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ABSTRACT
Worldwide concerns of air quality and climate change have made environmental protection one of the most critical issues in aviation today. NASA’s current Fundamental Aeronautics research program is directed at three generations of aircraft in the near, mid and far term, with initial operating capability around 2015, 2020, and 2030, respectively. Each generation has associated goals for fuel burn, NOx, noise, and field-length reductions relative to today’s aircrafts. The research for the 2020 generation is directed at enabling a hybrid wing body (HWB) aircraft to meet NASA’s aggressive technology goals. This paper presents the conceptual cycle and mechanical designs of the two engine concepts, podded and embedded systems, which were proposed for a HWB cargo freighter. They are expected to offer significant benefits in noise reductions without compromising the fuel burn.
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INTRODUCTION
More passengers and cargo are moved by air today than ever before, because of the global economy and worldwide connectivity. Over the next 15 to 20 years, the volume of air traffic is expected to at least double (for passenger traffic) or even triple (for cargo traffic) [1 and 2]. This robust growth rate causes growing concerns about the contribution that aircraft emissions will have on local air quality and global climate change. Chemical emissions of concern consist of anything that affects local air quality, global climate, or atmospheric ozone, including CO2, NOx, sulfur oxides, water vapor and particulates [3]. For carbon based fuels, there is a 1:1 relationship between the amount of fuel burned and the amount of CO2 generated. Aviation noise can have adverse impacts on property values, airport expansion, and prompts operational restrictions on existing runways that increase congestion, leading to travel and shipping delays [4]. It is generally recognized that significant improvement to the environmental acceptability of aircraft will be needed to sustain long term growth. The ability of the nation to benefit from continued growth in aviation depends on the development of future aircrafts that can meet demanding environmental and performance challenges.

To achieve environmental protection that allows sustained long-term aviation growth, NASA has been engaged in the development of revolutionary aero-propulsion technologies and aircraft concepts with specific objectives to reduce aircraft fuel burn, noise, and NOx emissions while satisfying the field length constraints. Under the Subsonic Fixed Wing (SFW) project of its Fundamental Aeronautics Program, NASA’s aeronautics research is directed at three generations of aircraft in the near, mid and far term, with initial operating capability (IOC) around 2015, 2020, and 2030, respectively. Each generation has associated goals for reductions in noise, emissions, fuel burn, and field length relative to today’s aircraft. The three generations of aircraft are designated as ‘N+1’, ‘N+2’, and ‘N+3’, respectively. The research for ‘N+2’ and ‘N+3’ are directed at enabling new vehicle configurations to meet NASA’s aggressive technology goals. The ‘N+1’ and ‘N+2’ goals, as defined in the 2007 NASA Research Announcement request for proposal, are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.—NASA SUBSONIC FIXED WING SYSTEM-LEVEL GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N+1 generation conventional IOC 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (cumulative below Stage 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing-and-takeoff NOx, (below CAEP/6) emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft fuel burn (relative to ’737/CFM56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N+2 baseline changed to B777/GE90 in 2008
** –33% with laminar flow control
*** –40% with laminar flow control
NASA funded a 1-year Phase-I effort to study the potential of a Hybrid Wing Body type aircraft to meet the N+2 technology goals. This study was to focus on the noise goal of -52 dB relative to Federal Aviation Regulations Part 36 (FAR 36) Stage 3 while meeting the fuel goal of -25% relative to the current state-of-the-art aircraft. Boeing Phantom Works, teamed with Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and University of California Irvine, proposed to perform the study on a freighter aircraft. Both Boeing and Airbus forecasted the demand for cargo air traffic will grow at a higher rate than passenger airliners in the next twenty years [1, 2]. The team was chosen to conduct the study.

Boeing, with its extensive background in blended wing body type aircraft, proposed two engine concepts for a hybrid wing body (HWB) freighter aircraft, for the 2020 timeframe - the conventional pylon-mounted ‘podded’ and the futuristic ‘embedded’ systems. The HWB configurations with podded and embedded engines were designated as ‘N2A’ and ‘N2B’, respectively.

The N2A podded engine configuration was considered to be ‘lower risk’ for the 2020 timeframe, because of its low engine operability risk. The N2B with embedded engines was considered to be a ‘higher risk’ configuration, because of its complexities associated with closely coupled engine/airframe and boundary layer ingestion inlets. The closely coupled engine/airframe has the potential to reduce the engine-airframe integration penalties. The N2B was to be derived from the “Silent Aircraft” [5, 6]. The HWB aircraft-engine configurations with two types of engine are shown in Figure 1.

For the podded twinjet engine system:
- thrust (per engine) = 10000 lbs (@ ISA +0)
- cruising Mach number = 0.8 @ 31,000 ft
- cruise altitude = 35000 ft or higher
- range = 6000 nm
- payload = 103,000 pounds
- field length = 10,000 ft or less

For the embedded system (three engines, 9 fans):
- thrust (per engine) = 15000 lbs (@ ISA +15C/ISA +27F)
- cruising Mach number = 0.8 @ 31,000 ft
- cruise altitude = 35000 ft or higher
- range = 6000 nm
- payload = 103,000 pounds
- field length = 10,000 ft or less

**Figure 1. HWB aircraft-engine configurations.**

Under the contractual agreement, NASA Glenn Research Center (GRC) agreed to perform engine conceptual design studies and provide the engine data to support Boeing’s effort. The design studies were for four podded engines with fan pressure ratios (FPR) of 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7, and one embedded engine with FPR1.5 (mutually agreed to be the same as the Silent Aircraft engine). This paper presents the conceptual cycle and mechanical designs of the two engine concepts proposed for the ‘N+2’ generation freighter aircraft.

**HYBRID WING BODY (HWB) AIRCRAFT**

A hybrid wing body aircraft is an alternative airframe design in which the fuselage blends seamlessly with the wings to form a hybrid flying-wing configuration [7]. It also incorporates many design features from the conventional ‘tube with wings’ aircraft. Because of its high-lift wings and wide airfoil-shaped body (thus better aerodynamic efficiency), the HWB aircraft reduces the drag and fuel burn. Fully integrating the HWB airframe and the engines, e.g. embedded engines, will allow the aerodynamic efficiency to be maximized, which would further improve the aircraft performance. Also, if the engines are installed above the wing, the engine noise will be shielded by the aircraft’s wide body and wing span and thus the aircraft will potentially operate quieter than the conventional aircraft.

A very quiet HWB airplane would not be limited by current operational curfews, such as night operations into noise-sensitive airports. The flexibility of operations, in combination with the worldwide trend towards widespread use of just-in-time delivery, would further stimulate the cargo growth and the demand for freighter aircrafts.

**Aircraft Mission Requirements**

Boeing defined the mission requirements for a HWB cargo freighter aircraft. They are:
- payload of 103,000 pounds;
- range of 6000 nm;
- 35000 ft initial cruise altitude or higher;
- time to climb through 31,000 ft not greater than 30 minutes;
- cruise Mach number of 0.8;
- field length of 10,000 ft or less

**PROPULSION SYSTEM DESIGN**

**Propulsion System Design Requirements**

Based on the mission requirements defined by Boeing, GRC defined the propulsion system requirements, as follows:

For the podded twinjet engine system:
- aerodynamic design point (ADP):
  - Mach number 0.8 @ 31,000 ft;
  - thrust (per engine) = 15000 lbs (@ International standard atmosphere (ISA +0))
- rolling takeoff (RTO) at Mach no. 0.25, sea level:
  - thrust (per engine) = 54000 lbs (@ ISA+15C/ISA+27F);

For the embedded system (three engines, 9 fans):
- aerodynamic design point (ADP):
  - Mach number 0.8 @ 31,000 ft;
  - thrust (per engine) = 10000 lbs (@ ISA +0)
- rolling takeoff at Mach no. 0.25, sea level:
  - thrust (per engine) = 36000 lb (@ ISA+15C/ISA+27F);

**Engine Cycle Design**

Cycle design involves simultaneously solving aerodynamic design point and off-design parameters. Four podded engines with FPR of 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 were modeled. Of these engines, the FPR1.4 and FPR1.5 engines were geared; the others were direct-drive. One embedded engine with FPR of 1.5 was modeled. It has three propulsion modules that were each composed of a gas generator that drove an inline fan and two additional outboard fans through a mechanical drive train.

The NASA software tool, NPSS (Numerical Propulsion System Simulation) [8 and 9], was used for this task that ultimately calculated engine thrust and specific fuel consumption for each of the engines. All engines were developed with the same ADP (Mach number, altitude, thrust). The ADP was selected to represent a nominal top-of-climb (TOC) condition for the hybrid wing airframe cargo freighter.
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A maximum high-pressure turbine (HPT) inlet temperature of 3460 °R was used to eliminate the LPT cooling. Also, a maximum low-pressure turbine (LPT) rotor inlet temperature of 3310 °R (with cooling air) were assumed, reflecting the use of advanced high temperature materials. Also, a maximum low-pressure turbine (LPT) rotor inlet temperature of 2460 °R was used to eliminate the LPT cooling.

Assumptions for fan, low pressure compressor (LPC), efficiencies were based on technology trend curves recently developed by the Aerospace Systems Design Lab (ASDL) at Georgia Tech for use in the FAA’s Environmental Design Space (EDS) system [10]. These curves have been reviewed by the EDS Independent Review Group, which includes industry representatives and is shown in Figures 2 and 3. For the high pressure compressor (HPC), a constant polytropic efficiency of 91.5% was assumed for all the engines. For the FPR1.4 and FPR1.5 engines, a variable area fan nozzle was needed to achieve the targeted 20% surge margin across the operating envelope. For the FPR1.6 and FPR1.7 engines, an acceptable surge margin was achievable with fixed geometry nozzles and the extra weight of a variable area nozzle was not justified.

General cycle characteristics of the podded engines are shown in Table 2. For the embedded engine, they are shown in Table 3. These data were generated with the inlet pressure recoveries provided by Boeing. For the podded engines, the inlet pressure recoveries were 0.998 at the ADP. For the embedded engine, they were 0.946 and 0.960 (with boundary layer ingestion) for the center and the side inlets, respectively.

### Engine Mechanical Design

The podded-engine system for the HWB cargo freighter is a twinjet (2 engines) system. For this system, four engine designs with fan pressure ratios (FPR) of 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 1.7 were modeled. The basic common engine architecture for these engines is a two spool turbofan. Of these engines, the FPR1.4 and FPR1.5 engines were geared to reduce the number of LPC and LPT stages; the others were direct-drive.

The embedded-engine system for the HWB cargo freighter is a 3-engine configuration with a total of 9 fans. Each embedded engine is composed of a gas generator (core engine) that drove an inline fan and two additional outboard fans through a mechanical drive train. For this concept, one engine design with FPR of 1.5 was modeled.

The NASA software tool WATE (Weight Analysis of Gas Turbine Engines) [11, 12, 13] was used to create engine architectures that could achieve the engine thermodynamic cycle detailed in the previous section. Since WATE’s original release in 1979, substantial improvements have been made to enhance its capability and improve its accuracy. Many of the empirical relationships have been replaced with analytical weight and dimension calculations. An approach is used where the stress level, maximum temperature and pressure, material, geometry, stage loading, hub-tip ratio, blade/vane counts, and shaft speed are used to determine the component weight. An updated gearbox-weight correlation is also included in the code.

The cycle data required for WATE execution, such as airflow, temperatures, and pressures, pressure ratios, bypass ratios, etc., was derived from NPSS output. Both the ADP and

---

This material is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.
off-design cases were used to encompass the maximum performance level required for each engine component. This data, the material properties, and design rules for geometric, stress, and turbomachinery stage-loading limits were used to determine the acceptable engine layout.

Advanced materials were assumed to accommodate higher engine operating temperatures and to reduce the weight. A complete summary of the advanced engine materials assumed is shown in Table 4.

Both highly-loaded and conventional turbomachinery stage-loading cases were studied. Using highly-loaded turbomachinery can reduce the number of compressor and turbine stages, reducing component and engine weights and lengths, but with a trade-off of component and overall efficiency. Based on the results, it was mutually agreed between GRC and Boeing that the small differences in weight (< 2%) and overall dimensions (< 6% in length) would not compensate for the overall efficiency degradation with the highly-loaded turbomachinery. In this paper, only the results based on conventional turbomachinery loadings are presented.

For the podded engines the core nozzles were axisymmetric, and variable area fan nozzles were used for the FPR1.4 and FPR1.5 engines. It was assumed that the variable-area geometry (to be actuated by shape memory alloy) would increase the nozzle weight by 10% [14]. For the embedded engines, vectoring 2D variable-area nozzles were used. The length of the nozzle was set at 2 fan diameters to provide the space for the acoustic liners. Tables 5 and 6 summarize the parameters of the podded and embedded engines. The engine layouts for estimating performance and weights are shown in Figures 4 and 5. For the embedded engine, the boundary-layer-ingestion inlet and nacelles were considered part of the airframe and were designed by Boeing.

![Figure 2. Variation of fan efficiency with pressure ratio (PR).](image)

![Figure 3. Variation of LPC efficiency with pressure ratio.](image)
### TABLE 4.—ADVANCED ENGINE MATERIAL ASSUMPTIONS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Blade</th>
<th>Vane</th>
<th>Disk</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>Polymer matrix composite</td>
<td>Polymer matrix composite</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Polymer matrix composite wrapped by Zylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>Titanium aluminide</td>
<td>Titanium aluminide</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Polymer matrix composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC (hot section)</td>
<td>Titanium aluminide</td>
<td>Titanium aluminide</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Titanium metal matrix composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT and LPT</td>
<td>5th generation nickel-based alloy</td>
<td>5th generation nickel-based alloy</td>
<td>Nickel-based powder metallurgy alloy</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet/Nacelle</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Polymer matrix composite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = not applicable  * Current state-of-the-art materials

### TABLE 5.—PRINCIPAL MECHANICAL PARAMETERS FOR THE PODDED ENGINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>FPR1.4</th>
<th>FPR1.5</th>
<th>FPR1.6</th>
<th>FPR1.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>Two-spool geared turbofan</td>
<td>Two-spool geared turbofan</td>
<td>Two-spool direct drive turbofan</td>
<td>Two-spool direct drive turbofan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan dia., inch</td>
<td>126.6</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan blade/Vane counts</td>
<td>18/46</td>
<td>18/46</td>
<td>18/46</td>
<td>18/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. fan tip speed, ft/sec</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan hub/tip ratio</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan stage loading</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC stages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC min. blade ht. (inch)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT stages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT stages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan nozzle type</td>
<td>Variable area</td>
<td>Variable area</td>
<td>Fixed area</td>
<td>Fixed area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Engine pod wt., lb</td>
<td>19007</td>
<td>16191</td>
<td>15513</td>
<td>13314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare engine length, inches</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>164.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6.—PRINCIPAL MECHANICAL PARAMETERS FOR THE EMBEDDED ENGINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Multiple fan system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fan dia., inch</td>
<td>Fan blade/vane counts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. fan tip speed, ft/sec</td>
<td>HPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan hub/tip ratio</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan stage loading</td>
<td>HPC min. blade ht. (inch)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC stages</td>
<td>HPT stages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT blade/vane counts</td>
<td>LPT stages</td>
<td>111/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT blade/vane counts</td>
<td>LPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>554/824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT stages</td>
<td>LPC stages</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT blade/vane counts</td>
<td>LPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>193/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT stages</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC blade vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC min. blade ht. (inch)</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>554/824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC min. blade ht. (inch)</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT blade/vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>111/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT stages</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPT blade/vane counts</td>
<td>HPC stages</td>
<td>657/436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT stages</td>
<td>Nozzle type</td>
<td>2-D variable area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC blade/vane counts</td>
<td>Engine weight (includes accessories, with no transmission), lb</td>
<td>12,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission &amp; lubrication system weight, lb</td>
<td>Total engine weight (excludes inlet), lb</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total engine weight (excludes inlet), lb</td>
<td>13791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Fan stage loading} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta h}{U_t^2 (1 + h/t)^2}
\]

\[
\Delta h = \text{change in stagnation enthalpy}
\]

\[
U_t = \text{blade tip speed}
\]

\[
h/t = \text{blade hub-to-tip ratio}
\]
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Figure 4. FPR1.6 podded engine internal layout (dimensions in inches).

Figure 5. Embedded engine internal layout.
Transmission Design for the Embedded Engine
Each embedded engine is composed of a gas generator that drove an inline fan and two additional fans through a mechanical drive train. The mechanical drive train was designed to be powered from the low pressure turbine (LPT) through angle gearboxes to adjacent fans. The gear-drive system configuration is shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6. The gear-drive system configuration.](image)

The gearboxes were designed using the calculation procedure for spiral bevel gears via the American Gear Manufacturers Association (AGMA, [15]). The load (power) was assumed to be split equally between the three fans. Therefore the gearbox driven directly by the power turbine was designed to transmit ~35khp (Figure 6, Gearbox #1), or 2/3 of the power, and then split the power to the adjacent gearboxes to drive the two parallel fans (Figure 6, Gearboxes #2). The gearbox arrangements also considered overall size to minimize the cross-sectional area down stream of the turbine and fans. Gearbox #1 was penalized during the design process since the pinion drives two gears. State-of-the-art materials and manufacturing processes would be required for all gearbox system components. The gearing design parameters are shown in Table 7.

An empirical correlation, shown in Figure 7, was used to calculate the weight of the transmission and lubrication system. The correlation was developed based on actual weight data from over fifty rotocrafts, tiltrotors, and turboprop aircrafts. They are also plotted in Figure 7. Using this parametric fit permitted gearbox weight to be estimated for the purposes of this study.

Aircraft Mission and Sizing Studies
With the engine data provided by GRC, Boeing used its BIVDS (Boeing Integrated Vehicle and Design System) tool suite to perform airplane mission and sizing analyses, based on an 11112-kilometers (6000 nautical miles) economic mission. The results have been reported in Reference 16. For the podded engines, they are summarized in Table 8.

![Table 8.—MISSION AND SIZING RESULT COMPARISONS FOR THE PODDED ENGINES](image)

Boeing used the fuel-burn trend band for current cargo freighters (B767-300ER, A330-200, etc.) for the comparison. It showed that the N2A (with FPR1.6 podded engines) exceeds N+2 fuel burned goal at -29%. Although both the FPR1.4 and FPR1.5 geared engines had lower fuel burn, the FPR1.6 engine was deemed to have lower risk for the 2020 IOC time frame. It was selected for the noise study. With the embedded engines, the N2B met the fuel-burn goal at -25%. Those results are summarized in Table 9.

![Table 9.—MISSION AND SIZING RESULTS FOR THE EMBEDDED ENGINE](image)
Aircraft and Engine Noise Studies

Subsequent noise studies were also conducted by Boeing and MIT. The methodology and results are reported in Reference 16. The noise estimate for the N2A was shown to be -47 dB below Stage 3 (or -37 dB below Stage 4), within 5 dB of the N+2 goal. For the N2B, the noise was shown to be -26 dB below Stage 3 (or -16 dB below Stage 4). Based on the results, Boeing concluded that the N+2 noise goal is achievable with N2A configuration, with increased jet shielding, increased climb speed, additional focus on landing gear fairings, and with continuing R&D on HWB type aircraft. For the N2B, increasing the duct treatment (e.g. with acoustic tiles) and reducing the jet velocity will help it move towards the N+2 noise goal. A part of the continuing R&D is the need to further improve noise prediction methodologies, especially for an embedded engine.

SUMMARY

NASA GRC conducted engine conceptual design studies on two engine concepts, podded and embedded systems, that were proposed for a HWB freighter aircraft for the ‘N+2’ timeframe. The results were provided to Boeing Phantom Works to support its investigation to develop a HWB subsonic freighter configuration with noise prediction methods to meet the NASA Subsonic Fixed Wing N+2 noise and fuel burn reduction goals. Based on its Phase 1 results, Boeing has concluded that the N+2 fuel burn and noise goals are achievable on a hybrid wing type vehicle, with continuing R&D on HWB type aircraft and improvement of noise prediction methodologies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. Timothy Krantz of the Army Research Laboratory for the development of the gearbox and lubrication system weight correlation used in this study, and Mr. Christopher Snyder for his comments on the paper.

REFERENCES


