

OWNER'S & OPERATOR'S GUIDE: 737NG FAMILY

- i) Specifications, fleet & developments, page 4
- ii) Fuel burn performance, page 10
- iii) Maintenance analysis & budget, page 12

737NG family & CFM56-7B specifications, fleet & developments

There are four main variants of the 737NG family. These are powered by six variants of the CFM56-7B. The main specifications of the aircraft and engine variants, the production line and fleet, product developments, and main product features and performance characteristics are examined here.

The next generation (NG) 737 family was launched in 1993 as a complete new family to replace the earlier 737 Classics, with the first NG being delivered in 1997. The 737NG was developed in response to competition from the A320 family and customer calls for a more advanced aircraft. The NG family includes the -600, -700, -800 and -900 series of aircraft, which are all powered by the CFM56-7B engine series. The 737-600 is the smallest and the -900 is the largest series of 737s.

Fleet demographics

The 737NG is operated globally, with 3,225 in service. About one-third of the fleet is based in North America. The Asia Pacific and Europe account for 28% and 25% of the aircraft, while the Middle East operates just 2%. South America and Africa have small fleets.

Southwest Airlines is the largest operator, with its 343 aircraft accounting for more than 10% of the entire 737NG global fleet. Ryanair is the second largest operator, with 235 737-800s.

The next two largest fleets are with Continental Airlines (186) and American Airlines (119), followed by Gol Transportes Aereos (90), WestJet (88) and Alaska Airlines (83). Air China and Delta Air Lines both have 81 NGs, followed by China Southern airlines (73) and SAS (66). China Eastern Airlines and Turkish Airlines (THY) each have 54. The popularity of the 737NG is reflected in its operation by 240 airlines.

While the 737NG is in many ways a new design of aircraft, it has retained some levels of commonality with the Classic, including the flightdeck layout and the basic airframe design. Differences include the optional addition of winglets, advanced avionics, 30% increased fuel capacity and a new engine.

With the addition of more fuel

capacity, winglets and more powerful engines, the NG fuselage was strengthened. In addition, the tail height was increased and the landing struts were lengthened to reduce the possibility of tailstrikes. The result is an aircraft that can deal more easily with hot-and-high airports, has a faster cruise speed of Mach 0.78 and a higher altitude of 41,000 feet. There is no flightdeck commonality with the earlier Classics.

Flightdeck

The 737NG flightdeck includes, as standard, six flat-panel liquid-crystal display (LCD) screens.

In 2002 Boeing introduced a demonstrator 737-900 to showcase nine advanced flightdeck technologies for the aircraft. These are marketed as an improved flightdeck experience in both operation and efficiency, as well as reducing noise and improving safety.

The 737NG was the first commercial aircraft to use military Head-up Display (HUD) technology, although this is still only available as an option. HUD is a glass display positioned at eye level that superimposes an image of the runway over the actual view out of the window during take-off and landing. It also shows critical information such as airspeed, altitude, attitude and flight path. HUD aims to reduce flight delays and cancellations by minimising the effect of poor visibility; it can allow take-off with as little as 300 feet of visibility, despite many regulating bodies requiring a minimum of 600 feet.

Landing can be improved by adding an Integrated Approach Navigation (IAN) system and a Global Positioning Landing System (GLS). IAN integrates 18 approach procedures into one common operational approach, while GLS accurately pinpoints an aircraft's position and enables airports to remain operational in adverse weather conditions.

In 2003, Virgin Blue became the first carrier to use Boeing's Vertical Situation Display (VSD) on its 737s. This display shows, graphically, an aircraft's position within its current and predicted flight path. The system is derived from ground proximity warning systems, and it enables a pilot to be more aware of ground terrain and possible runway overshoots. The use of VSD could mean a more efficient use of airspace in the future, allowing aircraft to fly closer together.

To this end, Boeing believes that its Navigation Performance Scales (NPS) could be able to tell a pilot their position to within 15 feet, by using global positioning technology to locate an aircraft accurately on a pilot's display.

The Quiet Climb System (QCS) reduces the effect that an aircraft's noise has on communities living close to an airport. Engine thrust is automatically reduced during take-off at sensitive airports to reduce pilot workload. The system could enable an airline to increase its payload while still remaining within airport noise limits. This will become more important as an increasing number of airports impose noise restrictions, especially at night.

Winglets

The 737NG's standard wings use advanced technology to ensure an improvement in fuel efficiency and an increase in fuel capacity, thereby increasing the aircraft's range. The wing area of the 737NG is 25% larger than the 737 Classic's, which equates to 30% more fuel volume, or a standard capacity of 6,875US Gallons (USG) on all the series, except the 737-900ER, which also has two auxiliary tanks.

As mentioned, the economy cruise speed is Mach 0.78, compared to Mach 0.74 for the 737 Classics.

The 737NG's performance is

737NG AND CFM56-7B SPECIFICATIONS TABLE

Aircraft Model	Engine options	Maximum take-off thrust lbs	MTOW lbs	MLW lbs	MZFW lbs	Max. fuel capacity USG	Typical seating 1 class	2 class	Max. range 2-class with winglets nm	Typical cruise speed (M)	Cargo volume -cu.ft.	Overall length ft.in.
737-600	CFM56-7B18E	18,400	124,000	120,500	113,500	6,875	132	110	1,310	0.785	720	102'6"
	CFM56-7B20	20,600	145,500			6,875	132	110	3,225	0.785	720	102'6"
	CFM56-7B22E	22,000	145,000	120,500	114,000	6,875	132	110	3,225	0.785	720	102'6"
737-700	CFM56-7B20E	19,700	133,000	128,000	120,500	6,875	149	126	1,580	0.781	966	110'4"
	CFM56-7B20	20,600	154,500			6,875	149	126	3,440	0.785	966	110'4"
	CFM56-7B26E	26,100	154,500	129,200	121,700	6,875	149	126	3,440	0.781	966	110'4"
737-700BBJ	CFM56-7B27E-B3	27,300	171,000	134,000	126,000	10,707 (9 aux. tanks)	8+	n/a	6,235 (1 class, & no aux. tanks)	0.79	169 (9 aux. tank)	110'4"
737-700C	CFM56-7B24E	23,700	154,500	134,000	126,000	6,875	140	126	2,725 (1 class) 1,775 (cargo)	0.78	966 3,750	110'4"
	CFM56-7B24	24,200	171,000			6,875	140	126	3,285 (1-class)	0.78	966	110'4"
	CFM56-7B26E	26,100	171,000	134,000	126,000	6,875		126	3,285 (1-class) 3,000 (cargo)	0.78	966 3,750	110'4"
737-700ER	CFM56-7B24E	23,700	154,500	129,200	121,000	6,875	48	76	3,975 (1 class, & no aux. tanks)	0.777	966	110'4"
	CFM56-7B26E	26,100	171,000	134,000	126,000	10,707 (9 aux. tanks)	48	76	5,775 (1-class & 9 aux. tanks)	0.78	183 (9 aux. tanks)	110'4"
	CFM56-7B27/B1	27,300	171,000			6,875-10,707 (depending on aux. tanks)	48	76	5,775 (1-class)	0.78	165-966 (dependant on aux. tanks)	110'4"
737-800	CFM56-7B24	24,200	174,200			6,875	189	162	3,115	0.785	1,555	129'6"
	CFM56-7B24	23,700	155,500	144,000	136,000	6,875	189	162	1,995	0.789	1,555	129'6"
	CFM56-7B27/B1E	28,400	174,200	146,300	138,300	6,875	189	162	3,115	0.789	1,555	129'6"
737-800BBJ	CFM56-7B27E-B3	27,300	174,000	146,300	138,300	10,442 (9 aux. tanks)	8+	n/a	5,620 (1 class & 7 aux. tanks)	0.79	256+	129'6"
737-900ER	CFM56-7B26E	26,100	164,000	149,300	141,300	7,837 (2 aux. tanks)	215	180	1,850	0.79	1,827 (no aux. tanks)	138'2"
	CFM56-7B26/3	26,300	187,700			7,837 (2 aux. tanks)	215	180	3,265	0.78	1,585 (2 aux. tanks)	138'2"
	CFM56-7B27E/B1F	28,400	187,700	157,300	149,300	215	180	3,265	0.79	1,585 (2 aux. tanks)	138'2" (2 aux. tanks)	
737-900ERBBJ3	CFM56-27E-B3	27,300	187,700	157,300	149,300	10,966 (9 aux. tanks)	8+	n/a	5,495 (1 class & 8 aux tanks)	0.79	208+	138'2"

Evolution data source: Boeing

enhanced by the addition of blended winglets, which are extensions to the wings that reduce drag and increase lift. Winglets are now available as a production option on all 737NG variants, except the -600, or as a retrofit option through Aviation Partners Boeing (APB). The possibility of installing winglets on the -600 is currently being examined.

The specific improvements that winglets can offer are: improved climb gradient meaning and a standard take-off weight at hot-and-high, and noise-restricted or limited runways; reduced climb thrust, meaning an extension of engine life and reduction in maintenance costs due to engine de-rate; and reduced fuel burn of up to 4% on longer flights, after the additional weight of the winglets is taken into account. Lower fuel burn will reduce emissions and improve range. Since an aircraft fitted with winglets aircraft can reduce the thrust level it requires during the climb stage, it can also reduce its noise levels, thereby reducing many additional operational and financial restrictions.

Engines

All 737NGs are equipped with CFM56-7B engines. There are six thrust variants of the -7B series, rated at between 19,500lbs and 27,300lbs thrust.

The engine offers 180-minute extended-range twin-engine operations (ETOPs) and full authority digital electronic control (FADEC). The CFM56-7B is a high-bypass, two-shaft engine. It is based on the CFM56-3, but the -7B incorporates many of the developments seen on the CFM56-5A/B series, as well as improvements of its own (see *Operator's & Owner's Guide: CFM56-7B, Aircraft Commerce, June/July 2008, page 10*).

There are also two main upgrade options available: the 'Tech Insertion' programme, launched in 2004; and the 'CFM56-7B Evolution' upgrade, announced in 2009.

The original CFM56-7B low-pressure shaft consists of a single-stage 61-inch diameter fan and a three-stage low pressure compressor (LPC). The number of fan blades on the -7B is reduced to 24,

from 44 on the CFM56-3 series. The -7B's 3-D aero design, increased airflow and wide-chord fan blades, give it higher bypass ratios than the -3 and -5A/B series. The -7B's bypass ratios vary from 5.1, for the highest rated variant, to 5.5 for the lowest thrust rating. This compares to a bypass ratio of 4.9-5.0:1 ratio for the -3 series.

The fan is powered by a four-stage low pressure turbine (LPT).

The high pressure shaft of the original -7B consists of a nine-stage high-pressure compressor (HPC). The HPC has been further developed over the years and the -7B again benefits from 3-D aero design techniques to improve efficiency and aerodynamics. The HPC is powered by the single-stage high-pressure turbine (HPT). The -7B uses single crystal HPT blades.

As an option, the engine is available with a single (SAC) or double annular combustor (DAC). Engines with a DAC are denoted with a /2 suffix, but they have not been as popular as hoped. The DAC offers a reduction of as much as 40% of NOx emissions compared to the

737NG GLOBAL FLEET SUMMARY

Engine Model	Africa		Asia Pacific		Europe		Middle East		North America		South America		Model Series	
	Active	Parked	Active	Parked	Active	Parked	Active	Parked	Active	Parked	Active	Parked	Total	Total
737-600	13		1		36				19				69	69
737-700	34		201	3	129	1	9		531	3	111		1,022	
737-700AEW&C			5			1							6	
737-700BBJ	4	1	12	1	11	4	18		27	4	8	1	91	
737-700C	1						2		20				23	
737-700ER			2										2	1,144
737-800	85		625	1	621	7	35		389	5	98		1,866	
737-800BBJ					2		9	1	1		2		15	
737-800P-8A									3	2			5	1,886
737-900			23		5				24				52	
737-900ER			39		2				30				71	
737-900ERBBJ							1		2				3	126
Geo sub-total	137	1	908	5	806	13	74	1	1,046	14	219	1	3,225	3,225

standard -7B combustor, due to a second combustion area used during high-thrust times.

The 'Tech Insertion' programme entered service on all new engines from 2007, and is also available as an upgrade kit for older engines.

It improves fuel burn by 1% and increases exhaust gas temperature (EGT) margins by 10 degrees, which in turn can increase time on-wing by up to 10%. Components of the HPT, LPT and SAC have been improved, while the HPC blades have been redesigned. Those engines that have the 'Tech Insertion' upgrades are denoted with a /3 suffix. 'Evolution' engines will be denoted with an 'E' at the end.

737-600

The 737-600 is the smallest of the NG family, and has the same fuselage length as the earlier -500 and -200 variants. The -600 has 110 seats in a standard US-style two-class configuration, and 132 in an all-economy configuration. This makes it a direct competitor to the A318 and a replacement for the 737-500.

Only 69 of these aircraft are operated by just nine airlines, accounting for just 2% of the fleet. Two large operators are SAS and WestJet. Others include Malev and Air Algerie. The oldest aircraft, still operated by SAS, is over 11 years old.

There are two engine model options for aircraft up to and including line number 447. These are the CFM56-7B20 and the -7B22. Aircraft from line number 510 and above are equipped with the CFM56-7B22.

Over 93% of the former have a maximum take-off weight (MTOW) of 127,500lbs, and are mainly located in Europe. The latter have an MTOW range

of 127,500-145,000lbs, and all 19 North American -600s are this variant.

The fleet averages about 1.5 flight hours (FH) per flight cycle (FC). There is a difference in the daily utilisation of the two engine options. The lower-powered aircraft average nearly two hours less utilisation per day than the CFM56-7B22 equipped aircraft.

The range of this series is up to 3,225nm when equipped with winglets and in a two-class configuration.

737-700

The -700 series entered service in January 1998 with Southwest Airlines. It is still the largest operator of the 737NG fleet, and the -700 series in particular, with a total of 343 aircraft. The 737-700 was designed to replace the -300 and compete with the A319. The -700 is powered by two CFM56-7B variants and the standard fuel capacity remains at 6,875USG.

In total there are 1,144 -700s, with just over half of them (585) being operated in North America. Asia Pacific operates 20% of the fleet, Europe 13% and South America 10%.

After Southwest Airlines, the largest operator is WestJet with 64 aircraft, followed by airTran Airways (52), China Eastern Airlines (40), Continental Airlines (36) and Gol Transportes Aereos (29).

There are five models within the series: the standard -700, the -700C convertible version, the executive Boeing Business Jet (BBJ), the AEW&C, and the long range -700ER.

The standard 737-700 typically carries 126 passengers in a two-class configuration, or 149 all-economy seats. Most, 1,022, are the -700 model, with again over 50% being in North America.

Operators generally operate the aircraft on flights of 1-3FH, with Southwest generating utilisation of more than 10FH per day. The MTOW varies from 133,000lbs to 154,500lbs. Newer aircraft are more likely to have a higher MTOW, while the thrust of the most powerful engine variant is rated at 26,300lbs.

Up to and including line number 2,465, the -700 is powered by a mixture of CFM56-7B20, -7B22, -7B24, -7B26 and -7B27 engines. Most aircraft are powered by the -7B22 and -7B24.

From line number 2,473, the engine variant selections include the -7B20, -7B22/3, -7B24/3 and -7B26/3. The standard -700 has a range of up to 3,440nm when fitted with winglets.

The 737-700C convertible can be converted from passenger to freighter configuration by removing the seats, although the sidewalls and overhead lockers remain. The wings have been strengthened and are identical to those on the executive BBJ. There is a new cargo handling system and 133.86 inches X 82.68 inches (3.4 x 2.1m) maindeck cargo door, which assists the aircraft in loading up to 40,000lbs (18,200kg) of cargo. In addition to the 966 cubic feet of belly space, the maindeck can accommodate 2,834 cubic feet of cargo. There are 23 examples. The -700C is powered by the -7B24, -7B22/3, -7B26 and -7B27/B1.

The MTOW is higher for the convertible example at 171,000lbs, with the maximum engine thrust also increased to 27,300lbs. In single-class passenger mode, the aircraft has 140 seats and a range of 3,285nm. In freighter mode, range is 3,000nm.

The 737-700ER has an increased MTOW of 171,000lbs: 16,500lbs more than the standard -700. The -700ER



utilises the -800's wings and landing gear. All Nippon Airways is the only operator, with two aircraft. They are powered by the -7B27/B1, and the aircraft has a range of 5,775nm when in a one-class configuration and with all auxiliary fuel tanks and winglets. The option for up to nine auxiliary fuel tanks gives a fuel capacity of 10,707USG. This model can seat up to 126 passengers in a two-class layout, or up to 48 with all-premium seating. It is capable of trans-oceanic flights.

737-800

The 737-800 entered service in April 1998 with Hapag-Lloyd of Germany. The variant was seen as a replacement for the 737-400 (although the -800 has a longer fuselage), as well as the MD-80/-90 and 727, and a competitor to the A320. It can carry up to 189 passengers in a one-class layout and up to 162 in a two-class configuration.

The -800 has two more fuselage plugs than the -700, and an extra pair of overwing exits. Additional differences include an increased engine thrust of up to 27,300lbs, with the -7B27, and a resized main landing gear and structure.

The 737NG winglets have been available as a retrofit to the -800 since May 2001. They improve fuel efficiency by up to 7%, and increase the range of the aircraft to 3,115nm when in a two-class configuration.

The 737-800's size has seen it become the most popular and the best-selling variant of the 737NG family, with 1,886 737-800s operating globally. Asia Pacific and Europe each operate 33% of the

fleet, while North America has accounts for just 21%.

The -800's popularity is illustrated by the fact that only 16 aircraft are parked, meaning that over 99% are active. The largest operator is Ryanair, with 235, followed by American Airlines with 119 and Continental Airlines with 108. Other large operators include Delta Air Lines (71), Air China (67), Gol Transportes Aereos (61) and Alaska Airlines and Hainan Airlines (52 each). Nearly 90% of the 737-800 North American fleet is with just four operators, while nearly 40% of the European fleet is with only one.

There are three models currently in operation: the standard -800, the BBJ and the -800P-84. The most numerous is the standard -800 of which there are 1,866 aircraft. This accounts for 99% of the -800 series fleet, and 58% of the entire 737NG family.

This model is generally equipped with CFM56-7B26 engines up to and including line number 2,476. The exceptions are: 295 -7B27-powered aircraft, 140 aircraft powered by -7B24 engines, one -7B26/2-powered aircraft, 16 -7B26/3-equipped aircraft and 10 aircraft equipped with -7B27/3 engines. This group of aircraft, numbering just over 1,300, mostly have MTOWs of 172,500, with a range of 155,500lbs to 174,200lbs.

After line number 2,479, aircraft are generally equipped with the CFM56-7B26/3, although 130 aircraft are powered by the -7B24/3, and 71 aircraft have -7B27/3 engines. The later group of aircraft were all delivered from January 2008 onwards, and vary in MTOW from

The 737-700 is the second most popular variant of the 737NG family. There are more than 1,100 in service, and the majority of the aircraft are powered by CFM56-7B20 and -7B22 engines. Southwest Airlines operates the largest -700 fleet, with more than 340 aircraft.

147,688lbs to 174,163lbs. The lower MTOWs are more popular.

There are another 15 737-800BBJ executive aircraft and five -800P-8A military variants in operation.

737-900

The 737-900 has the longest fuselage barrel of all the NG family variants, being about eight-and-a-half feet longer than the -800.

There are two main sub-variants: the -900 and -900ER.

The standard -900 model could have been considered a competitor to the A321, but the -900 has the same fuel capacity, seat numbers and MTOW as the -800. The -900's limited seat capacity is because it has the same emergency exit configuration as the -800 series. The -900s are powered by the CFM56-7B24 and -7B26 engines, with most having MTOWs of 174,000lbs while a few are as low as 164,500lbs.

As a result of limited seat capacity, there are only 52 -900s in operation. Alaska Airlines was the launch customer for the aircraft in 2001, while the largest operator is Korean Air with 16 aircraft.

Due to poor sales the 737-900 was superseded in 2007 by the -900ER. This variant became a realistic competitor to the A321, while also filling a hole left by the 757-200. The overwing and Type I door exits were kept, but with the addition of two Type II exit doors, it was possible to increase the passenger capacity to a maximum of 215.

With the addition of two auxiliary fuel tanks and winglets, the range is increased to 3,265nm. The landing gear, wingbox and keel beam structure have been strengthened to accommodate the increased MTOW of up to 187,700lbs. In addition there is a two-position tail skid and a flat rear-pressure bulkhead, which makes space for additional passenger seats. All the -900ER aircraft have the blended winglet option as standard. The majority of the aircraft are equipped with CFM56-7B26/3 engines, while six aircraft are equipped with -7B27/3 engines.

There are 47 -900ERs in operation, with 42 operated by Continental and Lion Airlines.

There are an additional three variants of the BBJ version in operation.

In addition to the 3,225 aircraft in service, there are another 2,047 737Gs on firm order. The 737-800 alone will have more than 3,200 examples in operation, and the 737NG will be the most numerous commercial aircraft in service.

Orders

There are currently 2,047 737NGs due for delivery from April 2010. This figure consists of 495 -700s, 1,363 -800s and 189 -900s/-900ERs.

While North America currently has the largest NG fleet, the Asia Pacific has orders for 535 aircraft, 26 units more than North American operators have on order.

This coincides with a large growth in the regional market place for Asian operators, backed up by the increase in, and growth of, low-cost carriers (LCCs). Lion Airlines of Indonesia, for example, has ordered 148 more aircraft to add to its current 36, and Virgin Blue is adding 60.

Of the 495 -700s on order, 473 are for the -700 aircraft, 18 are BBJs, and four are military convertible -700s. The largest customer is currently Southwest, with 87 aircraft due to be delivered by 2017.

Of the 1,363 737-800 aircraft on order, 1,359 are standard -800 models. Most of those that have been ordered are destined for Europe and the Asia Pacific. The largest orders are with Ryanair (104), Virgin Blue Airlines (60), and Air Berlin (51), which also operates 20 737-700s.

Of the 189 737-900s that are on order, 185 of them are -900ERs. There are 152 destined for the Asia Pacific and 22 going to Europe, while the remainder are going to Africa and North America. The biggest order is from Lion Airlines, which has ordered a total of 148 -900ERs.

As well as by airlines, large orders have also been placed by lessors, and many still have a number of aircraft outstanding. Aviation Capital Group has orders for 63, DAE Capital has a backlog of 70, while GECAS is awaiting 66 aircraft.

Developments

There have also been several additions to the 737NG's design during its operation. As mentioned there have been improvements to the flightdeck with many avionic additions as well as the addition blended winglets.

Boeing is considering emerging



technology, such as Enhanced Vision Systems (EVS) and Synthetic Vision Systems (SVS), to improve pilots' visibility at night and in bad weather.

In 2008 Delta Air Lines took delivery of a 737-700 with carbon brakes rather than steel. Boeing now offers carbon brakes on all 737NGs, and uses a new product from Messier-Bugatti, which reduces weight by as much as 700lbs.

Boeing acted on the needs of Gol Transportes Aereos, and developed a short-field performance package. With many of Gol's airports being restricted, the airline needed to find ways to improve the aircraft's take-off and landing performance. The package has been made available as an option on all NGs, and is also available as standard on the -900ER.

In April 2009 CFMI and Boeing stated that they would work to reduce fuel consumption by 2% by 2011. The reduction would be achieved through a combination of engine and airframe developments. The airframe will have structural improvements to reduce drag, which should result in a reduction in fuel consumption by 1%.

The engine will produce the other 1% through the 'CFM56-7B Evolution' upgrade. This will involve a reduction in parts, an improved engine cooling system and better aerodynamics on the HPT and LPT. The improvements are expected to provide operators with a 4% reduction in maintenance costs. CFMI has also commented that the expected 1% fuel

reduction was shown to be better at 1.6% during tests in 2010. Tests of a twin annular premixing swirler combustor (TAPS), which was first used on the GE90, have been conducted on the CFM56-7B and show a further NOx reduction of at least 20% compared to DAC engines.

Further developments will see the 737 in operation for many more decades to come. One option could involve a re-engining, while another may involve a completely new design. This new design has provisionally been named Y1, and is unlikely to proceed until the 787 has been established in operation.

In the meantime the cabin interior has been updated, with deliveries to be expected from 2010. The new interior will borrow ideas from the 787 dreamliner, and include larger overhead lockers, the use of noise-dampening materials, and the replacement of most lights with LED lighting. This last change will reduce maintenance costs, as will the one-piece sidewalls. Passenger service units and attendant controls have also been updated with touch screen capability for crew and a more simplified layout to assist passengers. The launch airlines include FlyDubai, Continental Airlines, Norwegian Air Shuttle, TUI Travel (London), GOL Airlines and Lion Airlines. 

To download 100s of articles like this, visit:
www.aircraft-commerce.com

737NG fuel burn performance

The fuel burn performance of four CFM56-7B-powered 737NG variants are analysed on five route lengths of between 212nm and 1,483nm.

The CFM56-7B series of engines powers all variants of the 737NG family. This analysis examines fuel burn per sector, per passenger seat and per seat-mile for the four variants over five US routes ranging in length from 212nm to 1,483nm.

For the purposes of this analysis, the 737-600 and -700 are powered by the CFM56-7B22, while the 737-800 and -900ER are powered by the CFM56-7B26.

Flight profiles

Aircraft performance has been analysed both inbound and outbound for each route in order to illustrate the effects of wind speed, and its direction, on the distance flown. The resulting distance is referred to as the equivalent still air distance (ESAD) or nautical air miles (NAM).

Average weather for the month of

June has been used, with 85% reliability winds and 50% reliability temperatures used for that month, in the flight plans produced by Jeppesen. The flight profiles in each case are based on International Flight Rules, which include standard assumptions on fuel reserves, diversion fuel and contingency fuel. Nevertheless, the fuel burn used for the analysis of each sector only includes the fuel used for the trip and taxiing. The optimum routes and levels have been used for every flight, except where it has been necessary to restrict the levels due to airspace or airway restrictions and to comply with standard route and Eurocontrol restrictions.

A taxi time of 20 minutes has been factored into the fuel burns and added to the flight times in order to provide block times. The flight plans have all been calculated using long-range cruise (LRC) with an equivalent cruise speed of Mach 0.78. Although other speeds are more likely on shorter routes, LRC has been

chosen so that all routes can be equally compared for all variants. LRC allows an aircraft to use the least fuel per nm and per seat-mile. Although this means that block times are longer, this is the economical and operational compromise between fuel consumption and flight times.

The aircraft being assessed are assumed to have passenger loads of 110 passengers on the 737-600, 126 on the 737-700, 162 on the 737-800 and 180 on the 737-900ER. These passenger loads are a realistic average of the numbers carried in the two-class configurations utilised by many operators of the 737NG operators. The standard weight for each passenger and their luggage is assumed, on these short-haul flights, to be 200lbs per person, with no additional cargo carried in the hold. The payload carried is therefore: 22,000lbs for the 737-600, 25,200lbs for the 737-700, 32,400 for the 737-800 and 36,000lbs on the 737-900ER.

Route analysis

Five routes of varying lengths were analysed with tracked distances of 212-1,483nm. The routes were chosen as examples of flights that Delta Airlines is currently operating out of its Atlanta hub. All five routes are in the same general direction to avoid the effect of wind distorting the comparison of different variants over different mission lengths.

The first route is Atlanta, GA (ATL) to Columbus/ Starkville/West Point, known as the Gold Triangle Regional (GTR) airport, MS. For this route there was a headwind, causing the tracked distance of 212nm increase to a longer ESAD of 228nm.

The second route is ATL to Springfield, MO (SGF). Again there are headwinds, which have the effect of increasing the tracked distance of 543nm by at least 35nm to an ESAD of 578nm.

The third route is ATL to Omaha, NE (OMA). There is a strong headwind of 32-36kts, which means that the ESAD has an average increase of approximately 55nm over the tracked distance to 810nm.

The fourth route is ATL to Denver, CO (DEN). Again, this route has a strong headwind, the consequence of which is that the ESAD is 127nm longer at

Analysis shows that as route or mission length increases up to about 600nm, the fuel per per seat-mile for each variant reduces. Fuel burn per seat-mile then remains about constant on all longer mission lengths.



FUEL BURN PERFORMANCE OF THE 737-600, -700, -800 & -900ER

City-pair	Aircraft variant	Engine type	Seats	Payload lbs	MTOW lbs	Actual TOW lbs	Block time min	Wind kt	ESAD nm	Track Dist (nm)	Max Fuel capacity (lbs)	Trip fuel burn (USG)	Fuel per seat (USG)	Fuel per seat-mile (USG)
ATL-GTR	B737-600	CFM56-7B22	110	22,000	143,500	112,576	59	M34	228	212	48,900	535	4.860	0.021
ATL-GTR	B737-700	CFM56-7B22	126	25,200	154,500	118,167	58	M34	226	212	39,600	539	4.274	0.019
ATL-GTR	B737-800	CFM56-7B26	162	32,400	174,200	132,649	62	M29	227	212	40,000	561	3.462	0.015
ATL-GTR	B737-900ER	CFM56-7B26	180	36,000	187,600	139,540	59	M34	225	212	52,600	586	3.253	0.014
ATL-SGF	B737-600	CFM56-7B22	110	22,000	143,500	117,730	102	M33	578	543	48,900	1,218	11.073	0.019
ATL-SGF	B737-700	CFM56-7B22	126	25,200	154,500	123,282	102	M33	578	543	39,600	1,225	9.720	0.017
ATL-SGF	B737-800	CFM56-7B26	162	32,400	174,200	137,962	114	M29	582	543	40,000	1,273	7.859	0.014
ATL-SGF	B737-900ER	CFM56-7B26	180	36,000	187,600	145,065	102	M33	578	543	52,600	1,322	7.347	0.013
ATL-OMA	B737-600	CFM56-7B22	110	22,000	143,500	120,569	131	M36	809	752	48,900	1,671	15.187	0.019
ATL-OMA	B737-700	CFM56-7B22	126	25,200	154,500	126,100	132	M36	810	752	39,600	1,679	13.326	0.016
ATL-OMA	B737-800	CFM56-7B26	162	32,400	174,200	140,951	151	M32	815	752	40,000	1,751	10.808	0.013
ATL-OMA	B737-900ER	CFM56-7B26	180	36,000	187,600	148,183	133	M36	809	752	52,600	1,813	10.074	0.012
ATL-DEN	B737-600	CFM56-7B22	110	22,000	143,500	125,228	180	M34	1207	1,126	48,900	2,466	22.419	0.019
ATL-DEN	B737-700	CFM56-7B22	126	25,200	154,500	130,924	180	M34	1209	1,126	39,600	2,476	19.648	0.016
ATL-DEN	B737-800	CFM56-7B26	162	32,400	174,200	145,952	209	M29	1210	1,126	40,000	2,586	15.964	0.013
ATL-DEN	B737-900ER	CFM56-7B26	180	36,000	187,600	153,147	180	M34	1210	1,126	52,600	2,663	14.792	0.012
ATL-SLC	B737-600	CFM56-7B22	110	22,000	143,500	130,190	232	M38	1611	1,483	48,900	3,255	29.593	0.018
ATL-SLC	B737-700	CFM56-7B22	126	25,200	154,500	135,824	232	M38	1610	1,483	39,600	3,270	25.951	0.016
ATL-SLC	B737-800	CFM56-7B26	162	32,400	174,200	151,242	269	M33	1615	1,483	40,000	3,429	21.168	0.013
ATL-SLC	B737-900ER	CFM56-7B26	180	36,000	187,600	158,460	232	M38	1611	1,483	52,600	3,516	19.531	0.012

Source: Jeppesen

1,210nm.

The fifth route is ATL to Salt Lake City, UT (SLC). This is a route that experiences the strongest headwind of up to 38kts, which therefore results in an increase in ESAD of at least 127nm to 1,611nm.

The block times and winds for the 737-600, 700 and -900ER are all very similar on each route, with only two minutes maximum between block times (see table, this page). The -800 on shorter routes shows a small difference compared to other variants in terms of absolute fuel burn, but on longer routes the difference in fuel burn per seat between variants actually widens. For the -800, the winds are weaker, although they are still headwinds, thereby making the ESAD longer than the tracked distance and, in most cases, making it the largest ESAD when comparing variants within a certain route.

Fuel burn performance

The fuel burn for each aircraft variant and the consequent fuel burn per passenger seat are shown (see table, this page). The fuel burn per seat-mile is also shown.

The data shows that the fuel burn

increases with larger variants, as the take-off weights increase.

Fuel burn per seat naturally increases as mission length increases. Although the ESAD of the fifth route is just over seven times the ESAD of the first, the fuel burn per seat is actually only just over six times as large for the four variants. This serves to illustrate the beneficial effect that longer mission lengths have on fuel burn economy.

As the number of seats for larger variants increases, however, the fuel per seat decreases, with the lowest fuel burn per seat being for the 737-900ER on the ATL-GTR route, the shortest sector.

The highest fuel burn per seat is on the 737-600 on the ATL-SLC route. This is the longest route and the smallest variant, so a high burn per seat is expected.


The burn per seat-mile takes into account the distances flown and the size of the aircraft. For the same variant the fuel burn per seat-mile reduces with longer stage lengths. For the same route length the fuel burn per seat-mile reduces with increasing aircraft size.

The highest burn per seat-mile is for the -600 on the shortest route. The lowest burn per seat-mile is for the -900ER on all but the first two routes.

Not surprisingly, the 737-600 has the lowest burn per seat-mile on the longest route, which is ATL-SLC. The aircraft is more likely to be seen on shorter routes, however.

All variants perform better with increasing stage lengths, up to about 600nm. For routes that are longer than this, burn per seat-mile does not improve for each variant.

There are large differences, however, in the rates of fuel burn per seat between the four variants on all route lengths. The -600, for example, has about a 50% higher burn per seat than the -900 on all route lengths. This represents a difference of more than \$6 per seat at current fuel prices between the two variants on a 550-600nm route. The difference between the -700 and -800 is smaller, but it is still equal to a difference in fuel price per seat of approximately \$5.

It is worth remembering that the shorter routes are not likely to be flown with LRC, but will use a faster cruise speed, which will increase the fuel per seat and per seat-mile. This will also reduce the flight time. 

To download 100s of articles like this, visit:
www.aircraft-commerce.com

737NG maintenance analysis & budget

The 737NG has a flexible maintenance programme that allows airlines to package tasks into checks that suits their operation. This results in lean maintenance requirements and low reserves for base maintenance.

There are 3,200 737NGs in service making it the most popular commercial aircraft. It offers superior range, cruise speed and cabin comfort, and lower cash operating costs than the older -300/-400/-500 Classics. The 737NG's maintenance planning document (MPD) lists individual maintenance tasks and their intervals in order to give operators full flexibility in planning maintenance and grouping checks. "This delivers lower airframe-related maintenance that uses one-third fewer man-hours (MH) than the 737 Classics," says Erdogan Firtinoglu, planning director at MyTechnic. The longer on-wing intervals of the CFM56-7B, the sole engine powering the 737NG family, also give it an economic advantage over its predecessor, the CFM56-3 series. These two key elements of total aircraft maintenance costs are analysed here, together with component-related costs.

737NG in operation

There are four main 737NG variants: the -600, -700, -800 and -900. The -700 and -800 dominate the fleet with 1,014 and 1,864 aircraft respectively. The 737NG has more than 240 operators in all continents, with fleet sizes varying from just a few aircraft to more than 200-300 aircraft in some cases.

There are just 63 737-600s in operation, with the biggest operators being SAS and Westjet. Average annual utilisations are 2,600 flight hours (FH) and 1,900 flight cycles (FC), with an average FC time of 1.4FH.

The 737-700 fleet is the second largest, with 1,014 aircraft. Major operators include Aeromexico, Air Berlin, AirTran, Alaska Airlines, China Eastern, China Southern, Continental Airlines, GOL, Southwest, Virgin Blue and Westjet. Southwest's fleet of 343 -700s is far the largest fleet. Westjet operates 64 737-700s.

Annual rates of utilisation average

3,300FH and 1,840FC, with an average FC time of 1.80FH.

The 737-800 fleet is the largest of all -800 models, with 1,864 aircraft in operation. Of the many operators those with the largest fleets include: Air Berlin, Air China (67 aircraft), Air Europa, Alaska Airlines (52), American Airlines (119), China Southern, Continental (117), Delta Airlines (71), GOL (61), Hainan, Jet Airways, Qantas, Ryanair (235), THY (48), Virgin Blue and Xiamen.

Annual rates of utilisation average 3,300FH and 1,650FC, putting average FC time at 2.14FH.

The 737-900 fleet is small at 123 aircraft, which are operated by only four airlines: Alaska, Continental, Korean Air, and Lion Airlines. Average annual rates of utilisation are 3,100FH and 1,700FC, making the average FC time 2.1FH.

The first aircraft delivered was a -700 in 1997, and is operated by Southwest Airlines. The fleet leaders have accumulated 45,400FH and 30,300FC.

The maintenance costs of the 737NG are analysed here for aircraft achieving an annual utilisation of 3,300FH and 1,700FC, with an average FC time of 1.95FH.

MPD

The 737NG's MPD simply lists all maintenance inspections and, unlike the 737-300/-400/-500's MPD, does not group them into pre-defined airframe checks such as 'A', 'C' or 'D' checks.

"The tasks in the 737NG MPD fall into three categories: systems and powerplant tasks, as specified in section 1 of the MPD; the structural maintenance programme, as specified in section 2; and the airworthiness limitation limits (AWLs) and certification maintenance requirements (CMRs)," explains Firtinoglu.

The tasks have intervals specified in one or two of three parameters: flight hours (FH), flight cycles (FC) and

calendar time, varying from 50FH to 30,000FH, 50FC to 75,000FC, and 2 days to 180 months. Operators are free to group these tasks into maintenance events or check packages, by combining the tasks with different but similar intervals, and those that come due at a similar time. Inevitably this means that not all task intervals will be fully utilised. Tasks with intervals of 1,200FH, 1,250FH, 1,600FH and 1,800FH, for example, will not use as much of their interval as a group of tasks with an interval of 1,000FH if they are grouped into the same check package with a 1,000FH interval.

"The system tasks have intervals specified in all three interval parameters, and are included in all types of checks," says Farid Abu-Taleb, director technical planning engineering at Joramco. "The structural and corrosion tasks also use all three interval parameters, but are only included in the heavier base checks with the higher intervals."

Duncan Rae, production support manager at KLM UK Engineering, comments that most structural and zonal tasks are usually aligned to 'C' or base checks, although higher frequency structural and zonal tasks are often aligned to A checks.

Task intervals are extended or shortened according to the findings and defects that arise from the routine inspections made by all operators. "The MPD is revised about once every four to six months," says Abu-Taleb, "so the MPD has been revised up to 30 times. Unlike older aircraft types, the revisions are not numbered. The most recent revisions were in February 2010 and mid-June 2010."

Many operators generate 3,000FH per year with their aircraft, and use an 'A' check every 500FH or 600FH, and a 'C' or base check every 6,000FH and 24 months. Tasks with intervals lower than the chosen A check interval may be included in line checks.

While most system tasks have intervals specified in FH, some have other interval parameters.

"The MPD released in June 2010 has 1,111 tasks," explains Elvin Coskun, aeronautical engineer at Turkish Technic. "There are 355 tasks with FH intervals, starting with 50FH. There are nine different intervals and 12 tasks up to 500FH. There are another 13 intervals up to 5,500FH, and 106 task cards."

There are a further 237 tasks for intervals from 6,000FH and 30,000FH, making them suitable for inclusion in base checks. The intervals of 6,000FH, 7,500FH, 8,000FH, 12,000FH and 25,000FH have a large number of tasks, between 14 and 91. The 7,500FH interval has the largest number of tasks with 91. There are 22 intervals between



the two extremes, and each interval comprises one to 11 tasks. The number of tasks generally indicates the amount of work at each interval, although an individual complex task can use five times the man-hours (MH) that several tasks at the same interval may require, for example. The number of tasks at each interval also changes at each revision of the MPD.

“The latest revision of the MPD in June 2010 saw a large number of tasks at the 6,000FH interval move to 7,500FH,” says Coskun, “so we will also be escalating our base check interval to 7,500FH.”

There are 84 tasks with FC intervals, ranging from 50FC to 75,000FC, and there are 18 different intervals. The intervals with the largest number of tasks are 1,600FC and 4,000FC. Seven tasks have intervals up to 300FC. Another 28 tasks have intervals between 450FC and 2,000FC, and the remaining 49 tasks have higher intervals up to 75,000FC.

There are an even larger number of tasks, 408 in total, with dual interval parameters of FC and calendar time, ranging from 560FC/90 days to 36,000FC/12 years. There are 33 different task intervals, and in every case the calendar interval would be reached first by an aircraft operating at 1,700FC per year. In all, there are 44 tasks with intervals of 560FC/90 days to 4,000FC/18 months.

There are 11 intervals that have a large number of tasks. The largest is the 5,500FC and 30-month interval, which has 74 tasks. The 5,500FC and 24-month interval has another 30 tasks. In all, 156 tasks come due at 24 or 30 months, and so would probably be combined and all grouped into a bi-annual base check.

Another 79 tasks come due every six years, 73 come due every eight years, 30 come due every 10 years, and 20 come due every 12 years.

The MPD also has 151 calendar tasks with intervals of 48 hours to 12 years. Four of these come due every two and 15 days. Another 21 tasks have intervals of 70 days to 18 months. The remaining 126 tasks are multiples of two years, with 58 due every two or three years, and the others due every four to 12 years. These can be grouped into bi-annual base checks.

There are also 11 tasks for the auxiliary power unit (APU), and 102 others, related mainly to component removals, life limited parts (LLPs), and NOTE and VEN REC (vendor recommended) tasks.

The 1,111 tasks can be broadly grouped according to their interval so that they are likely to be included in line, ‘A’, and ‘C’ or base checks. There are 23 tasks with intervals, or the equivalent, of up to 550FH, which means they are likely to be included in line checks. There are 199 tasks with intervals, or the equivalent, of 600FH to 5,500FH, so they are likely to be grouped into ‘A’ or intermediate checks, but they could also be grouped into line checks as they come due.

There are 772 tasks with intervals of 6,000FH or two years, or higher. Most have intervals that are multiples of two years. Others can be brought forward to two-year intervals. All these tasks are therefore most likely to be grouped into bi-annual base checks.

There are also 11 APU-related tasks with intervals of 1,000-10,000 APU hours. These are likely to be scheduled into A and base checks.

The 737NG's maintenance programme is based on usage parameters, and operators are free to group tasks into check packages that suits their operations. Despite this freedom, many airlines still package tasks into checks that are generically referred to as 'A' and 'C' checks.

There are 102 extra tasks for APU and engine changes, replacement of LLPs (mainly safety equipment), and VEN REC tasks.

Check planning

“The problem with check planning is that it is difficult to group the many task intervals,” says Dobrica Vincic, engineering manager at JAT Tehnika.

Each aircraft's accumulated FH and FC can be monitored as it operates, and compared with the task intervals, either manually, or with an IT system. The objective of any operator is to package tasks in order to maximise interval utilisation and minimise downtime for maintenance. “KLM uses the Swiss Aviation Software AMOS system,” says Rae.

A checks

Most operators still use a system of ‘A’ checks with intervals every 400-700FH, and ‘C’ or base checks with intervals every 4,000-6,000FH and 18 or 24 months. Tasks with the shortest intervals will be included in line checks, while those tasks with odd intervals that do not coincide with any of the line checks or A or base check intervals will be grouped by operators into checks as they come due.

The MPD line check tasks are specified in the usual pre-flight, daily, overnight and weekly intervals. Most of these tasks come from the flight operations manual, and a few from the MPD. Aircraft operating at 3,300FH per year are accumulating 65FH per week, so weekly checks therefore provide an opportunity to include tasks that have intervals between 60FH and the operator's chosen interval for ‘A’ checks.

Rae explains that the KLM line maintenance programme consists of a pre-flight check prior to every flight, for a maximum ground time of four hours; an overnight check, which is valid for 28 hours; and a daily check every day, which is valid for 48 hours. “Some drop-out tasks get planned into overnight and daily checks,” says Rae.

The logical choice for A checks is the interval which divides exactly into the majority of task intervals. That is, 500FH should be used if most tasks are a

POSSIBLE TASK GROUPING OF 737NG BASE CHECK TASKS

Interval parameter	FH	FC	FC/time	Time	TOTAL
Task group					
1C	157	1	156	58	372
2C	45	28	6	12	91
3C	3		79	18	100
4C	23	4	73	7	107
5C	8	1	30	20	59
6C		5	20	11	36
7C					
8C		7			7
Total	235	46	364	126	772

1C interval = 6,000FH, 3,000FC & 24 months

POSSIBLE 737NG BASE CHECK TASK GROUPING

Base check number	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8
Task group								
1C	372		372	372	372	372	372	372
2C		91		91		91		91
3C			100			100		
4C				107				107
5C					59			
6C						36		
8C								7
TOTAL	372	463	472	570	431	599	372	577

multiple of 500FH. These would be 1,000FH, 1,500FH, 2,000FH and so on up to the base check interval.

Operators may term the group of tasks that have an interval equal to the basic A check interval the '1A' tasks, and call the first A check the 'A1' check. Other tasks with a higher interval that are brought forward and performed early at the A check are also referred to as the 1A tasks. Tasks with an interval that is twice the basic A check interval can be referred to as the '2A' tasks. While there will be a sequence of A checks (A1, A2, A3, A4 and so on), unlike previous aircraft types there will be no clear cycle of A checks where all tasks are in phase at the last check of the cycle. Instead, there is a continuous stream of A checks. Some operators, however, consider the highest A check to be the one that is performed just before the base check interval.

KLM has an A check interval of 675FH and 400FC, but Turkish Airlines' check interval is 150FH. "We have an equalised system for A checks," says Coskun. "There are a large number of tasks between the weekly check interval and up to our 7,500FH and 24-month interval for the C check. We used to have

an interval of 600FH, but we now divide this into quarters. An equalised system means that the first three checks are light, and can be carried out at outstations. Only the fourth check is relatively heavy, which means that this has to be performed at our base."

While most tasks are packaged into A or C checks, a problem is created by tasks that fall at odd intervals between the operator's chosen A and C check intervals.

A C check interval of 6,000FH and 24 months means that the large number of tasks with intervals between the A check interval and up to 5,500FH will have to be performed in a particular A check as they come due. The odd intervals of many tasks mean that some airlines have had to develop a relatively small intermediate check with an interval midway between the A checks, which consists only of these drop-out tasks.

Base checks

Tasks with intervals higher than 6,000FH and up to 11,500FH can either be performed early and grouped together at every 6,000FH interval and included in the base checks, or as they come due and

are included in a particular A check.

Whether tasks with these odd intervals are included in A checks or base checks will be partly dependent on how much access is required. Light tasks are usually included in A checks, while those needing deeper access will go into base checks.

As with A checks, there is no clear cycle of C or base checks. The first base check may be referred to as the C1 check, and will be followed by the C2, C3, C4 checks and so on. Tasks with an interval equal to the C1 check might be referred to as 1C tasks, and those with intervals equal to higher C checks could be referred to as 2C, 3C, 4C tasks.

How tasks might be arranged into block checks is shown by using 6,000FH, 3,000FC and 24 months as a base check interval.

For tasks with FH intervals, those with intervals of 6,000-11,500FH might be grouped as 1C tasks, while those with intervals of 12,000-17,500FH might be grouped as 2C tasks and so on. If this system is used, the largest groups of tasks with FH intervals are those with intervals at or close to 6,000FH. These are the 1C tasks, totalling 157 tasks (*see table, this page*). There are also 45 2C tasks with FH intervals at, or just above, 12,000FH. There is another group of 23 4C FH tasks at 24,000FH, and eight FH 8C tasks at 48,000FH (*see table, this page*).

Tasks in the other three groups with intervals specified in FC, FC and calendar time or just calendar time could be grouped according to how their intervals convert to an equivalent FH interval. Using the FH:FC ratio of 1.95:1, the big groups of tasks with FC intervals are the 2C items with 28 tasks, the 4C items with four, the 6C tasks with five, and the 8C tasks with seven tasks (*see table, this page*).

Other large groups of tasks are those with dual FC and calendar intervals. With an interval of 3,000FC for most base checks, the large groups of tasks are 156 1C tasks, six 2C tasks, 79 3C tasks, 73 4C tasks, 30 5C tasks, and 20 6C tasks (*see table, this page*).

Calendar tasks also have large groups. Using a 24-month base interval, there are 58 1C tasks, 12 2C tasks, 18 3C tasks, seven 4C tasks, 20 5C tasks and 11 6C tasks (*see table, this page*).

There will be 772 tasks with intervals above the 6,000FH level: 372 1C tasks, 91 2C tasks, 100 3C tasks, 107 4C tasks, 59 5C tasks, 36 6C tasks, and seven 8C tasks (*see table, this page*).

If they are grouped into block checks, the smallest checks will be the C1 and C7 with 372 tasks (*see table, this page*). Checks with the largest number of tasks will be the C4, C6 and C8, with the C6 being the largest with 599 (*see table, this page*). The C8 check would have 577

tasks, almost the same number as the C6. The C2, C3 and C5 checks will have 16-25% more tasks than the C1/7 check, showing the relative differences in MH likely to be used for routine inspections during these checks.

"There is a group of 30 tasks with a dual interval of 10 years and 30,000/36,000FC, and another large group of 20 tasks with a dual interval of 12 years and 36,000FC. The 10- and 12-year intervals are likely to be reached before the 36,000FC interval, so some of the largest checks take place when these tasks come due. The base check cycle is considered complete when these higher tasks have been performed," explains Abu-Taleb.

An example of a base check interval is 6,000FH, 4,000FC and 24 months for KLM's fleet of 32 737-700/-800/-900s. This compares with annual rates of utilisation of 2,800FH and 1,620FC. "KLM's base check interval has three parameters of 6,000FH, 4,000FC and 24 months," says Rae. "The FC intervals are for structures and zonal tasks, while the calendar intervals are for both structures and system tasks. The C6 check, or the sixth check, is one of the largest checks on the 737NG, because it has a lot of 12-year structures tasks."

Turkish Airline's C check interval started at 5,000FH when its first 737NGs started operation. "This interval was escalated to 6,000FH, and then again to 7,000FH and 24 months in October 2007," says Coskun. "We will escalate the interval once more to 7,500FH and 24 months. The oldest aircraft was delivered in 1998, and has been through its C7 check."

Vincic says that some operators have a maintenance programme with an annual base check, so that tasks with 24-month intervals, plus FH and FC intervals falling due once every two years, can be split into left-hand and right-hand side tasks and performed on alternate checks. Tasks with odd intervals can also be planned into the base checks, rather than grouped into A checks.

In the past, airlines would adapt their own maintenance programmes and request permission from their local authorities to extend the intervals of task and checks over the MPD interval. "A more recent trend has been for airlines to follow the MPD as closely as possible, since a larger number of aircraft are acquired through operating leases. This is because lessors require aircraft to be maintained and returned after lease, based on the MPD," explains Vincic.

Line check inputs

The line maintenance programme adopted by most carriers for the 737NG is the standard for most aircraft types.

The pre-flight and transit checks are a walkaround visual inspection that is performed by flightcrew in a little over 30 minutes. Some airlines may still use mechanics for this, who will also be required to fix any defects that have arisen during operation. This can use several MH of mechanics' labour, and the line maintenance budget must allow for this.

The overnight and daily checks include visual inspections, and 2-3MH for some minor routine maintenance tasks, including: measuring brake pad thickness; inspecting and testing emergency systems and equipment; testing systems like the hydraulics; checking fluid levels; and reviewing messages on the on-board maintenance computer. Once an allowance for non-routine labour has been added, total labour will be 4MH. A budget of \$30 should also be allowed for materials and consumables.

At the rates of utilisation used for this analysis, an operator will perform 1,600 pre-flight and transit checks and 350

daily checks per year.

The weekly check has a similar routine content to the daily checks, but includes a few additional tasks. The check has a routine labour requirement of 4MH, and an allowance for non-routine should take the total to 6MH. An allowance of \$60 should be made for materials and consumables. An operator will perform about 50 weekly checks each year.

The allowance for non-routine labour to clear defects as they arise during operation should be 50% of routine labour for line checks. The total annual consumption of routine labour is 2,200MH, so additional non-routine labour is 1,100MH. A further 120MH per month should be added for cleaning. This takes total annual labour to 4,800MH. Charged at a standard labour rate of \$70 per MH, this totals \$335,000. The additional cost of materials and consumables will be \$10,000-15,000. The total cost of \$350,000 is equivalent to a rate of \$110 per FH (see table, page 30).

Jat Tehnika
80 years of experience

Certificates:

- EASA 145
- USA FAA

Aircraft Approved Fleets:

- DC9
- B727 & B737
- ATR 42/72

Engines Approved:

- JT8D-9 thru 17
- CFM56-3

European Location

If you are seeking:

- Skilled workforce
- Great experience
- Reliability
- Flexibility
- Cost-Effectiveness

Jat Tehnika is perfect location for your one-stop integrated MRO service.

Jat Tehnika • Airport Nikola Tesla 59 • 11180 Belgrade • Serbia
phone: +381 11 2280 115 • fax: +381 11 2675 664 • mail: marketing@jat-tech.rs • www.jat-tehnika.aero



A check inputs

Operators can choose a variety of intervals for A checks, and package tasks in many different ways when using the same interval.

With a 600FH interval to analyse the 737NG's maintenance costs, the tasks between the weekly and A checks are taken into consideration. Some operators bring certain tasks, such as lubricating items like the landing gear and flap and slat mechanisms, forward into weekly checks, while others use intermediate checks. Turkish Airlines has recently changed to an equalised system of checks at 150FH intervals in order to address this issue.

A check tasks include those in the weekly check, some functionality tests, checks on emergency and safety equipment, control surfaces and mechanisms, and some non-destructive tests on a few parts.

Using a 600FH interval for the A check and 6,000FH interval for the 'C' or base check means the ninth or tenth A check will be combined with the base check, depending on check interval utilisation. These two interval parameters, and the absence of an intermediate check have been used to illustrate MH consumed in A and base checks.

The workscope of A checks will start with routine inspections. The A6 and A10 checks at 3,600FH and 6,000FH have a larger group of routine tasks, and so will be the larger checks. There will be 40-75MH used for the eight lighter checks, while the A6 check will use 145MH, and the A10 check will use 205MH.

Airworthiness directives (ADs),

service bulletins (SBs), and engineering orders (EOs) will be added. The labour used will vary, and will depend on the ADs and SBs that are included in the check.

Some component changes, drop-out tasks and the operator's own additional requirements will also be required.

Another element is interior cleaning. This will include basic cleaning, and usually the changing of seat covers.

A conservative budget of 70-80MH could be allowed for these three elements.

The sub-total for all four elements will therefore be 110-145MH for the lighter A checks, 215MH for the A6 check, and 275MH for the A10 check.

The labour used for non-routine work will include rectifications arising from routine inspections and clearing defects accumulated during operation. "The non-routine ratio will be 30% for young aircraft, but 40-50% for mature aircraft," explains Abu-Taleb.

The non-routine ratio used here is 35-40% for the eight lighter checks, and 50% for heavier checks, taking the total labour input for the lighter checks to 150-205MH, 320MH for the A6 check to 320MH, and 415MH for the A10 check. Total labour for all 10 checks in the cycle is 2,100MH. At a labour rate of \$70 per MH, the total cost is \$147,000.

The budget allowed for materials and consumables should be \$800-1,500 for the eight lighter checks, \$3,000 for A6 checks, and \$7,000 for A10 checks. Total materials for the 10 A checks will be \$15,000-18,000.

Total cost for the 10 checks will therefore be \$165,000. The utilised interval is likely to be 85%, or 5,100FH. The reserve for A checks should therefore be \$32 per FH (see table, page 30).

The intervals used by 737NG operators for 'A' checks are close to 600FH, while intervals used for 'C' or base checks are close to 6,000FH and 24 months.

Reserves can be higher, particularly if an interval of 500FH is used for the A check.

Base check inputs

Using the 6,000FH, 3000FC and 24-month interval for this analysis, tasks can be grouped into block checks, so that the peaks in the number of tasks would occur with the C4, C6 and C8 checks. There is no particular cycle of checks, and the number of tasks for each check varies. The C12 would have the largest number, with 1C, 2C, 3C, 4C and 6C all coming due at the same time, totalling 706 tasks.

These tasks form the routine inspections for each check. Despite the number of tasks being grouped as described, operators will not use the full interval of each check. Actual rates of interval utilisation are typically 85%. At this rate, base checks would be performed every 20 months and 5,600FH and 2,900FC. With this actual interval, maintenance planners would group tasks into checks so that the aircraft was free of all major tasks for up to 24 months. Moreover, the first aircraft delivered in the late 1990s would have had base check intervals close to 5,000FH and 18 months, so the number of tasks would not be as described.

The C5 check would therefore come due at eight-and-a-half to nine years, while the C6 check would come due after 10-and-a-half to 11 years. The large group of structural tasks with a 10-year interval would therefore have to be performed at the C5 check, making it a heavy check. The C7 check would come due at 12 years. The C6 check would then have a relatively low number of tasks, while the C7 check would have a large number of tasks, including the 30 or so tasks that have an interval of 12 years, making it a heavy check.

The inputs for routine tasks and inspections for these first seven checks would be 1,000MH for the C1 check, rising steadily for each check up to the C5 check to 2,500MH. The C6 would be smaller, using 2,000MH, and the C7 would be larger again using 2,400MH. The total labour input for these checks over a period of 12 years and interval of 67,000FH is 13,000MH.

The extra items included in the base checks are: AD inspections and SB modifications; non-routine rectifications; component changes; interior cleaning;



clearing defects that have accumulated during operation; and additional customer items.

The amount of non-routine labour will depend on the non-routine ratio. This will start at a low rate for the early checks in the cycle. Turkish Technic has recorded ratios of 0.30 for C1 checks, rising to 0.60 for C2 checks, and 0.70 and 0.80 for C3 and C4 checks. The heavier checks will have a higher non-routine ratio, and reach 1.0 for the C5 check. The ratio observed by Turkish Technic dipped again at the lighter C6 check, but climbed to a high level of 1.40 for recently performed C7 checks.

These ratios would therefore generate MH inputs for non-routine rectifications of 320 for the lightest C1 check, to about 2,500MH and 3,400MH for the heaviest C5 and C7 checks. The total non-routine labour for these seven checks would be 11,500MH.

The labour inputs for ADs and SBs are highly variable, and depend on: the applicability of each AD and SB to the aircraft line number; which ADs and SBs have been issued and have to be complied with; when the aircraft is going into the check; and which SBs the airline wants to use. Examples of MH inputs for ADs and SBs are 150MH for the lightest checks to as much as 1,200MH for heavier checks, or where a large number of ADs have to be complied with, and a large number of SBs have to be incorporated on the aircraft.

Fortunately, the 737NG has had few major ADs and SBs. The few it has had cover the enhanced rudder power control unit, and the slat actuator modification.

Abu-Taleb recommends allowing 120MH for component changes at each check, 150MH for interior cleaning and

general cabin work, 100MH for clearing defects, and 200-300MH for additional customer items.

The total for the C1 check would therefore reach 2,000MH. The total would climb to 3,000MH and 3,700MH for the C2 and C3 checks, 5,000MH for the larger C4 check, and 6,800MH and 7,300MH for the largest C5 and C7 checks. The total labour input for all seven checks would be 33,000-34,000MH. Using a generic labour rate of \$50 per MH for base maintenance for illustrative purposes, the labour cost for these inputs is \$1.65-1.70 million.

The cost of materials and parts for the seven checks will vary from \$25,000 for the lightest C1 check up to \$250,000 for the heaviest C7 check. The total for the seven checks will be \$800,000.

This takes the labour and material inputs for these seven checks to \$2.5 million. Amortised over the interval of 39,000FH for these seven checks, the reserve would be \$65-70 per FH (see table, page 30).

The final elements of base checks will be interior refurbishment and stripping and repainting, the timing and quantity of which depend on airline policy. Turkish Technic, for example, strips and repaints its aircraft every five years. If this was done every third C check, it would be about once every 60 months. A typical input would be 1,200MH and \$25,000 for materials. Using the same labour rate of \$50 per MH, this would cost \$85,000, and equal a reserve of \$5 per FH (see table, page 30).

The refurbishment of interior items consists of: replacing worn carpet; cleaning and replacing seat covers; replacing seat cushions; overhauling seat frames; and refurbishing large items such

The 737NG's maintenance programme results in low reserves per FH for the aircraft. Tasks can be grouped into base checks, or those with awkward intervals can be included in A checks. There are a large number of tasks that come due every six, eight, 10 and 12 years.

as sidewall panels, overhead bins, passenger service units, dado panels, galleys and toilets.

Carpets, seat covers and seat cushions are cleaned or replaced, and the seat frames overhauled, on an on-condition basis by most airlines. The different intervals vary between every two A checks to every five years on a type like the 737NG. The regular refurbishment of large items can be carried out every five years.

The worksopes and costs for aircraft the size of the 737NG and A320 are detailed (see *Costs of narrowbody interior refurbishment, Aircraft Commerce, February/March 2010, page 26*). The reserve for refurbishing all these interior items is \$28 per FH (see table, page 30).

The total reserve for base check inputs, regular stripping and repainting and interior refurbishment is therefore \$100-105 per FH.

Components

The 737NG has 2,500-3,000 rotatable components, depending on configuration and aircraft specification. These include landing gear and safety equipment. About 6%, 150-200, of these are maintained on a hard-time basis.

The remaining 2,300-2,800 rotatables are maintained either on-condition (550-700) or are condition-monitored (1,800-2,100).

Rotable components can be subdivided into heavy components and all other rotatables.

Heavy components

There are four main heavy components of wheels and brakes, thrust reversers, the APU, and the landing gear.

Wheels and brakes require the maintenance of tyres, wheel rims and brake units. Tyre wear and brake pad thickness are checked during transit and pre-flight checks.

Wheels are removed when tyres become worn. In the case of nosewheels, this is typically up to 200FC, and at a slightly shorter interval for mainwheel tyres.

At this stage tyres are remoulded. Mainwheel tyres can be remoulded five or six times, while nosewheel tyres can be remoulded 10 or 12 times. It costs \$200-



300 to remould a nosewheel tyre, and \$450-600 to remould a mainwheel tyre.

Tyres are replaced after the maximum number of remoulds. New nosewheel tyres cost \$350-400 each, and new mainwheel tyres cost \$1,400-1,600 each.

At the same time that wheels are removed for tyres to be remoulded, wheel rims are inspected using a simple workscope. This costs \$300 for a nosewheel and \$500 for a mainwheel.

The combined cost for tyre remoulding and replacement and wheel rim inspection is therefore \$34 per FC.

Main wheels have brake units, which are typically repaired every third wheel removal, which is equal to 560FC. The 737NG has steel brakes, and the cost of repairing and overhauling each one of its four brake units is \$11,000, while the cost per FC for repair and overhaul of all four is \$79 per FC.

The landing gear has an overhaul interval of 18,000FC or 10 years, whichever is reached first. Aircraft operating at 1,600-1,700FC per year would reach the 10-year interval first. Most airlines now use third-party landing gear overhaul shops. Major landing gear shops for the 737NG are AAR Component Services, Ameco Beijing, Bedek Aviation, Goodrich, Hawker Pacific, Messier Services, Revima, SR Technics, ST Aerospace and Turkish Technic.

Most operators agree an exchange fee for landing gear overhauls. This includes the cost of overhaul and repair, and ownership or inventory of the gear set. There may also be an additional fee charged for the replacement of scrap parts, which is less predictable than the other costs.

The current market exchange fee for a

737NG landing gear shipset is \$300,000. Amortised over the 10-year interval, which is equal to 16,000-17,000FC, the reserve for landing gear maintenance is equal to \$18 per FC.

Thrust reversers are maintained on an on-condition basis. Intervals for the units on the CFM56-7B series are longer than those on older engine types, due to the extensive use of composites. Typical intervals vary by operator, but average intervals are expected to be 12,000FC, equivalent to seven or eight years of service.

Most operators sub-contract thrust reverser repair and overhaul to independent shops. Main providers include Goodrich Prestwick, Nordam, Middle River Aircraft Systems, Spirit Aerosystems, and Triumph Airborne Structures. The market rate for thrust reverser repair and overhaul is \$200,000 per shipset. The reserve for both shipsets is therefore equal to \$33 per FC.

The 737NG is equipped with the GTCP 131-9B APU, which has an average removal interval of 8,000-9,000 APU hours. The equivalent interval in aircraft FH depends on the operator's policy for APU use. Some will leave it running during turnaround between flights, while others will switch to ground power. If used during the complete turnaround time, which will be 45-70 minutes for most operators, the ratio of APU hours to aircraft FC will be 0.75-1.10:1. The APU removal interval is therefore equal to 8,000-12,000FC.

An APU shop visit costs \$200,000, not including LLPs, so the APU maintenance reserve is \$22 per FC.

The total cost for these four groups of heavy components is therefore \$254 per FC, equal to \$130 per FH for aircraft

The CFM56-7B has some of the longest removal intervals achieved by narrowbody engines. Despite this, reserves per EFC and EFH are still relatively high on account of high shop visit costs.

operated at 1.95FH per FC (see table, page 30).

Rotables

Besides the heavy components, all other remaining rotatable components can be treated as one group. A minority are maintained on a hard-time basis, so most will be removed during A and C checks. The remainder are on-condition and condition-monitored components, and so will be removed at random intervals, usually during line checks.

Large operators will own and maintain most or all of their inventories. Operators are increasingly interested in total support rotatable packages, which are provided by AJ Walter, AvTrade, KG Aircraft Rotables, P3 Aviation, AAR, Lufthansa Technik, and SR Technics.

These packages provide airlines with a homebase stock of rotatable parts with the highest failure rates, which are critical to the aircraft's operation, with the remaining parts supplied through a pool stock. Operators pay for the logistics and management of all parts, and the repair and overhaul of the inventory in an all-inclusive cost per FH contract.

Airlines will typically lease the homebase stock. The amount of stock and its value will be about \$2 million for a single aircraft, and about \$10 million for a fleet of 10, with a larger fleet benefiting from economies of scale. A lease rental of 1.5% per month would therefore be equal to \$150,000 per month, and \$55 per FH. The other two elements of main pool access and repair and management would be \$30-40 and \$150-160 per FH. The total for the whole support package would therefore be \$235-255 per FH (see table, page 30).

Engine maintenance

The CFM56-7B family has six main variants, each with a thrust rating ranging from 19,500lbs to 27,300lbs (see *CFM56-7B Owner's & Operator's Guide, Aircraft Commerce, June/July 2008, page 9*). The engine variants for each variant of the 737NG are summarised (see *737NG family & CFM56-7B specifications, fleet & developments, page 4*).

Several modifications have been made

since the base engines were introduced into service in 1997. The most notable is the Tech56 modification, which entered service in 2007. It was available for previously built engines and has also been standard on all engines built from this date. The Tech56 modification costs \$1.5 million, although not all the kit has to be installed, as it is possible to install different parts of the kit at less than full cost.

The modification includes a 3-D aero compressor blade design, an enhanced single-annular combustor, and improved designs for the high pressure turbine (HPT) blade and low pressure turbine (LPT) nozzle. This increases the engine's exhaust gas temperature (EGT) by 10 degrees centigrade, and reduces fuel burn by 1%. It also lowers NOx emissions.

Most 737-700s are powered by the -7B22 and -7B24 variants rated at 22,000lbs thrust and 24,000lbs thrust. The majority of the 737-800 fleet is powered by the -7B26 and -7B27 rated at 26,000lbs thrust and 27,000lbs thrust.

The small -900 fleet is powered by -7B24, -7B26 and -7B27 variants.

Few aircraft are powered by the -7B18, so the -7B20 is the only other significant variant. The smaller -600s are powered by -7B20 and -7B22 variants.

The most notable feature about the CFM56-7B is that all variants have high initial EGT margins when delivered new. "For non-Tech56 engines, these are: 125-130 degrees centigrade for the lowest-rated -7B18 and -7B20; 100-105 degrees for the medium-rated -7B22 and -7B24; 80 degrees for the -7B26; and 50-55 degrees for the -7B27," says Claus Bullenkamp, senior manager engineering & planning at MTU Maintenance.

Operators have to consider removal causes and likely removal intervals when optimising engine management. The engine has 18 LLPs. The shipset has a list price of \$2.11 million, up from the 2008 list price of \$1.77 million.

There are three LLPs in the fan and low pressure compressor (LPC), nine in the high pressure compressor (HPC) and HPT, and six in the LPT. CFMI has target lives of 30,000 engine flight cycles (EFCs) for the three parts in the fan/LPC, 20,000EFC in the HPC/HPT module, and 25,000EFC in the LPT. The three parts in the fan/LPC have a list price of \$424,000, up from the 2008 price of \$360,000. The nine HP parts have a list price of \$1.09 million, up from the 2008 price of \$921,000. The six LPT parts have a list price of \$594,000, up from the 2008 list price of \$500,000.

There are several part numbers for each LLP, and the earlier part numbers have lower life limits than the target lives. Engines with the Tech56 modification have all LLPs at target lives. "All engine variants now have LLPs at their target

lives, except non-Tech56 -7B26 and -7B27 engines. These have four parts in the HPT with lives at 17,600EFC.

"The high EGT margins of the lower- and medium-rated -7B engines mean that these engines generally achieve first and some subsequent on-wing removal intervals that are limited by LLP lives," explains Bullenkamp. "High thrust variants are usually removed due to a combination of EGT margin erosion and mechanical deterioration."

The CFM56-7B has had three main types of mechanical deterioration. The first is wear of the variable stator vane bushings in the HPC, which led to contacts between the stators and rotors. CFMI initially managed the problem through an SB, but improved hardware has now fixed it.

A second problem involved the engine's fuel nozzles.

A third issue was deterioration of the

HPT blades in earlier engines due to cooling problems caused by poor casting. This led to removals being limited to 14,000EFC and 16,000EFC in some cases. "There is a programme initiated by CFMI to manage the HPT blades, which comes via SB72-0696," explains Paul Smith, engineering manager at Total Engine Support (TES). "This SB applies a soft time for removal to certain standard HPT blades, necessitated by HPT blade failures to certain build-standard blades. Some were removed as early as 12,500EFC and 16,000EFC, which forced early engine removals in lower-rated engines."

Operators have to take into account the potential first, second and third removal intervals of each variant due to available EGT margin and rate of EGT margin erosion, possible mechanical deterioration, and the lives of LLPs in each of the three main groups. Restored

DESIGN | DEVELOPMENT | REPLACEMENT | REPAIR | QUALITY

You're building for the future.

WE'RE DESIGNING FOR IT.



Highly reliable cost effective repair and replacement solutions.

HARCO is an FAA approved repair facility with over 55 years of OEM experience. We have design teams developing cost effective repair solutions, while we also manufacture quality new replacement hardware when the original hardware is BER and cannot be repaired. Whether you are looking for new hardware or a solution for repairing existing equipment, within airframe, engine or aircraft systems, **HARCO** will provide you with the best in service, quality and cost.



Visit us at www.harcolabs.com for more information about our aerospace capabilities or contact us at **203 483-3700**.

INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS. PROVEN PERFORMANCE®.



EGT margins are 75% of initial EGT margins. The potential removal intervals in terms of EGT margin and engine performance for second and subsequent removal intervals will therefore be 75% of first removal intervals. A compromise has to be reached between these two main factors when managing engines.

The Tech56 modification programme increases EGT margin by 10 degrees centigrade, making it attractive for medium- and higher-rated engines. "The rate of EGT margin erosion averages 4-6 degrees per 1,000EFC, but is higher in the first 2,000EFC on-wing and then slightly lower," explains Markus Kleinhans, propulsion systems engineer CFM56-7B at Lufthansa Technik.

The additional 10 degrees provided by the Tech56 modification would therefore allow engines to remain on-wing for another 2,000EFC. This makes little difference to lower-rated engines that can remain on-wing to LLP limits, but is a worthwhile gain for higher-rated ones.

There are three types of workscope defined for the engine and its modules: a level 1 workscope, involving no LLP replacement, when the engine has lost its EGT margin, or the HPT or fuel nozzles have deteriorated; a heavier level 2 workscope for the HP modules, involving full disassembly and, in most cases, LLP

replacement; and a level 3 workscope for a full overhaul of the whole engine, and replacement of all LLPs.

-7B20/22

These lower-rated engines are capable of first removal intervals of up to the first LLP limit, which is 20,000EFC for parts in the two HP modules. The EGT margin of these engines is in fact high enough for them to remain on-wing for up to 25,000EFC. These long intervals are equal to 39,000-49,000 engine flight hours (EFH) at the average FC time being used in this analysis. The engines are therefore likely to also experience mechanical deterioration and reliability problems at these long intervals.

Some older LLPs in the HP modules have lives lower than 20,000EFC, and so will limit the first removal intervals of these older engines. In most cases, these lower-rated engines should be able to achieve first on-wing intervals of up to 20,000EFC.

At this stage, shop-visit worksopes are considered. A heavy workscope will clearly be required on the HP modules, resulting in a restored EGT margin of 75-100 degrees. This will allow a second on-wing interval of 20,000EFC, subject to restrictions placed by mechanical deterioration. This will only be possible,

however, if all the engine's LLPs are replaced at the first shop visit. The fan/LPC module will have parts removed with remaining or 'stub' lives of at least 10,000EFC. Parts in the LPT will have stub lives of at least 5,000EFC. The fan/LPC parts could be used in higher-rated -7B variants, or sold on the aftermarket. Parts in the LPT are likely to be scrapped.

The -7B20/22 variants will therefore need heavy worksopes on all modules at the first shop visit, since all LLPs will have to be removed. This full overhaul will allow the engine to achieve a second on-wing interval of 38,000-40,000EFH, equal to 20,000EFC. This interval is likely to be limited only by mechanical deterioration.

The engine will therefore have to be fully overhauled again at its second shop visit to prevent stub life LLPs in the fan/LPC and LPT limiting the third on-wing interval. It could therefore have accumulated a total of up to 75,000EFH by its second shop visit, equal to more than 20 years' operation.

-7B24

The -7B24's lower initial EGT margin of 100 degrees will allow a first on-wing interval of 18,000EFC, when operating in temperate climates, equal to 34,000EFH,

X = C

OUR LEAN BURN TECHNOLOGY
BY HUNDREDS OF DEGREES FOR FEWER

The lower the temperature, the lower the NOx emission levels. The lower the temperature, the longer the engine lasts. Burning up to 16% less fuel, producing 50%

and 10 years' operation. HP module LLPs will have to be replaced at this stage.

Like the -7B20/22 variants, the main factor driving first removals for shop visits will be loss of EGT margin. Mechanical deterioration can also be an issue for engines with potentially long on-wing intervals. Remaining LLP lives, restored EGT margin and potential second on-wing interval also have to be considered when determining the first shop-visit workscope.

A probable restored EGT margin of 70-80 degrees would allow a second removal interval of 14,000-17,000EFC. The stub lives of 12,000EFC in the fan/LPC module mean it does not make economic sense to replace them at the first shop visit. Stub lives of 7,000EFC for LPT parts mean they should be replaced, however. The first workscope would therefore be a heavy visit for the HP and LPT modules to replace LLPs and restore EGT margin and performance.

The second on-wing interval would be limited to 12,000EFC, or rather the total of the first and second intervals would be limited to 30,000EFC, the life of fan/LPC LLPs.

When the second shop visit is due, the fan/LPC LLPs will be replaced and the new LLPs in the HP and LPT modules will have only accumulated 12,000EFC. The second shop visit should comprise a

performance restoration workscope on the HP modules and a full workscope on the fan/LPC to replace LLPs. The LPT would be left unless there were findings on visual inspection.

The restored EGT margin again means the engine could have a third on-wing interval of up to 17,000EFC. The HP module LLPs will have a stub life of 8,000EFC at this stage, however, which will restrict the third interval to this short limit. The third shop visit will have heavy workscope on the HP and LPT modules for LLP replacement.

The higher EGT margins of the -7B24 Tech56-modified engines would allow them to achieve the same first removal interval as the lower rated -7B20/22 engines. The Tech56 -7B24 therefore has to have a full overhaul at its first removal in order to prevent LLP lives limiting the second removal interval in the LP modules.

The Tech56-modified -7B24 should be capable of a second on-wing interval of 15,000EFC, or possibly 2,000-3,000EFC longer. It should also be capable of a similar interval for third and subsequent runs, with the available EGT margin, which has to be considered together with LLP lives. The best compromise is to plan for removals every 15,000EFC, or a total of 30,000EFC every two intervals, so that HP and LPT module LLPs are replaced

every shop visit, and fan/LPC parts are replaced every second shop visit. A longer interval of 18,000EFC for the first interval would make better use of HP and LPT LLP lives, while a shop visit at 15,000EFC would leave LPT LLPs with stub lives of 10,000EFC, making them attractive enough for the used market.

-7B26

The -7B26's EGT margin of 80 degrees allows a first removal interval of 14,000EFC. The restored EGT margin after the first shop visit of 45 degrees would only allow a second interval of 9,000EFC. It should be appreciated that this variant has HPT LLPs at 17,600EFC, which would limit the second interval.

A level 2 workscope on the HP modules is therefore required at the first shop visit.

The fan/LPC LLPs will have remaining lives of 11,000EFC, the maximum possible second removal interval. The second removal is only likely to be 9,000EFC, however, before EGT margin is eroded. Fan/LPC LLPs will only have 5,000-7,000EFC remaining. The workscope at the second shop visit will require full overhauls of the two LP modules to allow LLP replacement. The HP modules will only need a level 1 workscope, since they will



OOL

REDUCES COMBUSTOR TEMPERATURE
NOX EMISSIONS. THAT'S THE POWER OF X.

less NOx, emitting up to 16% less CO₂ and reducing noise by 10-15 decibels, the remarkable CFM® LEAP-X is the coolest engine around. Visit www.cfm56.com/xpower

LEAP-X

CFM, CFM56 and the CFM logo are all trademarks of CFM International, a 50/50 joint company of Snecma and General Electric Co.

have only accumulated 9,000-11,000EFC on-wing since LLP replacement.

The HP module will have LLPs limited at 17,600EFC, unless target lives of 20,000EFC are reached. This will be the limit of the second and third removal intervals. Each one will therefore average 8,800EFC, so the third shop visit will need a heavy workscope on the HP modules to allow LLP replacement.

-7B26 engines with the Tech56 modification will be capable of a longer first removal interval of 16,000EFC. Despite an improved EGT margin and HP module LLPs at 20,000EFC, the LLP lives in the LPT still limit the second removal interval to 9,000EFC. The higher EGT margin and HP module LLP lives will therefore mean that the third removal interval will be limited to 11,000EFC. The engine will therefore follow the same shop visit pattern as an unmodified engine.

-7B27

Like the -7B26 non-Tech56 variant, the -7B27's initial EGT margin allows a first removal interval of only 11,000EFC.

The total of the first and second removal intervals will be limited to 17,600EFC. Restored EGT margin, of 39-44 degrees, will allow second and

subsequent removal intervals of up to 9,000EFC. The first interval is likely to be 10,000EFC, and the second 7,600EFC.

HP module LLP replacement is not required until the second shop visit. The 25,000EFC lives of LPT LLPs will limit the third interval to 7,400EFC. The fan/LPC LLPs will have remaining lives of 5,000EFC at this stage, which would limit the fourth removal interval. They would probably be replaced at this stage.

The workscope at the first shop visit will be a level 1 workscope for the HP modules. The workscope at the second shop visit will be a full overhaul for the core to allow for LLP replacement. The third shop visit will require level 2 worksopes to replace fan/LPC and LPT LLPs, plus a level 1 workscope on the HP modules to restore performance.

The Tech56-modified -7B27 engines are capable of slightly longer first removal intervals than unmodified engines, at 12,000EFC. This suggests that, despite a longer second removal interval being possible, it will be limited to 8,000EFC because of HP module LLPs. The restored EGT margin will actually allow a removal interval of 10,000EFC. The shop visit and removal pattern should therefore be aiming for full worksopes on the HP and LPT modules to allow LLP replacement at the

second shop visit. A full workscope, for LLP replacement, on the fan/LPC and a level 1 workscope on the HP modules would be made at the third shop visit.

Workscope inputs

There are four types of workscope for which inputs and costs have to be considered. Shop-visit costs comprise routine and non-routine labour, parts and materials, and sub-contract repairs.

The cost of each item will depend on the percentage of parts that can be repaired, or scrapped and replaced with new parts. A higher rate of repair will use relatively large amounts of labour and have a high sub-contract repair cost. A high rate of replacement and a low rate of repair will utilise less labour but cost more in materials and parts.

Shop-visit costs also depend on the shop's in-house capability for hi-tech repairs. A small capability will see smaller labour and materials inputs, but greater expense for sub-contract repairs.

A core restoration will use up to 2,500MH for all labour inputs, up to 1,500,000 for materials, and \$250,000-400,000 for sub-contract repairs. The higher material cost will cover 100% HPT blade and nozzle guide vane (NGV) replacement. Using a generic labour rate



Borescope inspections

- ✓ PART 145 qualified
- ✓ IAE V2500
- ✓ CFM 56
- ✓ Certificate of release
- ✓ worldwide services



NDT EXPERT - 18, rue Marius Terce, 31024 Toulouse Cedex 3
- FRANCE - Tél. : 33 (0) 5 34 36 12 00 - Fax : 33 (0) 5 34 36 12 22
E.mail : contact@ndt-expert.fr - www.ndt-expert.fr

NDT specialise in aircraft inspection and maintenance services for leading airlines and MRO's worldwide anytime -anywhere :

- Scribe Lines inspection
- Water Ingress Detection on Elevators and Rudders by Thermography.
- For the complete range of NDT services, please use our website or give us a call on :
00 33 5 34 36 12 00

SHOP VISIT WORKSCOPES, INPUTS & RESERVES FOR CFM56-7B FAMILY

Shop visit	Removal interval EFC	Shop visit workscope	LLP replacement	Shop visit cost-\$	LLP cost-\$	Reserve \$/EFC	Unsched visits \$/EFH	QEC \$/EFH	Total \$/EFH
-7B20/22									
1st	20,000	Full overhaul	All parts	2,200,000	2,110,000	216	31	10	152
2nd	20,000	Full overhaul	All parts	2,600,000	2,110,000	236	31	10	162
-7B24									
1st	18,000	Level 2 core & LPT	Core & LPT	2,250,000	1,684,000	241	31	10	165
2nd	12,000	level 1 core & level 2 fan/LPC	fan/LPC	2,050,000	424,000	257	31	10	173
3rd	8,000	Level 2 core & LPT	Core & LPT	2,350,000	1,684,000	375	31	10	233
-7B24-Tech56									
1st	20,000	Full overhaul	All parts	2,200,000	2,110,000	216	31	10	152
2nd	15,000	Level 2 core & LPT	Core & LPT	2,350,000	1,684,000	269	31	10	179
3rd	15,000	level 2 core & fan/LPC	Full set	2,250,000	2,110,000	291	31	10	190
-7B26									
1st	14,000	Level 2 core	Core	1,800,000	1,090,000	251	31	10	170
2nd	8,800	level 1 core, level 2 fan, LPC & LPT	Fan, LPC & LPT	2,200,000	1,018,000	315	31	10	202
3rd	8,800	level 2 core	Core	2,000,000	1,090,000	352	31	10	221
-7B26 Tech56									
1st	16,000	Level 2 core	Core	1,800,000	1,090,000	237	31	10	162
2nd	9,000	Level 1 core, level 2 fan, LPC & LPT	Fan, LPC & LPT	2,200,000	1,018,000	297	31	10	193
3rd	11,000	Level 2 core	Core	2,000,000	1,090,000	301	31	10	195
-7B27									
1st	10,000	Level 1 core		1,600,000	0	303	31	10	196
2nd	7,600	Level 2 core & LPT	Core & LPT	2,350,000	1,684,000	406	31	10	249
3rd	7,400	Level 1 core, level 2 fan/LPC	Fan/LPC	1,850,000	424,000	359	31	10	225
-7B27 Tech56									
1st	12,000	Level 1 core		1,700,000	0	267	31	10	178
2nd	8,000	Level 2 core & LPT	Core & LPT	2,350,000	1,684,000	374	31	10	233
3rd	10,000	Level 1 core & level 2 fan/LPC	Fan/LPC	1,950,000	424,000	295	31	10	192

of \$70 per MH, the total cost for this shop visit will be up to \$2.0 million; the higher level is more likely for second and subsequent shop visits when a higher rate of expensive parts will be replaced.

A fan/LPC workscope will require 400-900MH for all labour inputs, \$80,000-100,000 for materials and parts, and up to \$50,000 for sub-contract repairs. This will take the total to \$180,000-230,000.

A workscope on the LPT can use 800-1,500MH, depending on depth of scope and level of parts repair and replacement. Materials will cost \$150,000-250,000, and sub-contract repairs up to \$50,000. Total cost for the input will therefore be \$280,000-400,000.

A full overhaul will use 4,500-6,000MH, and cost \$300,000-400,000. The cost of materials and parts will be

\$1.4-1.7 million, depending on the level of parts replacement and repair. Earlier shop visits will have lower inputs, compared to later visits, which will have a higher cost of materials due to higher scrap rates. The cost of sub-contract repairs will be \$400,000-500,000. Total cost for the shop visit will therefore be \$2.2-2.6 million.

Unscheduled shop visits

Unscheduled shop visits fall into two categories: engine- and non-engine related. Non-engine-related shop visits are mainly due to birdstrikes and foreign object damage, and result in high shop-visit costs.

Engine-related unscheduled shop visits are light or heavy events. Light events do not interrupt the pattern of

planned shop visits, and incur costs of \$200,000-350,000. If they occur at average intervals of 60,000-70,000, a reserve of \$5 per EFH should be used.

Heavy engine-related events include bearing failures. These and non-engine-related events usually incur large shop visit costs of \$2.0-2.5 million, occurring once every 35,000-40,000EFC. They interrupt the pattern of planned shop visits, so they replace one in every three or four planned events. A reserve of \$40-50 per EFC should be made for these events. The reserve for all unscheduled shop visits is \$26-31 per EFH.

Engine reserves

The removal intervals, shop visit worksopes, LLP replacement, shop visit costs and reserves in \$ per EFC are

DIRECT MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR 737NG FAMILY

Maintenance Item	Cycle cost-\$	Cycle interval	Cost per FC-\$	Cost per FH-\$
Line & ramp checks	350,000	Annual		110
A check	165,000	5,100FH		32
Base checks	25 million	39,000FH		65-70
Stripping & repainting	85,000	16,800		5
Interior refurbishment				28
Heavy components			254	130
LRU component support				235-255
Total airframe & component maintenance				605-630
Engine maintenance:				
CFM56-7B20/22:	2 X \$152-162 per EFH			304-324
CFM56-7B24:	2 X \$165-233 per EFH			330-466
CFM56-7B24 Tech56:	2 X \$152-190 per EFH			304-380
CFM56-7B26:	2 X \$170-221 per EFH			340-442
CFM56-7B26 Tech56:	2 X \$162-195 per EFH			324-390
CFM56-7B27:	2 X \$196-249 per EFH			392-498
CFM56-7B27 Tech56:	2 X \$178-233 -per EFH			356-466
Total direct maintenance costs per FH:				909-1,128
Annual utilisation:				
3,300FH				
1,700FC				
FH:FC ratio of 1.95:1				

summarised for each engine variant (see table, page 28).

The reserves per EFC at each removal are not simply the cost of the shop visit and LLPs replaced at the time, divided by the most recent interval. The workscopes for modules must be taken into consideration, and LLPs must be replaced once every two or three shop visits. Reserves for these occurrences are spread across several shop visits, thereby making the calculation of reserves more difficult. The reserves listed (see table, page 28) relate to the shop-visit workscopes and LLPs replaced. These are at a cost per EFC.

There are additional reserves of \$31 per EFH for unscheduled shop visits, and \$10 for the repair and management of quick engine change (QEC) and accessory rotatable components.

The reserves for shop-visit inputs and LLP replacement are then converted from \$ per EFC to \$ per EFH, taking into consideration the FH:FC ratio of 1.95:1.

Total reserves per EFH are shown in the final column (see table, page 28). The reserves generally increase for each variant as the engine experiences shorter removal intervals after each successive on-wing run. Reserves are lower for lower-rated engines that have longer removal intervals. Reserves for engines operating in a harsh environment would be higher.

Reducing shop visit costs

The cost of shop visits is dominated by the expense of materials and parts, which can be reduced through a higher rate of parts repair, or the use of parts manufacturer approval (PMA) parts.

The most expensive engine parts are the airfoils. Repairs to these can cut the cost of shop visits by several hundred thousand dollars. Chromalloy is one of the largest providers of designated engineering representative (DER) hi-tech parts repairs for blades and stators in the CFM56-7B. These are repairs that are not approved by the OEM, and so are not available in the engine's repair and shop visit manual. One example is the stage 1 HPT vanes. "This is a very advanced repair, since it requires the casting of new airfoils, but it eliminates almost all airfoil scrappage," says Rob Church, regional sales director for the Americas at Chromalloy. "The list price for a set of HPT vanes or NGVs in the -7B is \$700,000-800,000. There is usually a 20% scrappage rate at each shop visit, but the cost of a repair is half that of a new OEM part, thereby saving \$100,000 per shop visit."

Chromalloy also has a repair for the stage 1 LPT vane. Church says there is a 34% scrappage rate at each shop visit, and that the repair can save \$34,000 at

each shop visit. The list price for a shipset of LPT vanes is \$330,000.

Chromalloy also offers tip repairs to HPC blades, and an erosion coating with a tungsten-carbide cobalt. It will soon offer an HPC blade chord restoration.

Another expensive part is first stage HPT blades. A typical blade scrappage rate at the first shop visit is 6%, and is higher at the second shop visit. There are 80 blades in a set, and each blade has a list price of \$9,000-10,000. The potential savings are therefore significant.

Chromalloy also has repairs for HPC stators, HPT shrouds and airseals.

MTU Maintenance also provides some DER repairs for the CFM56-7B, including a split vane repair for the NGV. This costs \$14,000, versus the \$29,000 list price for a new unit. It also offers repairs for combustion chambers.

Pratt & Whitney Engine Services (PWES) also offers DER repairs for HPT first stage blades and NGVs.

Chromalloy offers several PMA parts for the engine, and is developing more. "We already offer HPC stator seals and LPT outer stationary airseals," says Church. "We are now developing PMA blades, vanes, shrouds and HPT blades. We expect to be able to offer HPT blades for \$6,000 each, which comes to \$240,000 less for a shipset. We already offer PMAs for the stage 1 HPT NGVs and stage 1 LPT NGVs, which provide big savings when scrapped parts have to be replaced when they are beyond repair. We offer PMA stage 1 HPT NGVs for \$15,000. With 42 in a set, the saving is substantial.

"The OEM first stage NGVs in the LPT have a list price of \$15,000, while we offer PMA parts at \$9,000 each, saving \$6,000 per unit," adds Church.

DER repairs and PMA parts can save as much as \$350,000 per shop visit.

Summary

The 737NG's total maintenance costs are \$909-1,128 per FH, depending on aircraft variant and engine model, for aircraft in their first cycle of main base checks, up to their sixth or seventh base checks at an age of 12-14 years, and for aircraft with engines that are up to their third removal and shop visit, which can be as long as 50,000FC and 100,000FH, equal to more than 25 years' operation.

The varying total cost per FH is due mainly to the engine reserves, which gradually increase from the first to the third removal. The engines of most 737NGs are within their first or second engine removal cycles, so higher engine reserves apply to few operators. **AC**

To download 100s of articles like this, visit:
www.aircraft-commerce.com