

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGEForm Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE Technical Papers		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Please see attached				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER In-House	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 62500F	
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER 3058	
				5e. TASK NUMBER 00E7	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER 549983	
				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S NUMBER(S) AFRL-PR- ED-TP-FY99-0098	
				12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT 20030312 057					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT A	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Leilani Richardson
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (661) 275-5015

✓ Spreadsheet
✓ DTS

MEMORANDUM FOR PRR (Contractor/In-House Publication)

FROM: PROI (TI) (STINFO)

1 June 1999

SUBJECT: Authorization for Release of Technical Information, Control Number: AFRL-PR-ED-TP-FY99-0098
Mosze, "Liquid Rocket Propulsion - Evolution and Advancements: Rocket-Based Combined Cycle"

AIAA

(Public Release)

----- of distribution



Liquid Rocket Propulsion – Evolution and Advancements

Rocket-Based Combined Cycle

Dr. Ray Moszée

**Air Force Research Laboratory
Edwards AFB, CA**

June 25, 1999



Outline

- **Background**
- **History of RBCC**
- **Integrated Performance Analysis**
- **Current Activities**
- **Future Prospects**




Cycle Benefits

- Engine performance covers a broad operating range
 - Hypersonic vehicle mission application
- Benefits derived from Airbreathing Propulsion
 - High specific impulse
 - Low vehicle gross weight
- Benefits derived from Rocket Propulsion
 - High thrust (acceleration)
 - High energy density
 - Design experience
- Optimum performance is achieved by combined cycle approach
 - Synergistically blends rocket and ram/scramjet propulsion technology
 - Vehicle designer's options are broadened considerably



RBCC Engine Operating Modes



Ducted Rocket

Low Speeds
Mach 0 to 1.5

Rocket Ramjet

Low Mach Numbers
Mach 1.5 to 3

Ramjet

Mach 3 to 5

Scramjet

Mach 5 to 10


Rocket

Mach > 10 and/or
High Altitude

- Bridges air and space more than any propulsion concept
- Enables low cost DoD and commercial space launch systems
- Provides trans-atmospheric vehicle capability enabling many new missions



RBCC Engine Description






RBCC History


- RBCC engine is not a new propulsion cycle
 - Significant work has been accomplished back in the 60's
- Engine cycle experienced a rebirth in the 90's
 - Military applications
 - Commercial applications
- Performance and structural challenges of the past will hopefully be solved by incorporating recent technology advancements
 - Improved specific impulse
 - Higher engine thrust-to-weight
 - Efficient thermal management
- Opportunities exist for joint government / industry investments



Hyperjet



Dual-Mode Rocket/Ramjet Engine (1958)
Reached the Flight Demonstration Stage




Rocket Mode Launch

The First RBCC Engine Tested




Rocket Engine Nozzle Ejector (RENE)



Air-Augmented Rocket Powered Multistage Vehicle


RENE Propulsion System (1960)

SIMPLE AIR-AUGMENTED ROCKET
(e.g., RENE-ROCKET ENGINE NOZZLE EJECTOR)






Rocket Engine Nozzle Ejector (RENE)




**Detailed Hardware View of the LO₂ / RP-1
Water-Cooled Thrust Chamber Assembly
Used in the Air-Augmented Cluster**




**12 Thrust Chamber Cluster at
NASA MSFC Test Laboratory**



Rocket Engine Nozzle Ejector (RENE)




**12 Thrust Chamber Cluster at
NASA MSFC Test Laboratory**



**MSFC Rocket Cluster Firing
LO₂ / RP-1, 12x500 lb_f-thrust, 1000 psi**




Inlet Flow Entrainment



- **Ejector (primary) rocket provides inlet airflow entrainment (Mach 0-3)**
 - Operates on the principle of mixing between two streams of gas
 - Mixer length constitutes a performance loss in terms of drag, weight, etc.
 - Various mixing enhancement techniques have been explored.
 - Additional research in this area is needed to better understand and optimize the cycle.
- **Inlet (secondary) airflow provides substantial rocket performance augmentation**
 - Induced air mixes and burns with fuel-rich gases from the primary rocket exhaust
 - Improvements occur in both engine thrust and Isp



The Ejector Ramjet Engine




Ejector Ramjet Engine Schematic
(with Flowpath Stations Noted)

- Extensive RBCC ejector ramjet testing conducted from 1964-68
 - Air Force Aero Propulsion Laboratory (Sponsor)
 - The Marquardt Corporation
 - Explored both ejector and ramjet modes (Mach 0-6 range)
- Subscale “boilerplate” engines built and tested (16-18” dia.)
 - Regeneratively cooled
 - Fixed and variable area throats (translating plug nozzle)
 - Hydrogen / oxygen propellants
 - Hydrogen-peroxide / JP-4 propellants




The Ejector Ramjet Engine




**USAF / Marquardt Ejector Ramjet
Subscale Ground-Test Engine (1965)
Hydrogen / Oxygen Propellants
as Initially Configured**

**USAF / Marquardt Ejector Ramjet
Subscale Ground-Test Engine (1966)
Hydrogen / Oxygen Propellants**






The Ejector Ramjet Engine



**USAF / Marquardt Ejector Ramjet
Subscale Ground-Test Engine (1967)
Hydrogen Peroxide / JP-4 Propellants**

**Ejector Ramjet Engine Under Test
in Ejector Mode (H_2O_2 / JP-4)**






Integrating RBCC and LACE


- RBCC was only one of several innovative engine types
 - Interest existed in exploring potential uses of cryogenic hydrogen
 - Various applications were examined in the late 50s, early 60s
- Experimental work included the Liquid Air Cycle Engine (LACE)
 - Practical application of cryogenic hydrogen fuel
 - LAIR served as the rocket oxidizer combusting with hydrogen
 - SLS Engine Isp could Triple that of the ERJ (1300-1400 sec)
- Primary rockets in the RBCC could operate at an O/F = 34:1
 - Offered unprecedented performance for the propulsion community
 - Came with the cost of additional (and often complex) hardware
 - Came with the cost of certain operational complications
- The basic LACE was literally an airbreathing rocket engine
 - Several high performance engine concepts were derived




Liquid Air Cycle Engine



Basic LACE Engineering Test Apparatus




Basic Liquid Air Cycle Engine (LACE)



RBCC LACE Ejector Ramjet (RAMLACE)



Flightweight LACE Concept



- LACE was originated by Marquardt in 1957
 - Charles Lindley and the late Carl Builder were the inventors
 - Requires a series of compact cryohydrogen heat exchangers
 - Operation is constrained by thermal balances and temperature difference
 - Needs far more hydrogen than required for stoichiometric combustion
- LACE remains an attractive option up to speeds in the range of Mach 5-6
 - Performance falls off drastically at higher speeds due to inlet momentum penalties
 - A diverse set of approaches were explored to further enhance performance



The NAS7-377 Study

“ A Study of Composite Propulsion Systems for Advanced Launch Vehicle Applications ”

- **A systematic assessment of the significance and merits of a variety of composite propulsion systems in the post-1975 period**
 - Provided a detailed examination of technology ramifications
 - Emphasized critical or pacing technology requirements
 - Successfully “sorted out” and defined the leading contenders
- **NASA contract was awarded in 1966 to a Marquardt-led team**
 - Rocketdyne’s rocket expertise complemented TMC’s A/B forte
 - Lockheed California provided the hypersonic vehicle design expertise
- **Emphasis was on two-stage horizontal takeoff and landing concepts**
 - First stage was powered by a range of “composite” A/B - rocket engines
 - Second stage used advanced hydrogen / oxygen rocket propulsion



The NAS7-377 Study




Composite Engine Powered
Lockheed TSTO Vehicle at
Staging (NAS7-377 Study)

- Study provided for a progressive screening down of engine concepts
 - From original 36 to 12, and Finally to 2
 - The analysis and design level of each selection was progressively increased
- The “finalist” engines turned out to be:
 - Supercharged Ejector Ramjet (SERJ) engine (nearer-term technology)
 - ScramLACE (SL) engine (“further out” technology)




NAS7-377 Selected Engines

Supercharged Ejector RamJet




ScramLACE






NAS7-377 Vehicle Concepts


Advanced Rocket System



Cylindrical Body/Wing System





Lifting Body System





NAS7-377 Lessons Learned


**The Study Results Still Serve
the RBCC Community Today.**



Same Methods and Techniques Should be Used to Conduct Integrated Performance Analysis.




NAS7-377 Study



- SERJ and SL surpassed the all-rocket and composite cycle comparison cases.
 - Composite cycle propulsion is a strong competitor for advanced launch vehicles.
- NASA elected to support an “extension phase” effort.
 - Marquardt / Rocketdyne / Lockheed team provided further design details.
 - Conducted special studies on points of interest emerging from the basic study
 - All total, a nine volume final report set resulted



Genesis of SERJ






Integrated Performance Analysis

- We can build from what was learned in the past.
 - Methodologies are about the same
 - Tools have changed since the mid-1960s.
 - Make use of available databases.
- There is a better understanding of the requirements for reusable space transportation.
 - Focus on performance analysis
 - Incorporate broad analytical trade studies
- Design support must be provided by:
 - Propulsion
 - Structures
 - Aerodynamics
 - Aerothermodynamics
 - Mass properties
 - System level optimization



Integrated Performance Analysis




RBCC Propelled SSTO Concept






RBCC Engine Envelope






Airbreathing Engine Performance Profiles



Note: Hydrocarbon fuels offer logistically supportable aircraft-like operations.



Airbreathing Engine Performance Profiles




Note: Hydrocarbon fuels offer logistically supportable aircraft-like operations.



Representative RBCC Flight Profile

SSTO Trajectory Simulation






Payoffs of Combined Cycle Engines

- Lower gross takeoff weight for a given payload
- Improved engine specific impulse
 - Rocket Isp 455 sec (vacuum)
 - RBCC Isp 2200 sec (Mach 10)
- Relaxed vehicle mass fraction requirements
 - Rocket SSTO 0.88 -0.91
 - Rocket TSTO 0.85 -0.86
 - RBCC SSTO 0.64 -0.72
 - RBCC TSTO 0.57 -0.64
- Increased flight performance and maneuvering capability
 - All inclination flight
 - Longer duration launch window
 - Increased safety (abort options)



Comparison of I^* versus Mass Fraction for All-Rocket and RBCC Systems

7
GRAPHICAL PORTRAYAL OF THE MODIFIED
IDEAL ROCKET EQUATION SHOWING
CHARACTERISTIC PERFORMANCE AND PMF RANGES
FOR ALL-ROCKET AND RBCC PROPULSION



NASA RBCC Paper



Two-Stage vs. Single-Stage-To Orbit

- We're still trading two-stage versus single-stage-to-orbit.
- Conventional wisdom says SSTO least costly.
 - Maintaining one vehicle cheaper than two
 - Vehicle mating operations eliminated
 - Flight operations simplified
 - BUT,
 - Required mass fractions are elusive.
 - Payload bay volume dominated by propellant volume.
 - Weight margins easily exceed payload weight.
- Two stage systems are more forgiving in design.
 - Less dependence on advanced technologies required.
 - Lift-off mass doesn't go all the way to orbit and back.
 - Less sensitive to weight growth
 - Denser hydrocarbon propellants are attractive.



AFRL Parametric Comparison of Hypersonic Space Lift and Global Reach Concepts



Each Concept has been Parameterized.

- Propulsion Characteristics
- Vehicle Mass Fractions
- Trajectory



The graph plots the function $F(V) = \frac{dv_{\text{boost}}}{dV}$ on the y-axis against Boost Velocity in mps on the x-axis. The y-axis ranges from 0.000 to 1.000 with increments of 0.100. The x-axis ranges from 0 to 10000 with increments of 2000. Several curves are shown, representing different aircraft and conditions:


- Horizontal Takeoff & Landing Assisted Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.900).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.800).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.700).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.600).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.500).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.400).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.300).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.200).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.100).
- Vertical Takeoff, Ballistic:** A curve starting at (0, 1.000) and decreasing to approximately (1000, 0.000).

$$\Delta V = \int_{v_0}^{v_f} \frac{1}{F(v)} dv$$

where: $F(V)$ is the ratio of the actual change in velocity to ΔV invested


V_o is the initial velocity
 V_f is the final boost velocity

Total ΔV Required to Achieve a Required Boost Velocity






Effective Isp and Ascent Profile Modeling



Effective I_{sp} vs Boost Velocity
for Space Lift Concepts



$$I_{sp}^e = \frac{V_f \int_{V_o}^{\infty} \frac{1}{F(V)} dV}{\int_{V_o}^{\infty} F(V) I_{sp}(V) dV}$$

where: $F(V)$ is the ratio of the actual change in velocity to ΔV
 V_o is the initial velocity
 V_f is the final boost velocity

● Airbreathing propulsion assumptions:

- All concepts assuming LH₂/fueled Rocket Based Combined Cycle engines of various designs
- Air Breathing to Mach 16: Assumes an approximate model from NASP
- Air Breathing to Mach 12: Assumes a model from the Aerojet Strutjet project
- Air Breathing to Mach 6: Assumes a model from NASP history
- All concepts assume LH₂ & LOX rocket propulsion at higher Mach numbers

● Single, or first, stage rocket propulsion assumptions:

- Two broad categories assumed:
 - Hydrocarbon & LOX, $I_{sp} \approx 340$ sec vac
 - LH₂ & LOX, $I_{sp} \approx 450$ sec vac

● Upper stage propulsion, when applicable, $I_{sp} \approx 320$ sec vac



Vehicle Mass Accounting Space Lift Concepts

Payload delivered to orbit the key performance "Figure Of Merit" (FOM) for space lift concepts

- Greater than zero means it is feasible
- Relative merit when compared to other concepts
- A key parameter which determines cost

Performance FOM:

Payload Weight to Gross Takeoff Weight Ratio

$$\frac{M_c}{M_o} = \frac{MR + MF - 1}{MF}$$

-or-

$$\frac{M_c}{M_o} = 1 - \frac{(1-MR)}{MP} - \frac{f}{TW_e}$$

Mass Accounting of the Vehicle Concepts

$$M_o = M_s + M_p + M_e + M_c$$

where: M_o is the mass of the vehicle at takeoff
 M_s is the dry mass of the vehicle without the engine
 M_p is the mass of the propellant
 M_e is the mass of the engines
 M_c is the mass of the payload

- Simple mass accounting which captures the key mass contributors
 - Airframe, Engines, Payload & Propellant
- The mass of all concepts are easily parameterized with this accounting

Other Useful Definitions & Relations

$$MR = \frac{M_o - M_p}{M_o} = e^{-\frac{\Delta V}{I_{sp} g_0}}$$

$$MF = \frac{M_p}{M_p + M_s + M_e}$$

$$MP = \frac{M_p}{M_p + M_s}$$

where:

$$MF = \frac{MP(1-MR)}{(1-MR) + MP f / TW_e}$$



$$MP = \frac{MF(1-MR)}{(1-MR) - MF f / TW_e}$$

MR is the vehicle mass fraction
 MF is the propellant mass fraction
 MP is the airframe propellant mass fraction
 f is the vehicle thrust to weight fraction at takeoff
 TW_e is the engine thrust to weight at takeoff conditions



X-33 Provides a Technology Touch Stone


X-33's Airframe Propellant Mass Fraction




X-33's Airframe Demonstrates a Technology Capability

- For concepts where airframe technology has not been demonstrated, X-33 provides a relative measure of what may be possible.


Lifting, Airbreathing Horizontal Takeoff & Landing



Ballistic, Rocket, Generic MSP 1st Stage



Ballistic, Rocket, Generic RLV





Space Lift Concept Comparison

Payload to Orbit Performance Calculations


Concept	ΔV_T	ΔV_1	$\text{Eff}_1 I_{sp}$	MR_1	T/W_{Eng}	T/W_{Veh}	MP_1	MF_1	M_{d1}/M_0	M_1/M_0	ΔV_2	$\text{Eff}_2 I_{sp}$	MR_2	MF_2	M_2/M_1	M_c/M_{dt}	M_c/M_0
RBCC TSTO w/Store. USStg	11160	6340	1586	.666	23	1	.75	.70	.1302	.511	4820	320	.215	.85	.140	18.5%	4.0%
RBCC TSTO w/ Cryo USStg	11160	6340	1586	.696	23	1	.75	.70	.1302	.511	4820	450	.335	.85	.177	55.1%	10.0%
LACE TSTO w/Store USStg	10116	4711	983	.613	12	1	.75	.65	.2084	.401	5405	320	.178	.85	.033	5.2%	1.34%
LACE TSTO w/ Cryp USStg	10116	4711	983	.613	12	1	.75	.65	.2084	.401	5405	450	.294	.85	.169	26.6%	6.8%
Launch Assist	7250	3624	320	.315	40	1	.78	.76	.2163	.100	3626	320	.315	.85	.194	8.3%	1.9%
Rocket Recoverable TSTO	9200	4600	320	.231	70	1.2	.88	.86	.1252	.109	4600	320	.231	.85	.095	7.4%	1.03%
Generic MSP Pop-Up	9200	5500	426	.268	70	1.2	.83	.81	.1717	.101	3700	320	.307	.85	.185	10.3%	1.9%
Generic Rocket SSTO	9200	9200	435	.116	70	1.15	.915	.90*	.0985	.017	-	-	-	-	-	18.3%	1.7%
							(.83)	(.82)	(.1975)	(-.081)						(-41.3%)	(-8.1%)
Generic RBCC SSTO	11160	11160	730	.210	30*	1	.84	.81*	.1838	.026	-	-	-	-	-	14.2%	2.6%
					(23)		(.75)	(.72)	(.3068)	(-.097)						(-31.6%)	(-9.7%)

* A stated requirement, but not necessarily a demonstrated technology or capability
 (##) Estimate from the author's estimate of a achievable technology



AFRL Space Lift Concept Comparison

Excerpt
From
AFRL/PRST
In-House
Analysis
May 1999



- Parametric study of concepts allows “apple-to-apple” comparisons
- Comparison illuminates the potential of each concept
- Emerging propulsion technology offers significant performance improvements




Reusable Military Aerospace Vehicle (RMAV) Study

- **Providing an in-depth systems analysis of vehicle concepts designed to accomplish the future requirements for a military spaceplane**
 - Focus on TSTO configurations, with various staging Mach numbers
 - Evaluating both all-rocket and combined cycle propulsion options
- **Forming multi-disciplinary teams**
 - AFRL's Propulsion (PR), Air Vehicle (VA), Space Vehicle (VS) Directorates
 - Aeronautical Systems Center (ASC)
 - Space and Missile Center (SMC)
 - NASA Research Centers (Langley, Glenn, and MSFC)
- **Anchoring vehicle performance levels using nationally accepted codes**
 - ENG-92 – APAS – CONSIZ – ROCETS
 - POST – RJPA – RAMSCRAM – Etc.
- **Conducting a detailed, iterative synthesis process involving many design parameters and internal variables**
 - Including assessment of technology readiness and development schedule



Integrated Performance Analysis



Creating Analytical Models and Addressing Vehicle Integration Issues, For 1.1.1




NASA Glenn Research Center



Lewis Research Center

Trailblazer Vehicle



201099

Trailblazer Project

- Focusing on Technologies to Enable Affordable Access to Space
- Integrating RBCC Propulsion into a Near-Term Demonstrator
 - SSTO VTOHL Configurations
 - Three Different Class Concepts
- Parallel Development of Vehicle and Propulsion Technologies
- Vying to Become an Integral Part of NASA Bantam Program
 - Concept Downselect in 2001
 - Flight Demo in 2007
- Five In-House Test Rigs in Work
 - Subscale Inlet
 - Ejector Rocket
 - Variable Mode Combustor
 - Vehicle Aerodynamics


**An Aggressive RBCC
Propulsion System
Development**



NASA Langley Research Center

Airbreathing Launch Vehicle (ABL V) Study

- Study is sponsored by NASA MSFC's Advanced Reusable Technologies (ART) project
- Cooperative effort by NASA LaRC, Glenn, and MSFC to evaluate a matrix of SSTO concepts for access to space missions
 - 8 HTOHL configurations
 - 4 VTOHL configurations
- Emphasis on RBCC & TBCC propulsion integration and vehicle design resolution
 - Design
 - Performance Analysis / Closure
 - Sensitivities



Hyper-X
NASA Langley Research Center

3/19/1997

Image # EL-1997-00031



*ABL V Addresses Advanced Propulsion Technology
and Vehicle Integration Challenges.*



NASA Marshall Space Flight Center

Advanced Reusable Technologies (ART) Program

- NASA's Most Aggressive Pursuit of RBCC Engine Technology
- Four Engine Companies Selected (1996)
 - Aerojet
 - Rocketdyne
 - Kaiser Marquardt
 - Pratt & Whitney
- Additional Support Provided By:
 - Pennsylvania State (CFD)
 - Astrox Corp. (Flowpath Analysis)
- Several Subscale Engines Built and Tested at GASL, Focusing On:
 - Performance
 - Mode Transition
- Results Could Lead to Flight Demo.
 - Bantam
 - Future -X



**ART is Establishing a
Pipeline of Demonstrations
that will Facilitate Future
RBCC Engine Designs**



Future Prospects

- Air Force and NASA recognize RBCC technology may be the key to affordable access to space.
- Today's engine technology programs are leveraging off of past accomplishments
 - Liquid rocket propulsion is the Foundation to the engine cycle
 - Ejector rocket are very Mature and have a large database
 - Liquid rocket technology advancements are directly applicable to RBCC
- There is a need to better understand overall engine performance
 - Identify performance margins
 - Increase design robustness
 - Build flight-type hardware
 - Characterize engine mode transition
- Many challenges are being addressed in current programs.



Future Prospects

- RBCC technology is rapidly approaching the limit of what can be accomplished through ground testing.
- The next step is the design, fabrication and testing of a lightweight propulsion system
 - Actively cooled composite structures
 - Flight-type propellant delivery system
 - Flight-type engine controls
- For military operations, there is a need for engine analysis and design using hydrocarbon fuels.
- RBCC technology holds the promise of routine access to space
 - Vehicle robustness
 - Increased payload mass fractions