

# CMH-17 Fatigue & Damage Tolerance

## Initiatives and Priorities for Rev. H Updates

Prepared for

**Joint CMH-17-EASA-FAA Workshop on Damage  
Tolerance**

**EASA Headquarters, Cologne, Germany**

**July 15-17, 2019**

Prepared by

** NSE COMPOSITES**

NSE Composites  
1101 North Northlake Way, Suite 4  
Seattle, WA 98103  
(206) 545-4888  
[www.nsecomposites.com](http://www.nsecomposites.com)

**D.M. Hoyt  
Patrick Enjuto**

# Introduction

## Background

- Many updates have been made to CMH-17 over the past 10+ years focused on key safety-related areas identified by the regulators (FAA/EASA/TCCA) and industry leaders.
- One main goal has been to benchmark accepted industry practice relative to regulations and associated guidance.
  - *Currently incorporating information from Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) on Damage Tolerance and Fatigue.*

The CMH-17 Rev. H status, priorities and proposed content have been updated based on latest progress.

## Objectives

- Provide a roadmap of CMH-17 Fatigue and Damage Tolerance (F&DT) initiatives.
- Outline content completed, in-work or planned for next revision **(Rev. H)**.

# CMH-17 F&DT Priorities for Rev. H (1 of 2)

## Hybrid Issues for Composite-Metal Assemblies

- Thermal Loads
  - *Analysis and test requirements*
  - *Industry current best practices*
  - *Example case studies*

← **ARAC Report Section 3.3:**  
Testing of Hybrid Structure

## Repeated Load Tolerance & LEF Guidance

- LEF Guidance
  - *Emerging approaches for LEFs for hybrid FSFT*
  - *Multi-LEF (already in Rev. G), Deferred Severity Spectrum*
  - *High-LEF details at subcomponent level*

← **CMH-17 Section 12.6.3:**  
D&DT Test Issues

## Damage Threat Assessment

- Part 25 large vs. Part 25 small / Part 23
  - *Damage threat vs. criteria for specific structure or AC type*

← **ARAC Report Section 3.1:**  
Threat Assessment

# CMH-17 F&DT Priorities for Rev. H (2 of 2)

## Categories of Damage & HEWABI

- Relationship among categories & minimum damage sizes
  - *Shape of the residual strength curve*
  - *Minimum damage sizes for large (structural) damage capability*
- HEWABI & CAT 5 Damage
  - *Updates based on Policy Statement and latest R&D*



**ARAC Report Section 3.2:**  
Structural Damage Capability



**ARAC Report Section 3.8:**  
Structural Inspections and ALS

## Composite Aging, LOV, and Damage Accumulation

- Current practices resulting in avoidance of safety related aging mechanisms for composite structures
- Composite considerations for LOV



**ARAC Report Section 3.4:**  
Aging Mechanisms

**ARAC Report Section 3.9:**  
Harmonize EASA Aging  
Aircraft Rulemaking

## Building Blocks for Analysis Supported by Test

- Relationship between analysis and test
- Appropriate scale for substantiation



**CMH-17 Section 4.3.7:**  
BB Analysis Validation

# CMH-17 F&DT Other Topics for Rev. H

## Additional Topics

- Flights with Known Damage and Defects
- Maintenance Inspection Technology
- Application of Probabilistic Methods
- Smarter Testing

**ARAC Report Section 3.5:**  
Inspection Thresholds

**ARAC Report Section 3.8:**  
Structural Inspections and ALS



## Topics Covered Elsewhere

- Bonded joints and bonded repairs
- Sandwich disbond

**CMH-17 updates are in-work by others (Borgman, Krueger, et. al.)**



# Priorities from Industry/Regulatory Working Group

## Priorities from Industry/Regulatory Working Group

- *“Key components of composite fatigue and damage tolerance and related maintenance practice that are typically addressed during type certification”*
- Agreed on several “**key aspects**” to focus on for each priority topic relative to safety and certification.
- The key aspects were rated by importance:
  - **Most Important**
  - **Needed**
  - *Desired in Time*
- The priorities established by the Industry/Regulatory Working Group generally align with the technical areas studied by the **Part 25 § 25.571 ARAC**.

Key aspects defined by the Industry/Regulatory Working Group align with the areas covered by the §25.571 ARAC.

Color-coded “key aspects” for each priority topic.

## § 25.571 ARAC Final Report

- Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee
- Transport Airplane Metallic and Composite Structures Working Group (TAMCSWG) – Recommendation Report to FAA
- Document provides a strong conceptual basis for many priority topics.
  - *Evaluate current § 25.571, subparts C and E of part 26, and guidance material*
  - *Recommend Rule or Guidance changes*
  - *Estimate the Costs and Benefits associated with any changes*

**The ARAC Final Report was reviewed with the goal of aligning the new content for CMH-17 Rev. H.**

### §25.571 ARAC Final Report

#### **Transport Airplane Metallic and Composite Structures Working Group – Recommendation Report to FAA**

RELEASE/REVISION  
**Final**

RELEASE DATE  
**June 27, 2018**

CONTENT OWNER:

**Transport Airplane Metallic and Composite Structures Working Group**

All revisions to this document must be approved by the content owner before release.

## § 25.571 ARAC Draft White Paper (Ilcewicz/Sippel)

- **“Goal:** Document key points on potential § 25.571 rule change and the related future guidance needs based on ARAC discussions and a review of progress in documenting industry recommendations.”
- Document is in **DRAFT** form but provides a strong conceptual basis for many priority topics.
  - *Living document, expected to change throughout ARAC process in order to build consensus before including in industry guidelines, guidance, or rules.*

**Key content from the §25.571 ARAC Draft White Paper was identified as possible input to CMH-17 Rev. H.**

### §25.571 ARAC Draft White Paper

#### **Transport Fatigue & Damage Tolerance Considerations in Evolving §25.571 (and supporting guidance) to Address Safety for Both Metals and Composites**

**Goal:** Document key points on potential §25.571 rule change and the related future guidance needs based on ARAC discussions and a review of progress in documenting industry recommendations.

§25.571 ARAC task-based approach currently being used (W. Sippel)

- a) Schedules and milestones (updated for an extension, with additional details since tasking started)
  - b) Synopsis of the deliverables (see June 2015 presentations with some updates for current details)
- Task 2 Items under consideration
- a) Briefly describe how they were derived and justify their need (W. Sippel)
  - b) Outline any task interactions evident from ARAC discussions (L. Ilcewicz, W. Sippel)
    - i) MSG-3 (normal maintenance), ALS, and inspections or other procedures intended to avoid catastrophic failure (e.g., HEWABI has safety management approach involving training, reporting awareness, conditional inspections and robust design practices that avoid questions on whether significant damage has occurred)
    - ii) SDC and failsafe have similar purpose and meaning unless the structure has a “single load path characteristic”, in which case, other procedures are sought to avoid catastrophic failure (e.g., lower stresses, more regular inspections). Even if SDC and failsafe design practice is possible the failure mode must be evident to ensure the proper inspection is performed (e.g., damage will not always be obvious as is the case for lack of bonded stringer attachment)
  - c) ID missing tasks or a need to generalize tasks in covering both metals & composites (L. Ilcewicz)
  - d) Summarize key points derived to date (L. Ilcewicz)
    - i) Critical damage threats differ significantly between metals and composites
    - ii) Maintenance inspections to avoid catastrophic failure differ for specific damage threats, including those that can’t be addressed through DTE (e.g., HEWABI)
    - iii) Aging phenomena for metals and composites have unique relationships with damage threats
    - iv) Hybrid (assemblies with metal and composite elements) structural considerations appear manageable through current industry practices, supported by minor rule changes
    - v) Damage tolerance evaluation (DTE) depend on damage assumptions & inspection limitations
    - vi) Baseline maintenance practices, applied with other scheduled inspections derived from DTE are consistent with the composite categories of damage (as defined in AC 20-107B), which are applied to composites to ensure damage threats are addressed in a timely manner
    - vii) Structural damage capability (SDC) to reduce potential catastrophic failure is essential to practical DTE and maintenance practices
    - viii) Most emerging technologies under consideration for airframe applications should be covered by rules generalized to address metals and composites
    - ix) Stringent QC practices and design limitations are used in combination with existing DTE practices to avoid catastrophic failure due to bonding manufacturing defects
  - e) Document inconsistencies or missing content in recommendations drafted by industry near the end of Task 2 from NAA perspectives (L. Ilcewicz, W. Sippel)
    - i) A desire for SDC, which unless it becomes required, may prove to be nothing more than “good design practice”. Perhaps we need to consider a less controversial definition. Let’s propose SDC as: “The capability of a structure to avoid catastrophic failure considering all the relevant limitations and assumptions associated with damage tolerance analysis/test evaluations and required inspections.” Such a definition would have a natural link with the Categories of Damage.



### 2014 ASC Paper [1]

#### Industry and Regulatory Interface in Developing Composite Airframe Certification Guidance

C. ASHFORTH, L. ILCEWICZ and R. JONES

**ASC paper provides regulatory perspective and is a good source for CMH-17 content updates.**

#### ABSTRACT

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has proactively worked with the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), Transport Canada (TCCA), and the international industry (domestic and foreign) to develop rules, policy and guidance applicable to the use of composites for many years. This has led to an excellent safety record in applying composite materials and structural bonding to critical airframe components since the 1970s. The emphasis of this paper will cover accomplishments since 1999. The paper will also discuss the background that helps make composite technology a viable option to mature metal technologies.

Since 1999, significant progress has been achieved towards regulatory standards relating to advanced composite material and process control, shared databases, bonding, repair, structural substantiation, fatigue & damage tolerance, inspection, and numerous other areas. The corresponding foundation for safety awareness education supporting structural engineering, manufacturing, and maintenance has also been achieved. The historical perspectives of these developments will be discussed. Finally, a seven year strategic plan will be presented that details future interface with industry for composite regulatory developments.

The FAA initiatives focus first and foremost on the safety of the existing fleet, and secondly on the efficiency of certifying new products. Service experience, such as the Airbus "lost rudder" incident on Air Transat Flight 961 on March 6, 2005, and the Cessna "spar disbond" incident identified in AD 2010-26-54, force priorities in FAA resources. Both historically and moving into the future, a majority of FAA initiatives center on the subjects of fatigue and damage tolerance (F&DT) and structural bonding, with related maintenance activities. Workforce education is a FAA priority that compliments all other initiatives by ensuring the FAA has the knowledge and skill to oversee composite design, manufacturing, and maintenance activities.

Cindy Ashforth and Larry Ilcewicz, Federal Aviation Administration, 1601 Lind Avenue SW, Renton, WA 98057  
Rusty Jones, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20591

[1] Ashforth, C., L. Ilcewicz, and R. Jones. "Industry and Regulatory Interface in Developing Composite Airframe Certification Guidance." In *Proceedings of the American Society for Composites (ASC) Twenty-Ninth Technical Conference*. La Jolla, CA, 2014.

## Scaling IPD Composite Airframe – Book Chapter (Ilcewicz/Ashforth)

- **Goal:** “...highlight some past development projects that led to civil airplane applications and the corresponding service experiences”, and “discuss barriers to expanding applications before addressing key considerations for composite integrated product development and implementation.”
- Documents a number of practices that allow for composite structures to avoid safety related aging mechanisms.

**Documents a number of practices contributing to avoid safety related aging mechanisms, identified as possible input to CMH-17 Rev. H.**

## Scaling IPD Composite Airframe – Book Chapter

### 3.2 Scaling Crucial to Integrated Product Development of Composite Airframe Structures

Larry Ilcewicz and Cindy Ashforth, Federal Aviation Administration, Renton, WA, United States

© 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

3.2.1	Introduction	26
3.2.2	Historical Perspective	27
3.2.2.1	Composite Structure Service Experience	30
3.2.2.1.1	Early experiences with Kevlar/epoxy composites	30
3.2.2.1.2	Boeing 737 horizontal stabilizer tear-down inspection	32
3.2.2.1.3	Beechcraft Starship wing tear-down inspection	34
3.2.2.1.4	Accidents, incidents and recurring field problems for composite airframe structures	36
3.2.2.1.5	A310 Flight 961 Incident Investigation	38
3.2.3	Issues Affecting Expanding Application	43
3.2.3.1	Cost and Weight Trades	44
3.2.3.2	Lack of Standardization	48
3.2.3.3	Lack of Knowledgeable Resources	49
3.2.3.4	Evolving Technology	50
3.2.3.5	Safety Lessons Learned Leading to More Regulation	53
3.2.4	Integrated Product Development	54
3.2.4.1	Product Value	54
3.2.4.2	Development Cycle Time	56
3.2.4.3	Technology Development and Product Implementation	57
3.2.4.4	IPDs	59
3.2.4.5	Scaling Issues	60
3.2.4.6	Size Scaling	61
3.2.4.7	Product Scaling	62
3.2.5	Aircraft Technology Development	65
3.2.5.1	Composite Fuselage Study Section and Critical Issues	65
3.2.5.2	Fuselage IPT Approach to Product Scaling	67
3.2.5.3	Composite Fuselage Quadrant Selection: Cost and Weight Trades	68
3.2.5.4	Composite Fuselage Crown Technology Development	70
3.2.5.4.1	Crown panel fabrication scale-up	71
3.2.5.4.2	Control of cured-panel tolerances as related to assembly	73
3.2.5.4.3	Critical structural scaling issues	74
3.2.5.4.4	Composite tensile damage tolerance and related crown panel design trades	75
3.2.5.4.5	Maintenance scaling issues	78
3.2.5.4.6	Assigning damage metrics to composite impact damage	79
3.2.6	Aircraft Product Implementation	84
3.2.6.1	Certification Considerations	84
3.2.6.2	Production Readiness	85
3.2.7	Guidelines for Integrated Product Development	86
3.2.8	Summary	87
References		88

#### 3.2.1 Introduction

The use of advanced composite materials in commercial aircraft structures has increased over time. Small airplanes and rotorcraft led early applications to critical structures, while transport aircraft use of composites gradually increased from the 1970s until the turn of the century, when advanced applications to wing and fuselage structure started. The nature of composite materials and fabrication processes used to make composite structures has promoted a multidisciplinary approach to product development, where key integrating functions such as design engineers needed advanced skills in both structures and manufacturing. The integrated product development approach has become essential to current applications, which seek further advances.

The main benefits of composites over metals technology for aircraft products have been structural weight savings, fatigue resistance, and corrosion suppression. Additional strategic defense benefits such as shielding and damage tolerance also led more

# CMH-17 Volumes for Polymer Matrix Composites (PMC)

Volume 1 – Guidelines for Characterization of Structural Materials

Volume 2 – Materials Properties

Volume 3 - Materials Usage, Design, and Analysis

Volume 6 - Structural Sandwich Composites

1. General Information
2. Introduction to Composite Structure Development
3. **Aircraft Structure Certification and Compliance**
4. **Building Block Approach For Composite Structures**
5. Materials and Processes
6. Quality Control of Production Materials and Processes
7. Design of Composites
8. Analysis of Laminates
9. Structural Stability Analyses
10. Design and Analysis of Bonded Joints
11. Design and Analysis of Bolted Joints
12. **Damage Resistance, Durability, and Damage Tolerance**
13. **Defects, Damage, and Inspection**
14. **Supportability, Maintenance, and Repair**
15. Thick-section Composites
16. Crashworthiness and Energy Management
17. Structural Safety Management
18. Environmental Management

Supporting discussions

Main D&DT content

Supporting discussions

# Ch. 12: Damage Resistance, Durability, and Damage Tolerance

12.1 Introduction

Content on most priority topics is contained in these sections.

**12.2 Rules, Requirements and Compliance for Aircraft**

**12.3 Design Development and Substantiation**

12.4 Inspection for Defects and Damage

12.5 Damage Resistance

**12.6 Durability and Damage Growth Under Cyclic Loading**

12.7 Residual Strength

**12.8 Application/Examples**

12.9 Supporting Discussions

# CMH-17 Updates – Section 12.2

## 12.2 Rules, Requirements and Compliance for Aircraft

### 12.2.1 Civil aviation regulations and guidance

12.2.1.1 Static strength with damage

12.2.1.2 Damage tolerance and fatigue

### 12.2.2 Categories of damage

12.2.2.1 Category 1

12.2.2.2 Category 2

12.2.2.3 Category 3

12.2.2.4 Category 4

12.2.2.4 Category 5

12.2.2.6 Factors affecting placement of damage in categories

12.2.3 Load and damage relationships

12.2.4 Compliance approaches

12.2.4.1 Deterministic compliance method

12.2.4.2 Probabilistic or semi-probabilistic compliance methods

#### Rev H Updates (Proposed)

- AC 25.307-1?

#### Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- HEWABI Policy Statement
- Relationship among categories

# CMH-17 Updates – Section 12.3

## 12.3 Design Development and Substantiation

### 12.3.1 Damage Threat Assessment

### 12.3.2 Damage design criteria

12.3.2.1 Category 1

12.3.2.2 Category 2

12.3.2.3 Category 3

12.3.2.4 Category 4

12.3.2.5 Large damage from undefined events

12.3.2.6 Relationship among categories of damage

### 12.3.3 Substantiation

### 12.3.4 Addressing Category 5 damage

### 12.3.5 Additional design development guidance

Rev H Updates (In-Work)

Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- SDC and minimum damage sizes
- Relationship among categories (including new section)

Rev H Updates (Complete)

Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- HEWABI Policy Statement

Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- Relationship among categories

# CMH-17 Updates – Section 12.6.1 & 12.6.2

## 12.6 Durability and Damage Growth Under Cyclic Loading

### 12.6.1 Influencing factors

12.6.1.1 Definitions for cyclic loading and S-N curves

12.6.1.2 Cyclic stress ratio (R-ratio) and spectrum effects

**12.6.1.3 Environment and thermal cycling**

**12.6.1.4 Visco-elastic effects**

12.6.1.5 Damage mechanisms

12.6.1.6 High-cycle fatigue

### 12.6.2 Design issues and guidelines

**12.6.2.1 Design details**

12.6.2.2 Damage tolerance considerations

**12.6.2.3 Aging considerations**

### 12.6.3 Test issues

<subsections not shown>

### 12.6.4 Analysis methods

<subsections not shown>

#### Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- Significant new content including sections on environmental cycling and visco-elastic effects (related to aging)

#### Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- New section summarizing aging issues with input from ARAC.



# CMH-17 Updates – Section 12.6.3

## 12.6 Durability and Damage Growth Under Cyclic Loading

### 12.6.1 Influencing factors

### 12.6.2 Design issues and guidelines

### 12.6.3 Test issues

#### 12.6.3.1 Scatter analysis of composites

##### 12.6.3.1.1 Individual Weibull method

##### 12.6.3.1.2 Joint Weibull method

##### 12.6.3.1.3 Sendekyj equivalent static strength model

#### 12.6.3.2 Life Factor approach

#### 12.6.3.3 Load Factor approach

#### 12.6.3.4 Load Enhancement Factor approach

##### 12.6.3.4.1 LEFs for complex structure

##### 12.6.3.4.2 Testing Requirements

##### 12.6.3.4.3 Considerations for Metal/Composite Hybrid Structure

#### 12.6.3.5 Ultimate Strength approach

#### 12.6.3.6 Test spectrum development

#### 12.6.3.7 Test environment

#### 12.6.3.8 Damage growth

### 12.6.4 Analysis methods

#### Rev H Updates (Complete)

- LEF guidance
- Emerging approaches and load sequencing

#### Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- Test spectrum development

# Ch. 4: Building Block Approach for Composite Structures

4.1 Introduction and Philosophy

4.2 Rationale and Assumptions

**4.3 Methodology**

4.4 Considerations for Specific Applications

4.5 Special Considerations and Variances for Specific Processes and Material Forms

**Content on building block priority topic is included in this section.**

# CMH-17 Updates – Section 4.3

## 4.3 Methodology

4.3.1 Failure modes

4.3.2 Analysis

4.3.3 Material qualification and allowables (coupon level)

4.3.4 Design detail allowables (element test level)

4.3.5 Critical structure pre-production assurance (subcomponent test level)

4.3.6 Full-scale structure validation—component level tests

**4.3.7 Analysis validation**

### Rev H Updates (In-Work)

- Protocol for Analysis and Test Correlation/Structural Substantiation