural linewidth, various relaxation rates, and the useful atomic flux) which are difficult to measure directly, but are of great importance in order to evaluate the instrument performance.

3.1 THE OSCILLATION PARAMETER AND THE SATURATION FACTOR

Unlike the self-oscillation of an active hydrogen maser, the small-size passively operated maser is used as a microwave amplifier, having a very narrow bandwidth, by injecting in the microwave cavity an interrogation signal. The oscillation parameter α is an important parameter determining the oscillation properties of the system. The passive behavior is obtained when $\alpha < 1$.

The amplitude gain at resonance G_0 of the maser amplifier [2] is given by:

$$G_0 = \frac{1 + S_0}{1 + S_0 - \alpha} \quad (1)$$

where S_0 is the saturation factor at resonance, which is in proportional to the interrogation power P_{in} for a given atomic flux:

$$S_0 = k_s P_{in} \quad (2)$$

k_s is inversely proportional to $\gamma_1\gamma_2$ according to the definition of S_0 , with k_c calculated as the constant independent of the atomic flux:

$$k_s = \frac{k_c}{\gamma_1\gamma_2} \quad (3)$$

From Eq.(1), the value of α is extracted from the unsaturated amplitude gain corresponding to a very low level of the interrogation signal, when $P_{in} \rightarrow 0$. The value of S_0 at larger interrogation levels is obtained from the measured (saturated) amplitude gain knowing the value of α .

Figure 6 shows the least-squares fit to the IOV-EQM PP measurement data of G_0 vs. P_{in} for three levels of H_2 flux, to find out α and S_0 with k_s .




Figure 6. Atomic gain at resonance vs. interrogation power for three H_2 low pressures, and the respective oscillation parameter by the least-squares fit

3.2 THE NATURAL LINEWIDTH

The transverse relaxation rate γ_2 corresponds to the natural linewidth, distinguished from the measured operational linewidth LW which is subjected the power broadening effect.

The amplitude gain G of the maser amplifier is [2]:

$$G = \left[1 + \frac{1}{1+x^2} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{\left(1 + \frac{S_0}{1+x^2}\right)^2} - \frac{2\alpha}{1 + \frac{S_0}{1+x^2}} \right) \right]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4)$$

where x is the normalized frequency offset $x = \frac{\omega - \omega_a}{\gamma_2}$, ω is the interrogation carrier angular frequency, ω_a is the hydrogen resonance angular frequency and the cavity is assumed to be tuned to the hydrogen frequency.

The linewidth broadening factor F can be solved as the value of x at the half maximum of the power gain signal according to Eq.(4), for known α and S_0 :

$$F = \sqrt{\frac{4\alpha - 4\alpha^2 + \alpha^3 - 2(\alpha - 3)\alpha S_0 + 2\alpha S_0^2 - \sqrt{4(\alpha - 2 - 2S_0)^2(1 - \alpha + S_0)^2 + \alpha^2[(\alpha - 2)^2 - 2(\alpha - 3)S_0 + 2S_0^2]}}{2(\alpha - 2 - 2S_0)}} \quad (5)$$

and γ_2 can be determined from the operational linewidth:

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{\pi \times LW}{F} \quad (6)$$

3.3 THE USEFUL ATOMIC FLUX AND VARIOUS RELAXATION RATES

These parameters can be solved by the set of equations:

$$\alpha = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 \eta' Q_c \psi}{\hbar V_b \gamma_1 \gamma_2} \quad (7)$$

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_b + \frac{4}{3} \gamma_{2w} + 2k_e \psi \quad (8)$$

$$\gamma_2 = \gamma_b + \gamma_{2w} + k_e \psi \quad (9)$$

where,

μ_0 , μ_B and \hbar : constants of the magnetic permeability of vacuum, Bohr magneton and Planck's constant divided by 2π , respectively.

Q_c : Cavity loaded quality factor.

V_b : Storage bulb volume.

ψ : Useful H atomic flux entering the cavity in the (1,0) hyperfine state.

γ_1 : Longitudinal relaxation rate.

γ_b : Storage bulb or geometric relaxation rate. This can be calculated by

$$\gamma_b = \frac{\bar{v} \pi a^2}{4V_b \left(1 + \frac{3L}{8a}\right)} \quad (10)$$

where \bar{v} is the mean velocity of Hydrogen atoms, L and a are the length and radius of the exit tube of the storage bulb respectively. This value is constant for all our PP.

γ_{2w} : Transverse wall relaxation rate, due to atomic collisions with the wall of the storage bulb.

A magnetic relaxation rate should be added theoretically to Eq.(8-9). This term is however negligible for our configuration and is neglected.

The last terms of Eq.(8-9) are beam density-dependent contributed by the spin-exchange relaxation rate. k_e is considered as a variable for different PP.

In Eq.(7), the filling factor η' relates to the coupling between the atomic medium and the microwave field. It is defined by

$$\eta' = \frac{V_b \langle H_z \rangle_b^2}{V_c \langle H^2 \rangle_c} \quad (11)$$

where V_c is the overall volume of the cavity space, $\langle H_z \rangle_b^2$ is the square of the average amplitude of the axial component of the magnetic field within the bulb volume and $\langle H^2 \rangle_c$ is the quadratic average value of the magnetic field amplitude within the overall microwave cavity volume.

It's challenging to obtain the value of η' by the rigorous theoretic solution for such a complicated magnetron cavity structure. The numerical simulation of the electromagnetic field for the cavity-bulb assembly was performed (Figure 7) to solve η' by integrating the H field distribution function over the bulb and the cavity volumes. The value obtained for η' is 0.40. This is the value we assume for all the PP.




Figure 7. TE011 magnetron microwave cavity and the magnetic field distribution simulation

For two purifier currents A and B (corresponding to two H₂ flux setting A and B) the Eq.(7-9), give a the set of 6 equations with known α_A , α_B , γ_{2A} , γ_{2B} and γ_b . This allows to solve 6 unknown parameters : ψ_A , ψ_B , γ_{1A} , γ_{1B} , γ_{2w} and k_e (γ_{2w} and k_e are independent of flux).

3.4 THEORETICAL FREQUENCY STABILITY AND OPTIMIZATION

We assume that the noise of the interrogation signal is negligible. In such a case the frequency stability equation for the PHM, has contributions from the thermal noise of the receiver and the PP parameters:

$$\sigma_y(\tau) = \sqrt{\frac{k_s k T F_r}{2 A_c} \frac{(1 + S_0 - \alpha)^2}{Q_0 \alpha \sqrt{S_0} (1 + S_0)}} \tau^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (12)$$

where k is Boltzman's constant, T is the temperature of the cavity, F_r is the noise figure of the receiver, A_c is the cavity power attenuation, and Q_0 is the atomic line quality factor:

$$Q_0 = \frac{\pi f_0}{\gamma_2} \quad (13)$$

For a given PP, being k_s , Q_0 and α dependent on the useful atomic flux ψ (Eq.3, 7-9 & 13), σ_y is now the function of ψ and S_0 , i.e. respectively of the H₂ low pressure and of the interrogation power.

Figure 8 shows $\sigma_y(1s)$ vs. ψ & S_0 , , Figure 9 shows α vs. ψ , and Figure 10 shows H₂ low pressure vs. ψ , for IOV-EQM PP. From these figures the optimum purifier current, the optimum interrogation power and the maximum oscillation parameter corresponding to the best frequency stability can be obtained.




Figure 8. Theoretical Allan deviation at 1s vs. saturation factor S_0 and useful atomic flux ψ (minimum $\sigma_y(1s) = 6.9 \times 10^{-13}$ at $S_0 = 0.37$ (corresponding to interrogation power of -80dBm), and $\psi = 8.3 \times 10^{12}$ atoms/s (corresponding to a low pressure of 0.10mbar))




Figure 9. Calculated oscillation parameter vs. useful atomic flux for three different H₂ low pressures, and theoretical model with optimum point ($\alpha=0.407$ at $\psi=8.3e12$ atoms/s)




Figure 10. H₂ low pressure vs. calculated useful atomic flux and fitting for optimum value (0.10mBar at $\psi=8.3e12$ atoms/s)

IV. VERIFICATION RESULTS OF PHYSICS PACKAGES

Table 1 lists the results from measurements of all PP manufactured at TNT up to now.

In an attempt to characterize the PP before delivering to GA the physics parameters were measured using the same electronics (reference electronics), with the same interrogation power.

The nominal operational H₂ low pressure was set to have the same H₂ consumption (< 2bar.liter/year) for each PP. The values were selected according to the conductance calibration for each mutli-hole collimator of the hydrogen dissociation bulb performed in the Technological Model before the assembly to PP. With this H₂ consumption, the useful atomic flux for 4 PP is about 5e+12/s, varying slightly from unit to unit. The higher value of 7.9e12/s for IOV EQM could come from the higher dissociation or state selection efficiency.

Table 1. Comparison of PP in nominal operational condition
(blue: measurement parameters)

PP		GSTB-V2 EQM	GSTB-V2 PFM	GSTB-V2 FM1	IOV EQM	QM1
		Aug.2004	Feb.2005	Aug.2005	Jul.2006	Oct.2006
Interrogation power [dBm]		-82	-82	-82	-82	-82
H ₂ low pressure [mbar]		0.1	0.1	0.08	0.09	0.09
Cavity quality factor		5800	5800	9500	9500	9500
Useful flux [atoms/s]		5.5E+12	4.1E+12	5.7E+12	7.9e+12	4.9e+12
Linewidth [Hz]	Geometric relaxation	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Wall relaxation	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.9	0.2
	Spin-exchange relaxation	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.5	1.6
	Natural (sum of above)	3.1	2.3	2.6	3.6	3.0
Atomic gain [dB]		2.1	2.5	4.8	3.4	2.8
Oscillation parameter		0.24	0.35	0.60	0.41	0.34
Theoretical Allan deviation $\sigma_y(\tau) = A\tau^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	Operational (1s)	1.4E-12	9.9E-13	3.2E-13	7.0e-13	7.3e-13
	Optimum (1s)	8.2E-13 @0.2mbar (1.1e13/s) -75dBm	8.9E-13 @0.22mbar (6.8e12/s) -81dBm	2.8E-13 @0.12mbar (6.9e12/s) -85dBm	6.9e-13 @0.1mbar (9.0e12/s) -80dBm	6.9e-13 @0.05mbar (3.2e12/s) -81dBm

For the flux-independent relaxation effects, the bulb escape relaxation contributes 1.2Hz due to the fact that we assure a constant geometry for all the storage bulb, but the wall relaxation linewidth appears to be varying.

The average of k_e for 5 units is 6.2e-13, which is in good agreement with theoretical value of 5.6e-13 according to [2].

The first 2 PHM use Al cavities coated by Alodine, having a quality factor of 5800. The higher atomic gain and the oscillation parameter leading to better frequency stability for PFM are due to the narrower natural linewidth which benefits mainly from the smaller wall relaxation effect.

Since the FM1, the cavity quality factor has been increased from 5800 to 9500 by a silver coating of the magnetron cavity. Significant higher atomic gain and higher oscillation parameter have been achieved by the quality factor improvement.

Figure 11 shows the frequency stabilities of PP for GSTB-V2 EQM, PFM and FM, measured by the reference electronics. The theoretical Allan deviations are calculated for the operational conditions corresponding to the measurements and assuming the same noise figure contributed by the receiver. The evaluation is in good agreement with the measurements of EQM and PFM, but too optimistic for FM1. In this particular case, the stability of FM1 is limited by the noise of the

interrogation oscillator, which is limited to 6E-13 to 8E-13 within the maser line bandwidth. For further FM models, the local oscillator could be selected with a better short term stability to improve the instrument short term stability performances if there is a real need at system level.




Figure 11. Measured and theoretical frequency stabilities of Physics Packages for GSTB-V2 EQM, PFM and FM

For recent IOV EQM and QM1, a modification of the C-field was performed due to weight constraints. The initial assumption is that the modification could have produced a small increase of the magnetic inhomogeneity. A system is presently under study in order to estimate the associated small magnetic relaxation. The atomic gain and oscillation parameter for IOV EQM are bigger than for QM1. This is probably associated with a very small background vacuum obtained for EQM. However the estimated best frequency stabilities reach to the same value for these two masers.

Figure 12 shows the preliminary measurements of PP for IOV EQM and QM. The theoretical predications are consistent with the measurements.

As shown in the table, the best frequency stability is evaluated by optimizing the operating parameters. However, if the flux has to be increased to favor the stability which follows the penalty of the life time, the trade-off for the life time has to be made carefully.




Figure 12. Measured and theoretical frequency stabilities of Physics Packages for IOV EQM and QM1

V. CONCLUSIONS

An efficient method for extracting the relevant maser parameters has been devised. The maser operational parameters for the 5 units tested are found to be in a reasonable range.

The operational flux assures the lifetime specification.

Except for the 1st EQM, the stability of all other units at the operational parameters settings is found to be in the specifications.

The optimum frequency stability determined by the PP parameters as demonstrated by FM1 can reach the level of 3E-13 at 1s, i.e. 3 times better than the specification, but in such case the frequency performance is limited by the local oscillator noise.

VI. REFERENCES

- [1] P. Rochat, F. Droz, P. Mosset, G. Barmaverain, Q. Wang, D. Boving, U. Schmidt, T. Pike, L. Mattioni, M. Belloni, M. Gioia, and F. Emma, "The onboard Galileo rubidium and passive maser, status and performance," in Proceedings of 2005 Joint IEEE International Frequency and Control Symposium and Precise Time and Time Interval (PTTI) Systems and Applications Meeting, 29-31 August, 2005, Vancouver, Canada, pp 26-32.
- [2] J. Vanier and C. Audoin, **The Quantum Physics of Atomic Frequency Standards**, (Adam Hilger), Vol. 2, 1988.

38th Annual Precise Time and Time Interval (PTTI) Meeting

Communication information:

Qinghua Wang
Temex Time
Vauseyon 29, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland
E-mail: qinghua@temextime.com
Tel: +41 32 732 96 74
Fax: +41 32 732 16 67