

# Examining the means to protect against fuselage burnthrough

#### S. F. Jagger<sup>1</sup>, J. R. Hoyes<sup>1</sup>, P. T. Ireland<sup>2</sup>, H. S. Ledin<sup>1</sup> and A. Mullender<sup>2</sup>

1. Health & Safety Laboratory, 2. Rolls-Royce Plc





### Outline



- Introduction
- Methods for protection
- Assessment of protection methods
- Experimental
  - ISO 2685 and UL94 tests
  - Example results
- Modelling approach
  - Modelling of burner
  - Modelling of material response
- Summary

#### Methods for Protection – 1



Protective shields

Stainless steel panels Dimpled steel (4/1000") or plain (0.6 mm)

Surface coatings

Ceramics Fastblock





#### Hardening of materials

- Addition of retardants
  - Polyphosphate
  - Nano clays
  - Carbon nano tubes

## Higher performance composites – HEXCEL (not yet tested)

### Assessment of performance



- Carried out experimentally:
  - Enhanced ISO 2685 test
  - UL94 test
- Modelling approach:
  - Ultimately would like to model response of panels
  - Use testing to provide data to develop models

### ISO 2685 Test



- Tests carried out according to ISO 2685 protocol
- Use propane burner as fire source
- Facility to apply +ve and –ve pressure to back face
- Facility to vibrate sample

Enhance with IR Imager for rear face temperature measurement

#### **ISO 2685 Pre-Test Calibration**





Measurements of temperature with an array of nine thermocouples



Measurements of heat flux using a continuous water flow calorimeter

#### ISO2685 Burner





Burner exit plane, 373 large holes – fuel and primary air, and 340 small holes – secondary air



### Fuselage burnthrough test in progress





- Flammability testing
- Vertical testing with bunsen burner
  - Flame applied for 10 s and then removed
  - Flame is reapplied for another 10 s once the flaming has stopped
- Persistence & length of burn measured

#### **Protective shields**





Shield survives but deforms Panel off-gases & collapses Volatiles burn-off at edge of panel

#### Shielded composite



#### Surface coatings - 1





#### No improvement to performance Resin burns off with loss of structural strength

### Surface coatings - 2





#### FASTBLOCK 300

Ceramic loaded silicon-based proprietary fire protection coating

2 mm AL panel survives test with 4 mm coating

Rear temperatures little above ambient Problems with adhesion to composite Useful for repairs



#### Results: AL plate thickness & ventilation





### Composite hardening



- Composite hardened panels show good performance in lab-based UL 94 tests
- No improvement over unhardened materials in large-scale fire tests
- Toxicity problems with carbon nano-tube hardeners
- Hexcel composite shows promise but not yet tested

### CFD Modelling – 1



- ANSYS CFX-12
  - General purpose commercial CFD code
  - Compressible flow solver
  - Physics
    - Turbulence
    - Combustion
    - Chemical reactions
    - Radiation
    - Multi-phase flows
    - Multi-physics

### CFD Modelling – 2



- Hybrid mesh
  - Prismatic cells in nearwall region
  - Tetrahedral cells elsewhere
- Menter's SST turbulence model
  - K-ω model in the nearwall region
  - K- $\varepsilon$  model elsewhere
- Combustion
  - Eddy BreakUp model

- Radiation
  - P1 model
  - Discrete Transfer model
  - Monte Carlo model
- Sensitivity analysis effects on the solution to
  - Mesh resolution
  - Choice of
    - Turbulence model
    - Radiation model (not shown here)
- All simulations were performed as steady state calculations

#### Mesh Sensitivity





#### **Turbulence model**







#### Menter's SST model

*k-ε* model

#### Temperature (IR)





20.0°C

unity

### Summary – Experimental



- Material protection
  - Hardened composites provide little advantage
  - Thin ceramic coatings provide no benefit
  - Thick Fastblock coatings provide good protection and insulation
  - Thin stainless steel sheets prevent flame penetration but transfer heat sufficient to volatilise composite resins

#### Testing

- Testing must be carried out under pressure to fully examine composite performance
- Lab scale fire testing does not give true idea of composite performance

### Summary – Modelling



- CFD modelling is feasible, but further work is required
- Outstanding tasks
  - Validation no comparison between experiments and modelling yet
  - No conjugate heat transfer in the test panel
  - Material degradation is modelled with 1D model not reported here

### Acknowledgements



- Work funded by a combination of
  - EU FP6 Programme
  - Health & Safety Executive
  - Rolls-Royce
  - Other UK Government Departments