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## Space Policy Directive-1


"Lead an innovative and sustainable program of exploration with commercial and international partners to enable human expansion across the solar system and to bring back to Earth new knowledge and opportunities.

Beginning with missions beyond low-Earth orbit, the United States will lead the return of humans to the Moon for long-term exploration and utilization, followed by human missions to Mars and other destinations."

## The Apollo Program

6 landings between
1969 and 1972

2 people

3 days on the surface
$\sim 2,000 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ down, 8.4 t propellant ~2,000 m/s up, 2.5t propellant

Pressure fed hypergolic propellants

## Human Mars Mission

2-4 landers per mission

4+ people
>1 year on the surface
$\sim 800 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ down, 15 t propellant
$\sim 5,300 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ up, 36t propellant

Cryogenic ISRU-compatible propellants



## Mars Ascent Vehicle (MAV) Drives Lander Size

- The MAV is the largest indivisible payload that must be delivered
- MAV's to high orbits are > 40t at liftoff.
- Delivering 40t or more on a lander may be infeasible
- With ISRU generated propellants, MAV's can achieve high orbits with low delivered mass on the lander


Earth Return Vehicle will be in a high orbit, 1 Sol to 5 Sol

## Propellant Choice Drivers: Performance

## - Ascent Performance

- Highly sensitive to Isp, impacts ripple through lander and transportation stages
- Propellant combinations with higher mixture ratios favored to make greatest benefit of surface LOX



## Propellant Choice Drivers: Thermal Management

- Long duration storage
- Fuel storage at similar temperature to LOX simplifies CFM design, and enables a nested tank option


Thermal Environment Favors CH4 (methane) as a Cryogenic Fuel for Mars due to Storage Temperature

## Propellant Choice Drivers: Packaging



LOX/LH ${ }_{2}$


LOX/CH 4


MMH/NTO (must be landed fully fueled)

Variation in propellant volumes for 1 Sol MAV

- Radiators not shown
- No attempt was made to optimize the configuration



Lander Options \& Packaging Challenges

## Mars Descent Propulsion System

- Commonality of propulsion components for descent and ascent can maximize the value of development investments
- We need main engines with throttle capability, thrust level, and Isp that balance descent and ascent performance needs
- Common $22.5 \mathrm{klb}_{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{O}_{2} / \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ engine
- 3+1 for Ascent, 8 for Descent
- Active cryogenic fluid management with advanced insulation
- Integrated reaction control systems
- Capable of withstanding long duration dormancy with high reliability



## Propulsion Challenges: Powered Descent Initiation

Engines Off


- Strong, detached shock near vehicle
- Heatshield is the flow obstruction
- Dominant forces and moments are steady
- Well-defined scaling relationships

Engines On


Source: A. Korzun (NASA LaRC), FUN3D solution, 2018.

- Shock displaced far upstream
- Complex, unsteady plume structure is part of the flow obstruction
- Aerodynamic forces and moments can be unsteady
- Less confidence in scaling relationships


## Propulsion Challenges: Plumes Near Landing



At Mach = 0.8 (20t payload):
Altitude above surface: 975 m Downrange to target: 1.04 km Flight path angle: $-35^{\circ}$ Plumes extend $\mathbf{1 5 0} \mathbf{m}$ in front of the vehicle!

Source: F. Canabal (NASA MSFC), LociCHEM solutions, instantaneous Mach number contours, 2018.

- Unsteadyaerodynamics in nominal operation
- Transitions through nozzle expansion conditions as the vehicle decelerates
- Throttling introduces asymmetry and can significantly alter the resulting aerodynamics


## Propulsion Challenges: Surface Plume Interaction

Mars Science Laboratory
$5,600 \rightarrow 700$ lbf of thrust, $60+f t$ from surface
Damaged instrument


Human Mars Lander $180,000 \mathrm{lbf} \rightarrow 36,000 \mathrm{lbf}$ of thrust,

10+ft from surface in proximity to other assets


The total thrust at landing is 50 times more than Curiosity or InSight missions. Landing on bedrock is preferred, but even that may be altered.

## Landing Precision

- Landing precision is improving with each Mars mission
- To get to the current state of the art, system changes have been made, along the way:
- MSL had the first active hypersonic guidance
- In addition, Mars 2020 employs a range trigger on the parachute, and uses Terrain Relative Navigation
- Human missions will need integrated guidance, improved velocimetry, and hazard detection/ avoidance





## EDL Vehicle Designs: 20 t Payload Capability

| Name | Shape | Vehicle <br> Dimensions | Launch <br> Mass | Entry <br> Mass | Ballistic <br> Number | L/D |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capsule |  | $10 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> $10 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{w})$ | 68 t | 63 t | $500 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.3 |
| Mid L/D |  | $22 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{l}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> $7.3 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> $8.8 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{w})$ | 66 t | 62 t | $380 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.55 |
| ADEPT | $4.3 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> 18 m diameter | 60 t | 55 t | $155 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.2 |  |
| HIAD |  | $4.3 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{~h}) \mathrm{x}$ <br> 16 m diameter | 57 t | 49 t | $155 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.2 |

ADEPT = Adaptable Deployable Entry \& Placement Technology HIAD = Hypersonic Inflatable Aerodynamic Decelerator
Mid-L/D = Has a lift-to-drag ratio (L/D) of about 0.55


