AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

external aerodynamic pressures, and flight loads. These loads must be multiplied by a factor of 1.15 unless the dynamic effects of failure under static load are otherwise considered.

(c) The damage tolerance evaluation of § 23.573(b).

[Doc. No. 4080, 29 FR 17955, Dec. 18, 1964, as amended by Amdt. 23–14, 38 FR 31821, Nov. 19, 1973; Amdt. 23–45, 58 FR 42163, Aug. 6, 1993; Amdt. 23–48, 61 FR 5147, Feb. 9, 1996]

§ 23.572 Metallic wing, empennage, and associated structures.

(a) For normal, utility, and acrobatic category airplanes, the strength, detail design, and fabrication of those parts of the airframe structure whose failure would be catastrophic must be evaluated under one of the following unless it is shown that the structure, operating stress level, materials and expected uses are comparable, from a fatigue standpoint, to a similar design that has had extensive satisfactory service experience:

(1) A fatigue strength investigation in which the structure is shown by tests, or by analysis supported by test evidence, to be able to withstand the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected in service; or

(2) A fail-safe strength investigation in which it is shown by analysis, tests, or both, that catastrophic failure of the structure is not probable after fatigue failure, or obvious partial failure, of a principal structural element, and that the remaining structure is able to withstand a static ultimate load factor of 75 percent of the critical limit load factor at V_c. These loads must be multiplied by a factor of 1.15 unless the dynamic effects of failure under static load are otherwise considered.

(3) The damage tolerance evaluation of § 23.573(b).

(b) Each evaluation required by this section must—

(1) Include typical loading spectra (e.g. taxi, ground-air-ground cycles, maneuver, gust);

(2) Account for any significant effects due to the mutual influence of aerodynamic surfaces; and

(3) Consider any significant effects from propeller slipstream loading, and buffet from vortex impingements.

[Amdt. 23–7, 34 FR 13090, Aug. 13, 1969, as amended by Amdt. 23–14, 38 FR 31821, Nov. 19, 1973; Amdt. 23–34, 52 FR 1830, Jan. 15, 1987; Amdt. 23–38, 54 FR 39511, Sept. 26, 1989; Amdt. 23–45, 58 FR 42163, Aug. 6, 1993; Amdt. 23–48, 61 FR 5147, Feb. 9, 1996]

§ 23.573 Damage tolerance and fatigue evaluation of structure.

(a) *Composite airframe structure*. Composite airframe structure must be evaluated under this paragraph instead of §§ 23.571 and 23.572. The applicant must evaluate the composite airframe structure, the failure of which would result in catastrophic loss of the airplane, in each wing (including canards, tandem wings, and winglets), empennage, their carrythrough and attaching structure, moveable control surfaces and their attaching structure fuselage, and pressure cabin using the damage-tolerance criteria prescribed in paragraphs (a)(1) through (a)(4) of this section unless shown to be impractical. If the applicant establishes that damage-tolerance criteria is impractical for a particular structure, the structure must be evaluated in accordance with paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(6) of this section. Where bonded joints are used, the structure must also be evaluated in accordance with paragraph (a)(5) of this section. The effects of material variability and environmental conditions on the strength and durability properties of the composite materials must be accounted for in the evaluations required by this section.

(1) It must be demonstrated by tests, or by analysis supported by tests, that the structure is capable of carrying ultimate load with damage up to the threshold of detectability considering the inspection procedures employed.

(2) The growth rate or no-growth of damage that may occur from fatigue, corrosion, manufacturing flaws or impact damage, under repeated loads expected in service, must be established by tests or analysis supported by tests.

(3) The structure must be shown by residual strength tests, or analysis supported by residual strength tests, to be able to withstand critical limit flight loads, considered as ultimate loads,

with the extent of detectable damage consistent with the results of the damage tolerance evaluations. For pressurized cabins, the following loads must be withstood:

(i) Critical limit flight loads with the combined effects of normal operating pressure and expected external aerodynamic pressures.

(ii) The expected external aerodynamic pressures in 1g flight combined with a cabin differential pressure equal to 1.1 times the normal operating differential pressure without any other load.

(4) The damage growth, between initial detectability and the value selected for residual strength demonstrations, factored to obtain inspection intervals, must allow development of an inspection program suitable for application by operation and maintenance personnel.

(5) For any bonded joint, the failure of which would result in catastrophic loss of the airplane, the limit load capacity must be substantiated by one of the following methods—

(i) The maximum disbonds of each bonded joint consistent with the capability to withstand the loads in paragraph (a)(3) of this section must be determined by analysis, tests, or both. Disbonds of each bonded joint greater than this must be prevented by design features; or

(ii) Proof testing must be conducted on each production article that will apply the critical limit design load to each critical bonded joint; or

(iii) Repeatable and reliable non-destructive inspection techniques must be established that ensure the strength of each joint.

(6) Structural components for which the damage tolerance method is shown to be impractical must be shown by component fatigue tests, or analysis supported by tests, to be able to withstand the repeated loads of variable magnitude expected in service. Sufficient component, subcomponent, element, or coupon tests must be done to establish the fatigue scatter factor and the environmental effects. Damage up to the threshold of detectability and ultimate load residual strength capability must be considered in the demonstration.

(b) *Metallic airframe structure.* If the applicant elects to use § 23.571(a)(3) or § 23.572(a)(3), then the damage tolerance evaluation must include a determination of the probable locations and modes of damage due to fatigue, corrosion, or accidental damage. The determination must be by analysis supported by test evidence and, if available, service experience. Damage at multiple sites due to fatigue must be included where the design is such that this type of damage can be expected to occur. The evaluation must incorporate repeated load and static analyses supported by test evidence. The extent of damage for residual strength evaluation at any time within the operational life of the airplane must be consistent with the initial detectability and subsequent growth under repeated loads. The residual strength evaluation must show that the remaining structure is able to withstand critical limit flight loads, considered as ultimate, with the extent of detectable damage consistent with the results of the damage tolerance evaluations. For pressurized cabins, the following load must be withstood:

(1) The normal operating differential pressure combined with the expected external aerodynamic pressures applied simultaneously with the flight loading conditions specified in this part, and

(2) The expected external aerodynamic pressures in 1g flight combined with a cabin differential pressure equal to 1.1 times the normal operating differential pressure without any other load.

[Doc. No. 26269, 58 FR 42163, Aug. 6, 1993; 58 FR 51970, Oct. 5, 1993, as amended by Amdt. 23–48, 61 FR 5147, Feb. 9, 1996]

§ 23.574 Metallic damage tolerance and fatigue evaluation of commuter category airplanes.

For commuter category airplanes—

(a) *Metallic damage tolerance.* An evaluation of the strength, detail design, and fabrication must show that catastrophic failure due to fatigue, corrosion, defects, or damage will be avoided throughout the operational life of the airplane. This evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the provisions of § 23.573, except as specified in paragraph (b) of this section, for each