

ADVISORY CIRCULAR



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Aviation Administration
Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL AVIATION REGULATION GUIDANCE MATERIAL

Subject: DAMAGE-TOLERANCE AND FATIGUE EVALUATION OF STRUCTURE

1. PURPOSE. This advisory circular sets forth an acceptable means of compliance with the provisions of Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR), Part 25, dealing with the damage-tolerance and fatigue evaluation certification requirements of aircraft structure.

2. BACKGROUND.

a. During recent years, there have been significant state-of-the-art and industry-practice developments in the area of structural fatigue and fail-safe strength evaluation of transport category airplanes. Recognizing that these developments could warrant some revision of existing fatigue requirements contained in §§25.571 and 25.573 of Part 25 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, the FAA, on November 18, 1976, gave notice of its Transport Category Airplane Fatigue Regulatory Review Program and invited interested persons to submit proposals to amend those requirements (see 41 FR 50956). Subsequently, the FAA convened a Transport Category Airplane Fatigue Regulatory Review Conference on March 15-17, 1977, in Arlington, Va., to obtain the views of all concerned on the proposals submitted for the review.

b. Participants in the Review Conference discussed the proposals submitted for the review. These proposals and the related discussions formed the basis for the FAA's belief that a comprehensive revision of the structural fatigue evaluation standards of §§25.571 and 25.573, and guidance material was warranted. To that end, it was proposed to substantially revise §25.571, to delete §25.573 (but expand the scope of §25.571 to cover the substance of the deleted section), and to provide guidance material containing compliance provisions related to the proposed change.

c. This advisory circular provides detailed guidance for showing compliance with the revised rule.

3. INTRODUCTION.

a. The contents of this advisory circular are considered by the FAA in determining compliance with the damage-tolerance and fatigue requirements of § 25.571.

(1) Although a uniform approach to the evaluation required by §25.571 is desirable, it is recognized that in such a complex field new design features and methods of fabrication, new approaches to the evaluation, and new configurations could necessitate variations and deviations from the procedures described in this advisory circular.

(2) Damage-tolerance design is required, unless it entails such complications that an effective damage-tolerant structure cannot be achieved within the limitations of geometry, inspectability, or good design practice. Under these circumstances, a design that complies with the fatigue evaluation (safe-life) requirements is used. Typical examples of structure that might not be conducive to damage-tolerance design are landing gear, engine mounts, and their attachments.

(3) Experience with the application of methods of fatigue evaluation indicates that a test background should exist in order to achieve the design objective. Even under the damage-tolerance method discussed in paragraph 5, "Damage-tolerance (fail-safe) evaluation," it is the general practice within industry to conduct damage-tolerance tests for design information and guidance purposes. Damage location and growth data should also be considered in establishing a recommended inspection program.

(4) Assessing the fatigue characteristics of certain structural elements, such as major fittings, joints, typical skin units, and splices, to ensure that the anticipated service life can reasonably be attained, is needed for structure to be evaluated under § 25.571(c).

b. Typical loading spectra expected in service. The loading spectrum should be based on measured statistical data of the type derived from government and industry load history studies and, where insufficient data are available, on a conservative estimate of the anticipated use of the airplane. The principal loads that should be considered in establishing a loading spectrum are flight loads (gust and maneuver), ground loads (taxiing, landing impact, turning, engine runup, braking, and towing) and pressurization loads. The development of the loading spectrum includes the definition of the expected flight plan which involves climb, cruise, descent, flight times, operational speeds and altitudes, and the approximate time to be spent in each of the operating regimes. Operations for crew training, and other pertinent factors, such as the dynamic stress characteristics of any flexible structure excited by turbulence, should also be considered. For pressurized cabins, the loading spectrum should include the repeated application of the normal operating differential pressure, and the superimposed effects of flight loads and external aerodynamic pressures.

c. Components to be evaluated. In assessing the possibility of serious fatigue failures, the design should be examined to determine probable points of failure in service. In this examination, consideration should be given, as necessary, to the results of stress analyses, static tests, fatigue tests, strain gage surveys, tests of similar structural configurations, and service experience. Service experience has shown that special attention should be focused on the design details of important discontinuities, main attach fittings, tension joints, splices, and cutouts such as windows, doors, and other openings. Locations prone to accidental damage (such as that due to impact with ground servicing equipment near airplane doors) or to corrosion should also be considered.

d. Analyses and tests. Unless it is determined from the foregoing examination that the normal operating stresses in specific regions of the structure are of such a low order that serious damage growth is extremely improbable, repeated load analyses or tests should be conducted on structure representative of components or subcomponents of the wing, control surfaces, empennage, fuselage, landing gear, and their related primary attachments. Test specimens should include structure representative of attachment fittings, major joints, changes in section, cutouts, and discontinuities. Any method used in the analyses should be supported, as necessary, by test or service experience.

4. DAMAGE-TOLERANCE (FAIL-SAFE) EVALUATION.

a. General. The damage-tolerance evaluation of structure is intended to ensure that should serious fatigue, corrosion, or accidental damage occur within the operational life of the airplane, the remaining structure can withstand reasonable loads without failure or excessive structural deformation until the damage is detected. Included are the considerations historically associated with fail-safe design. The evaluation should encompass establishing the components which are to be designed as damage-tolerant, defining the loading conditions and extent of damage, conducting structural tests or analyses, or both, to substantiate that the design objective has been achieved, and establishing data for inspection programs to ensure detection of damage. This evaluation applies to either single or multiple load path structure.

(1) Design features which should be considered in attaining a damage-tolerant structure include the following:

(i) Multiple load path construction and the use of crack stoppers to control the rate of crack growth, and to provide adequate residual static strength;

(ii) Materials and stress levels that, after initiation of cracks, provide a controlled slow rate of crack propagation combined with high residual strength;

(iii) Arrangement of design details to ensure a sufficiently high probability that a failure in any critical structural element will be detected before the strength has been reduced below the level necessary to withstand the loading conditions specified in § 25.571(b) so as to allow replacement or repair of the failed elements; and

(iv) Provisions to limit the probability of concurrent multiple damage, particularly after long service, which could conceivably contribute to a common fracture path. Examples of such multiple damage are:

(A) A number of small cracks which might coalesce to form a single long crack;

(B) Failures, or partial failures, in adjacent areas, due to the redistribution of loading following a failure of a single element; and

(C) Simultaneous failure, or partial failure, of multiple load path discrete elements, working at similar stress levels.

(2) Normally, the damage-tolerance assessment consists of a deterministic evaluation of the above design features and this paragraph provides guidelines for this approach. In certain specific instances, however, damage-tolerant design might be more realistically assessed by a probabilistic evaluation employing methods such as risk analysis. They are routinely employed in fail-safe evaluations of airplane systems and have occasionally been used where structure and systems are interrelated. These methods can be of particular value for structure consisting of discrete isolated elements where damage tolerance depends on the ability of the structure to sustain redistributed loads after failures of discrete elements resulting from fatigue, corrosion, or accidental damage. Where considered more appropriate than deterministic analysis, probabilistic analysis might be used if it can be shown that loss of the airplane is extremely improbable and the statistical data employed in the analysis is based on tests or operational experience, or both, of similar structure.

b. Identification of principal structural elements. Principal structural elements are those which contribute significantly to carrying flight, ground, and pressurization loads, and whose failure could result in catastrophic failure of the airplane. Typical examples of such elements are as follows:

(1) Wing and empennage.

(i) Control surfaces, slats, flaps, and their attachment hinges and fittings;

(ii) Integrally stiffened plates;

- (iii) Primary fittings;
 - (iv) Principal splices;
 - (v) Skin or reinforcement around cutouts or discontinuities;
 - (vi) Skin-stringer combinations;
 - (vii) Spar caps; and
 - (viii) Spar webs.
- (2) Fuselage.
- (i) Circumferential frames and adjacent skin;
 - (ii) Door frames;
 - (iii) Pilot window posts;
 - (iv) Pressure bulkheads;
 - (v) Skin and any single frame or stiffener element around a cutout;
 - (vi) Skin or skin splices, or both, under circumferential loads;
 - (vii) Skin or skin splices, or both, under fore-and-aft loads;
 - (viii) Skin around a cutout;
 - (ix) Skin and stiffener combinations under fore-and-aft loads; and
 - (x) Window frames.

c. Extent of damage. Each particular design should be assessed to establish appropriate damage criteria in relation to inspectability and damage-extension characteristics. In any damage determination, including those involving multiple cracks, it is possible to establish the extent of damage in terms of detectability with the inspection techniques to be used, the associated initially detectable crack size, the residual strength capabilities of the structure, and the likely damage-extension rate considering the expected stress redistribution under the repeated loads expected in service and with the expected inspection frequency. Thus, an obvious partial failure could be

considered to be the extent of the damage for residual strength assessment, provided a positive determination is made that the fatigue cracks will be detectable by the available inspection techniques at a sufficiently early stage of the crack development. In a pressurized fuselage, an obvious partial failure might be detectable through the inability of the cabin to maintain operating pressure or controlled decompression after occurrence of the damage. The following are typical examples of partial failures which should be considered in the evaluation:

- (1) Detectable skin cracks emanating from the edge of structural openings or cutouts;
- (2) A detectable circumferential or longitudinal skin crack in the basic fuselage structure;
- (3) Complete severance of interior frame elements or stiffeners in addition to a detectable crack in the adjacent skin;
- (4) A detectable failure of one element where dual construction is utilized in components such as spar caps, window posts, window or door frames, and skin structure;
- (5) The presence of a detectable fatigue failure in at least the tension portion of the spar web or similar element; and
- (6) The detectable failure of a primary attachment, including a control surface hinge and fitting.

d. Inaccessible areas. Every reasonable effort should be made to ensure inspectability of all structural parts, and to qualify them under the damage-tolerance provisions. In those cases where inaccessible and uninspectable blind areas exist, and suitable damage tolerance cannot practically be provided to allow for extension of damage into detectable areas, the structure should be shown to comply with the fatigue (safe-life) requirements in order to ensure its continued airworthiness.

e. Testing of principal structural elements. The nature and extent of tests on complete structures or on portions of the primary structure will depend upon applicable previous design, construction, tests, and service experience, in connection with similar structures. Simulated cracks should be as representative as possible of actual fatigue damage. Where it is not practical to produce actual fatigue cracks, damage can be simulated by cuts made with a fine saw, sharp blade, guillotine, or other suitable means. In those cases where bolt failure, or its equivalent, is to be simulated as part of a possible damage configuration in joints or fittings, bolts can be removed to provide that part of the simulation.

f. Identification of locations to be evaluated. The locations of

damage to structure for damage-tolerance evaluation should be identified as follows:

(1) Determination of general damage locations. The location and modes of damage can be determined by analysis or by fatigue tests on complete structures or subcomponents. However, tests might be necessary when the basis for analytical prediction is not reliable, such as for complex components. If less than the complete structure is tested, care should be taken to ensure that the internal loads and boundary conditions are valid.

(i) If a determination is made by analysis, factors such as the following should be taken into account:

(A) Strain data on undamaged structure to establish points of high stress concentration as well as the magnitude of the concentration;

(B) Locations where permanent deformation occurred in static tests;

(C) Locations of potential fatigue damage identified by fatigue analysis; and

(D) Design details which service experience of similarly designed components indicate are prone to fatigue or other damage.

(ii) In addition, the areas of probable damage from sources such as severe corrosive environment should be determined from a review of the design and past service experience.

(2) Selection of critical damage areas. The process of actually locating where damage should be simulated in principal structural elements identified in paragraph 5.b. of this advisory circular should take into account factors such as the following:

(i) Review analysis to locate areas of maximum stress and low margin of safety;

(ii) Selecting locations in an element where the stresses in adjacent elements would be the maximum with the damage present;

(iii) Selecting partial fracture locations in an element where high stress concentrations are present in the residual structure; and

(iv) Selecting locations where detection would be difficult.

g. Damage-tolerance analysis and tests. It should be determined by

9/28/78

analysis, supported by test evidence, that the structure with the extent of damage established for residual strength evaluation can withstand the specified design limit loads (considered as ultimate loads), and that the damage growth rate under the repeated loads expected in service (between the time at which the damage becomes initially detectable and the time at which the extent of damage reaches the value for residual strength evaluation) provides a practical basis for development of the inspection program and procedures described in paragraph 5.h. of this advisory circular. The repeated loads should be as defined in the loading, temperature, and humidity spectra. The loading conditions should take into account the effects of structural flexibility and rate of loading where they are significant.

(1) The damage-tolerance characteristics can be shown analytically by reliable or conservative methods such as the following:

(i) By demonstrating quantitative relationships with structure already verified as damage tolerant;

(ii) By demonstrating that the damage would be detected before it reaches the value for residual strength evaluation; or

(iii) By demonstrating that the repeated loads and limit load stresses do not exceed those of previously verified designs of similar configuration, materials and inspectability.

(2) The maximum extent of immediately obvious damage from discrete sources should be determined and the remaining structure shown to have static strength for the maximum load (considered as ultimate load) expected during the completion of the flight. Normally this would be an analytical assessment. In the case of uncontained engine failures, the fragments and paths to be considered should be consistent with those used in showing compliance with § 25.903(d)(1) of the FAR's, and with typical damage experienced in service.

h. Inspection. Detection of damage before it becomes dangerous is the ultimate control in ensuring the damage-tolerance characteristics of the structure. Therefore, the applicant should provide sufficient guidance information to assist operators in establishing the frequency, extent, and methods of inspection of the critical structure, and this kind of information must, under § 25.571(a)(3), be included in the maintenance manual required by § 25.1529 of the FAR's. Due to the inherent complex interactions of the many parameters affecting damage tolerance, such as operating practices, environmental effects, load sequence on crack growth, and variations in inspection methods, related operational experience should be taken into account in establishing inspection procedures. Comparative analysis can be used to guide the changes from successful past practice when necessary. Therefore, maintenance and inspection requirements should recognize the dependence

on experience and should be specified in a document that provides for revision as a result of operational experience, such as the one containing the operator's FAA-approved structural inspection program developed through the Maintenance Review Board (MRB) procedures for FAR Part 121 operators.

5. FATIGUE (SAFE-LIFE) EVALUATION.

a. General. The evaluation of structure under the following fatigue (safe-life) strength evaluation methods is intended to ensure that catastrophic fatigue failure, as a result of the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected in service, is extremely improbable throughout the structure's operational life. Under these methods, loading spectra should be established, the fatigue life of the structure for the spectra should be determined, and a scatter factor should be applied to the fatigue life to establish the safe-life for the structure. The evaluation should include the following; however, in some instances it might be necessary to correlate the loadings used in the analysis with flight load and strain surveys:

(1) Estimating or measuring the expected loading spectra for the structure;

(2) Conducting a structural analysis including consideration of the stress concentration effects;

(3) Fatigue testing of structure which cannot be related to a test background to establish response to the typical loading spectrum expected in service;

(4) Determining reliable replacement times by interpreting the loading history, variable load analyses, fatigue test data, service experience, and fatigue analyses; and

(5) Providing data for inspection and maintenance instructions and guidance information to the operators.

b. Safe-life determination: scatter factor. In the interpretation of fatigue analyses and test data, the effect of variability should, under § 25.571(c), be accounted for by an appropriate scatter factor. Relating test results to the recommended safe-life is extremely difficult since there are a number of considerations peculiar to each design and test that necessitate evaluation by the applicant. These considerations will depend on the number of representative test specimens, the material, the type of specimen employed, the type of repeated load test, the load levels, and environmental conditions.

c. Replacement times. Replacement times should be established for parts with established safe-lives and should, under § 25.571(a)(3), be included in the information prepared under § 25.1529. These replacement times

9/28/78

can be extended if additional data indicates an extension is warranted. Important factors which should be considered for such extensions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Comparison of original evaluation with service experience;
- (2) Recorded load and stress data. Recorded load and stress data entails instrumenting airplanes in service to obtain a representative sampling of actual loads and stresses experienced. The data to be measured includes airspeed, altitude, and load factor versus time data; or airspeed, altitude and strain ranges versus time data; or similar data. This data, obtained by instrumenting airplanes in service, provides a basis for correlating the estimated loading spectrum with the actual service experience;
- (3) Additional analyses and tests. If test data and analyses based on repeated load tests of additional specimens are obtained, a reevaluation of the established safe-life can be made;
- (4) Tests of parts removed from service. Repeated load tests of replaced parts can be utilized to reevaluate the established safe-life. The tests should closely simulate service loading conditions. Repeated load testing of parts removed from service is especially useful where recorded load data obtained in service are available since the actual loading experienced by the part prior to replacement is known; and
- (5) Repair or rework of the structure. In some cases, repair or rework of the structure can gain further life.

d. Type design developments and changes. For design developments, or design changes, involving structural configurations similar to those of a design already shown to comply with the applicable provisions of § 25.571(c), it might be possible to evaluate the variations in critical portions of the structure on a comparative basis. Typical examples would be redesign of the wing structure for increased loads, and the introduction in pressurized cabins of cutouts having different locations or different shapes, or both. This evaluation should involve analysis of the predicted stresses of the redesigned primary structure and correlation of the analysis with the analytical and test results used in showing compliance of the original design with § 25.571(c).


J. A. FERRARESE
Acting Director
Flight Standards Service

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979-621-087 153 3 1