

# IM Technologies & Implementation of New Designs

Dr. Brian Fuchs  
CCDC AC US Army Picatinny Arsenal  
Mr. Stephen Struck  
US Air Force Research Laboratory  
Mr. Ken Tomasello  
Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity NOSSA  
Dr. Ernest Baker  
Munitions Safety and Information Analysis Center NATO

July 30, 2019

## Abstract

In order to meet arising threats, current munitions development goals are transitioning from providing safer munitions to providing higher performance. The improvement of Insensitive Munitions response does not necessarily mean a reduction in performance, and in some cases performance actually improves. This paper will review some of these technologies and the opportunities offered by the implementation of new designs.

## Background

The need for increased safety, through the development of Insensitive Munitions (IM), has been recognized under US law:

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that Insensitive Munitions under development or procurement are safe throughout development and fielding when subject to unplanned stimuli [1].

Internationally, NATO has also implemented IM improvements:

Technological advances in the design of explosive ordnance are making possible the development of a range of munitions termed Insensitive Munitions (IM) or Munitions á Risques Atténués (MURAT) which are less

dangerous than previous weapons when subjected to accidental and combat stimuli. Such munitions remain effective in their intended application, and are less sensitive than their predecessors to extreme but credible environments such as heat, shock or impact.

Introduction of IM into service is intended to enhance the survivability of logistic and tactical combat systems, minimise the risk of injury to personnel, and provide more cost effective and efficient transport, storage, and handling of munitions [2].

In order to develop IM it is necessary to either suppress the release of the chemical energy in munitions or release it in a less violent manner. Violent reactions can occur with any poorly designed munition, and the violence is not limited to systems containing energetics. Examples of violent reactions with poorly designed safety are easily found in the large number of steam explosions in the early industrial age, Figure (1) [3]. Inert bombs loaded with concrete have been known to have more violent reactions in cook-off than properly designed munitions, due to a steam explosion from the water within the concrete. The challenge facing modern munitions engineers is to improve performance while maintaining or increasing safety. However, many legacy systems were designed prior to modern modeling and materials were available without as much emphasis on safety. Fielding new systems represents an opportunity to increase performance and safety.



Figure 1: Boiler Explosion at Hays Manufacturing Co. Erie, Pa .

## IM Improvement Methods

Decreasing the IM responses of a munition requires a systems approach. For a legacy system designed without IM consideration, replacing the energetic material to developing the IM improved munition is rarely sufficient. The violence of reaction is not determined by the intended use (propellant, detonating explosive), but rather the confinement and the detonation and burning properties of the energetics.

For many modern systems, many propellants are more detonable than some of the latest IM explosive fills. As a result, IM technologies are focused on two areas of improvement:

Suppressing the release of the chemical energy:

- Less Shock Sensitive

- Larger Critical Diameter

- Self Extinguishing

  - Some materials require higher than atmospheric pressure to burn unaided

- Barriers between Munitions

- Armour

Releasing the chemical energy in a less violent manner:

- Venting

- Select Materials with Lower Burning Rates at Higher Pressure

- Less of the Energetic Materials

By considering the physics of the problem, improved performance and Insensitive Munition design can co-exist. The following are examples of some techniques that can be used.

## Carbon Composite Rocket Motor Systems

The performance advantages of carbon composite rocket motor cases have been recognized since the 1960's [4]. The light weight and high strength of these materials can be used to improve performance. The technology has been demonstrated in the THAAD and PAC-3 large missile systems, Figures 2 and 3 [5].

Composite Rocket motor cases have been shown to be an effective component of IM mitigation systems. Esslinger et. al. demonstrated improvements in Fast Cookoff, Slow Cookoff, Bullet Impact, and Fragment Impact testing by utilizing composite cases. [6].

Composite cases are successful because of their high strength, yet the cases have large fractures and vent areas when they fail, which reduces internal pressures. Additionally direct exposure to fire weakens the cases. With decreased weight when compared to older steel cases, composite rocket motor cases represent a "low hanging fruit" technology where safety and performance can both be improved with investments in manufacturing and inspection techniques [7].



Figure 2: THAAD Missile



Figure 3: PAC-3 Missile

## Package Venting

The packaging of munitions has evolved far beyond putting an item in a box. Modern package requires the design for: difficult handling, drop testing, electro-static protection, long shelf life etc. Military packaging is an advanced technical specialty. Simple changes to the protective packaging used for munitions have been shown to have profound effects on munition responses.

Panels and packages that melt-away in the event of a fire have been shown to be effective, without losses in performance or logistics and are undetected by the user. This technology has been applied to the Modular Artillery Charge System (MACS). Figure 4 shows the logistical configuration of the MACS charge during IM testing, and figure 5 shows the post test results of the Fast Cookoff test. [8].

IM success stories are not well reported because the lack of fatalities, injuries, and damage to equipment do not generate concern. The MACS charge is an exception. After development and fielding, there was a fire at the manufacturing plant. There was significant fire damage, but no blast or fragmentation damage due to the improved IM packaging design, Figure 6 [9].

## Improved Fragmentation

Modern methods are being developed that eliminate the chaotic nature of natural fragmentation in order to improve both the lethality and fragment distribution from a warhead. Some of these methods improve the safety of the munitions. Baker et. al. developed a melting plastic liner that provides both venting area and designed fragmentation, Figure 7 [10].



Figure 4: MACS Charge Staged for Fast Cookoff Test



Figure 5: MACS Charge After Fast Cookoff Test



Figure 6: MACS Charge after Plant Fire




Figure 7: Melt Liner for Controlled Fragmentation/ IM

Another method utilizes preformed fragments, where dense fragments of desired size are embedded in a matrix. If the matrix is a polymer, venting of the munition from unplanned stimuli is easily achieved. The lethality of embedded fragments has been demonstrated on the HE-PFF (High Explosive - Preformed Fragmentation) 105 mm M1130 artillery projectile [11].






Figure 8: PFF Lethality



Figure 9: PFF Lethality



Figure 10: Melt Liner for Controlled Fragmentation

Embedding fragments within a polymer matrix has been demonstrated by Widener et. al., figure 10 [12].

## New Energetics

Many legacy systems are still utilizing TNT as a main explosive fill, although at this time an IM waiver is required. The US Air Force has developed the explosive AFX-757 for main bomb fills with improved Insensitivity and 39% performance increase over Comp B, and TNT/RDX melt cast formulation [13].

## Torpedo Explosives

Recent heavyweight torpedoes are achieving greatly improved IM responses, as well as improved performance. These include the F21 [14], SeaHake Mod 4 DM2A4, TP-2000 and the Black Shark. The F21 incorporates IM design features including thermal protection and controlled ignition for cook-off mitigation. Reduced sensitivity explosive formulations are incorporated to provide mitigation against impact threats, sympathetic reaction and even shaped charge jet attack. These newer explosive formulations (PBXN-105, B-2211D and PBXN-111 (same formulation as B-2211D)) are proving to produce increased bubble energies over more traditional torpedo explosives (Tritonal, HBX-3 and Torpex 9). Figure 11 presents a relative comparison of bubble energies for the different explosives. Figure 12 presents F21 warhead and IM Signature.




Figure 11: Relative bubble energies for different explosives [15] [16]




Figure 12: F21 warhead (left) and IM signature (right) compared to HBX or Torpex filled torpedo warheads

## Integrated Technologies

The development of munitions systems with reduced violence to unplanned stimuli require multiple technologies to be successful. The French CBEMS 500 lb bomb is an example. By utilizing a new energetic, with improved venting and logistics, the munitions was capable of passing 5 of the six standard IM tests. For improved safety a Intumescent paint was applied to increase the time to reaction in fires [17].






Figure 13: French CBEMS 500 lb bomb [18]

# Conclusion

With a new emphasis on performance, it is anticipated that innovative and updated systems will be fielded. This should be viewed as an opportunity to implement the IM technologies that have been developed, and improve both safety and effectiveness of our munitions portfolio. However, despite the IM developments that address effectiveness, utility and lethality, there is a desire to deemphasize the importance of these technologies.

## References

- [1] U.S. Code, Title 10, IM Requirements IM requirements are set forth in U.S. Code, Title 10, Subtitle A, Part IV, Chapter 141, Section 2389
- [2] Allied Ordnance Publication (AOP) “GUIDANCE ON THE ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF INSENSITIVE MUNITIONS”, AOP-39 Ed D V1 Nov. 2018.
- [3] <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki>
- [4] Trigg, T. A., and M. W. Jones. Carbon fibre composites in rocket motor systems. BRISTOL AEROJET LTD BANWELL (UNITED KINGDOM), 1969.
- [5] Ken Duncan “Insensitive Munitions and the U.S. Army A perspective for the NDIA 2003 IM/EM Symposium.
- [6] Esslinger Jr, J. R., J. B. Neidert, K. Tappe, R. Clawson, A. DeFusco, C. Wilson, S. Riley, and M. Shewmaker. Evaluation of Less Shock Sensitive Minimum Smoke Propellants in High Performance Composite Cases. ARMY AVIATION AND MISSILE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND ENG CTR REDSTONE ARSENAL AL, 2010.
- [7] <https://www.gd-ots.com/composite-structures/missile-space-structures/rocket-motor-cases/>
- [8] Robert M. Forrester and K. Duncan “Insensitive Munitions Testing: Protecting Ourselves From Our Ammunition” Army Logistician. July-August 2006.
- [9] Brian Fuchs “Report of the Review of Slow Cook-off Rate for Insensitive Munitions Testing Workshop” MSIAC Newsletter 3rd quarter 2011.
- [10] Baker, Ernest, Chuck Chin, Arthur Daniels, Stanley DeFisher, Vladimir Gold, Jack Pincay, and Irene Wu. “More safe insensitive munition for producing a controlled fragmentation pattern.” U.S. Patent 7,886,667, issued February 15, 2011.
- [11] Zecevic, B., J. Terzic, F. Razic, and S. S. Kadic. “Lethal Influence Factors of Natural and Performed Fragmentation Projectiles.” DAAAM International Scientific Book (2015): 219-234.
- [12] Jeffrey F. Widener, R. Mudryy, D. Murphy. “Reactive Material Candidates for Low Collateral Damage- Part 1: Arena Testing” 2012 NDIA Insensitive Munitions & Energetic Materials Technology Symposium May 14-17, 2012. Las Vegas, Nevada.

---

UNCLASSIFIED

Distribution Statement A

This is approved for public release distribution is unlimited.

- [13] MSIAC Energetic Materials Compendium.
- [14] Fougeyrollas, R., Courrillaud, D., Chaffois, L., Chabin, P., “Heavyweight Torpedo Warhead IM Assessment?, Insensitive Munitions and Energetic Materials Symposium, Portland, OR, 23-26 April 2018.
- [15] DERA, “Insensitive Munitions Lecture?, RMCS Explosive Ordnance Engineering Course on IM Energetic Materials, 1996.
- [16] Langer, G., Keicher, T., Ehrhardt, W., Happ, A., Kebler, A., Kretschmer, A., “The influence of particle size of AP and Al on the performance of underwater explosives?, 34th ICT, Karlsruhe, Germany, 24-27 June 2003.
- [17] Laurent Delrieu, S. Régnaut, B. Nouguez W. H. “New French IM 500 lb Bombs.” In Insensitive Munitions and Energetic Technology Symposium. USA: NDIA, 2010.
- [18] Bernie Halls “Insensitive Munitions State of the Art.” In Insensitive Munitions and Energetic Technology Symposium. USA: NDIA, 2008.

---

UNCLASSIFIED

Distribution Statement A

This is approved for public release distribution is unlimited.