Safety Unit

F.ACT.O.R.



FOLLOW-UP ACTION ON OCCURRENCE REPORT

FACTOR n.:	01/2017	issue da (data di emissio	te one)	02/02/2017	Rev (stato di revision	1. 0
Operation type (tipo di volo)	□ commercial air transport ☑ g (trasporto aereo commerciale)		gene (aviaz	ral aviation	aerial work	□ other (altro)
a/c category (categoria aeromobile)	☑ Fixe (a □ Hel (ala	ed wing ^{Ia fissa)} licopter ^{I rotante)}		Balloon (mongolfiera) Dirigible (dirigibile)	ت و رد R در	Glider Allante) APAS GAPR)
1 st a/c involved (1° a/m coinvolto)	manufacturer (costruttore)			ty	PE (modello)	Registration Mark (marche)
	Tecnam				F-GXEC	
2nd a/c involved (2° a/m coinvolto)	manufacturer (costruttore)			ty	pe (modello)	Registration Mark (marche)
	-			-		-
Occurrence Location: Andernos-les-Bains (France)			Occurrence dat (data dell'event	t e: 26/10/2013		

Technical Investigation	ANSV					
(Rapporto di Investigazione emesso da)	☑ BEA (Bureau d'Enquetes e d'Analyses)	n. (<i>if applicable – se applicabile</i>)				
Title: (titolo del Rapporto)	Failure of a rudder control component, runway excursion during landing, coming to a standstill in a ditch					
Ref. no.: (n. di protocollo)	002132/BEA/D Incoming D	ate: 14 September 2016				

Event description (copied from *): (descrizione dell'evento – tratto da *)

The aeroplane landed shortly beyond the displaced threshold on unpaved runway 13, rolled about 100 metres and exited the runway to the right. After crossing the taxiway, it came to rest in the adjacent ditch.



FOLLOW-UP ACTION

Safety Recommendation no.: (Raccomandazione di Sicurezza n.)	FRAN-2016-037	
The Italian production Supervisory Aut the welding and weld inspection proce	ority ensure that the manufacturer of the Tec ses, to reduce the risk of crack initiation.	nam P 2002 improves
ENAC Recommendation Assessment (p	izione dell'ENAC):	
 agreement (in accordo) partial agreement (parzialmente in accordo) 	more information requi	più applicabile) red (richieste ulteriori informazioni)
disagreement (in disaccordo)	not responsible (non response	sabilità di ENAC)
	unknown (non definita)	
ENAC response (valutazione dell'ENAC):		
From the information received, Tecnam do probably the result of the incident. The ro who in this specific case with critical cro operation, increasing overly the loads on excessive load which damaged the pedal lin	s not consider the pedal as the root cause of occu t cause of issue is more probably the landing pro s wind (around 90°, with gust 10Kts) didn't ma ne pedals. Probably he aligned the NLG before to kage.	rrence but it could be more cedure performed by Pilot, nage correctly the landing touch ground creating an
Another possible conclusion could be that control of the aircraft avoiding to come int	he pilot landed out of paved runway and was not ditch.	able to break and keep the

The conclusions above are confirmed from bent rod which indicate the high load transmitted on pedal (Before landing and after).

Considering that the airplane P2002 JF s/n 038, delivered in May 2006, had 3195 flight hours without problem Tecnam is confident that the issue is not related to production issue. In addition, the problem occurs on a part which is made in special steel (4130 welded), material known for its great fatigue strength and low propagation speed of cracks.

Moreover Tecnam informs that damaged pedal is installed on around 2500 aircraft (countering CS-VLA and UL/LSA) and considering that only 2 occurrences were received on it, the failure rate is very low, around ≈0,0008.

Finally Tecnam didn't receive occurrences on the pedal, without counting this latter, since 2011.

In addition the two occurrence analyzed with EASA PCM, have been detected during the application of SB-018, so also the limits, reported in the SB, are appropriate to detect the damage.

Therefore also if the crack was present, as third remote possibility, it underlines a probably poor maintenance by customer, which didn't detect the crack, if present, in the previous maintenances.

EASA PCM agrees with Tecnam investigation and conclusion.

Although during the POA audit a revision of SB-018 has been proposed, at the end Tecnam didn't consider necessary, from all performed investigation, further corrective actions because no similar occurrences were received since 2013, and therefore the SB results to be adequate to identify the cracks.

Completion Status (cross the applicable %)	0%	25 %	50 %	75 %	х
(stato di completamento del follow-up – segnare con una X la % applicabile)					

This publication is issued according to Regulation EU 996/2010 art. 18 Questa pubblicazione viene emessa in ottemperanza al Regolamento EU 996/2010 art. 18.