Boeing 747-236B, G-BDXH, 21 May 1996

AAIB Bulletin No: 4/97 Ref: EW/C96/5/9 Category: 1.1

Aircraft Type and Registration:	Boeing 747-236B, G-BDXH
No & Type of Engines:	4 Rolls Royce RB211-524D4 turbofan engines
Year of Manufacture:	1979
Date & Time (UTC):	21 May 1996 at 1118 hrs
Location:	20 nm southwest of London Gatwick Airport
Type of Flight:	Public Transport
Persons on Board:	Crew - 19 - Passengers - 186
Injuries:	Crew - None - Passengers - None
Nature of Damage:	Fin tip cap destroyed, No 4 powerplant components damaged
Commander's Licence:	Airline Transport Pilot's Licence
Commander's Age:	50 years
Commander's Flying Experience:	15,105 hours (of which 7,064 were on type)
	Last 90 days - 108 hours
	Last 28 days - 62 hours
Information Source:	AAIB Field Investigation

History of the flight

The aircraft took off at 1113 hrs from Runway 26L at Gatwick, bound for Lagos (Nigeria). The aircraft was cleared on a Bogna1M Standard Instrument Departure, which involved climbing straightahead initially for 4 nm before turning left onto a southerlytrack, climbing to 5,000 feet altitude. At the start of the lefturn, ATC requested the aircraft to take up a heading of 230° for traffic separation. The flight crew requested a turn onto240° to avoid weather. The Flight Data Recorder (see below)indicated that engine anti-ice on was selected for all four enginesat around this time. The aircraft was then cleared to climb to6,000 feet altitude.

As the aircraft reached 6,000 feet there was a loud bang as theaircraft was struck by lightning in the region of the No 4powerplant, after which the 'COWL OV HT' (Cowl Overheat) ambercaption

illuminated on the centre panel. A similar caption alsoappeared for the No 4 engine on the pilot's overhead panel. The aircraft continued a normal climb and proceeded on the plannedroute.

Company maintenance control was contacted by radio. Some diagnosticchecks were carried out on the system and it was confirmed thatthe No 4 engine Cowl Anti-Ice system was inoperative. Asthunderstorms and icing conditions were forecast further downthe route, the commander decided to return to London Gatwick Airport.In consultation with French ATC, a right turn was commenced atFL330, just south of Limoges, at 1219 hrs.

Some 2,000 kg of fuel was dumped during the return in order tobe comfortably below maximum permitted landing weight. While approachingMayfield VOR during the Gatwick Standard Arrival, the crew becameaware that both the No 1 and 2 VHF Navigation receiverswere inoperative, and they were thus unable to receive the ILSLocaliser signal. Glidepath indications were normal. A radar monitoredvisual approach was carried out to Runway 26L, where theaircraft landed uneventfully at 1338 hrs. After landing it wasobserved that most of the fin tip cap was missing.

The crew filed a company Air Safety Report and transferred acrossto another aircraft to operate the flight, which finally departed for Lagos at 1651 hrs.

An aftercast from the Meteorological Office indicated that, atthe time of the lightning strike, a cold front was just clearingKent with an unstable westerly airstream being established overSussex and Kent. The Meteorological Office radar showed one stormcell 10 nm south of Gatwick at 11:20:23 hrs. A thunderstormwas also reported at Manston, Kent at 1100 hrs.

Flight Recorders

The aircraft was fitted with a Cockpit Voice Recorder (CVR), aFlight Data Recorder (FDR) and an Optical Quick Access Recorder(OQAR). The circuit breaker for the CVR had not been pulled followingthe lightning strike and so the audio recordings of the entireflight had been overwritten. The FDR was removed from the aircraftand replayed at AAIB and the OQAR optical disk was removed andreplayed by the operator. Both recordings contained all of theincident flight.

Replay of the FDR showed that at 1118:12 hrs, as the aircraftclimbed through 5900 ft at 286 kt, the FDR recorded an incorrecttime for a period of 4 seconds. Data synchronisation was not lostand this was the only evidence of an electrical disturbance in the FDR recording system. At the same time the OQAR lost datasynchronisation for a period of 5 seconds and then recorded thesame incorrect time as the FDR for a further 4 seconds. Followingthe recovery of data synchronisation, the OQAR showed an engineNo 4 cowl overheat warning and that engine anti-ice on engineNo 4 had been set to off. In addition, the electrical outputsfrom the localiser No 1 and No 2 systems decayed togive readings of zero. No degradation of engine performance wasdetectable subsequent to the above events nor were any abnormalaircraft handling characteristics observed. None of the threeILS systems on the aircraft was used for the approach.

Aircraft Description

The top of the fin (Figure 1.1) is formed by three fairings(Figure 1.2) bolted to the upper edge of the aluminium skinof the main part of the fin, immediately above the topmost ribof the fin. A composite tip cap forms the main component; to thisis riveted an aluminium leading edge fairing and an aluminiumtrailing edge fairing. The tip cap is of sandwich constructionand consists of 0.38 inch thick plastic honeycomb bondedbetween an inner and an outer glass reinforced plastic

(GRP) epoxyskin. An aluminium diverter strip of 1.25 x 0.085 inch crosssection is riveted along the top of the fin cap and to the topof the leading and trailing edge fairings. The Maintenance Manual(Chapter 236100, Figure 1, Flagnote 4) showed3 wick-type static dischargers mounted on the diverter strip. A twin VOR/LOC antenna of aluminium construction, serving No 1and 2 systems, is mounted on the top rib of the fin beneaththe fin cap. Access to the antenna is provided by a 20 x 10 inchcut-out in the right side of the tip cap, covered with a GRP accesspanel retained by steel screws.

Aircraft Examination

Marks were evident on the lower outboard part of the No 4engine cowl, probably consistent with a lightning strike but without appreciable damage except for detachment and loss of the smallstarter valve access panel from the cowl.

Virtually all of the fin tip trailing edge fairing and much of the tip cap (approximately 70%) were missing (Figure 2.1), including the VOR/LOC antenna access panel. The cap generallyhad fractured immediately above the fin attachment flange; signs of slight localised overheat were evident in the area of several of the screw fasteners in this area. The forward part of the capremained in situ, together with the leading edge fairing and thewhole of the diverter strip, which remained bolted to the leadingedge fairing. The leading edge fairing had suffered minor deformationconsistent with the effects of a forward overload applied in theregion of the diverter strip attachment.

The VOR/LOC antennas had been considerably damaged, with the forwardpart broken up, heavily distorted and severely blackened (Figure 2.2). The two signal cables from the antenna had sustained severe overheatdamage in the fin cap area.

A lightning strike inspection by the operator revealed no otherevidence of strike damage to the aircraft.

It was noted that there were no attachment holes for static dischargerspresent in the fin tip cap diverter strip and the evidence showedthat none of the 3 static dischargers specified in the MaintenanceManual had been fitted. The operator did not believe that thepresence of these static dischargers, intended to reduce radioreceiver interference, would have any relevance to the likelihoodof experiencing a lightning strike or to the severity of the damageif a strike occurred.

Investigation of the aircraft systems identified a short circuitin the overheat detector transducer for the No 4 powerplantnose cowl, damage to the No 4 engine cowl anti-icing circuitand an electrical breakdown in the circuit for the oil temperature indicator. No other damage to aircraft systems was found by the operator. No evidence of damage to the VOR/LOC receivers was foundand the aircraft returned to service with the same receivers installed.

History

Boeing Service Bulletin 747552027, issued 16 May1986, concerned reduction in the likelihood of lightning strikedamage to the 747 tip cap area. The Bulletin summary included:

"BACKGROUND: The accomplishment of this modification willreduce the possibility of damage to the VOR antenna and fin tipcap structure caused by lightning strike.

Eleven operators have reported 23 instances of VOR antenna damageresulting from lightning strikes. Lightning strikes have causedvarying degrees of damage from small pit marks on the antennaelements up to almost complete destruction of antenna elements, coax cables, and fibreglass honeycomb fin tip cap structure. Thepath of lightning penetration to the antenna is suspected to bethe antenna access door metal fasteners.

A sustained lightning strike could cause the VOR system to be inoperative and require repair or replacement of the fin tip assembly before the next flight."

The modification involved the removal and discarding of the VORaccess panel fasteners from the forward, upper and aft edges of the panel and the attachment of the panel by adhesive bonding. Three vertical diverter strips were then to be bonded with adhesive each side of the cap in the region of the VOR antenna (Figure 1.3). The Bulletin listed the kit cost as US\$590 and the total labourrequirement as 10 manhours. A consequence of incorporating the modification would be that the whole fin tip cap would need to be removed to gain access to the VOR/LOC antennas.

The modification was optional and the operator had reportedlyrejected it because of the low frequency of lightning strike damageto the VOR/LOC antennas and fin tip structure. The operator alsoconsidered that, while the additional diverter strips may assistin reducing damage, they would not preclude all damage, particularlyfrom powerful strikes. It had not been incorporated on G-BDXH.

Recommendation

In this case the lightning strike caused a false cowl overheatwarning, loss of the anti-icing system on one engine, incorrectindication of engine oil temperature and loss of two of the threeVOR systems on the aircraft, together with the dropping of fairlylarge pieces of the fin tip fairings on Sussex. The evidence indicated that the likelihood of the damage to the VOR systems and to thefin tip fairings could have been reduced by the modification described above. It has therefore been recommended that:

Recommendation 97-13:

The CAA, in conjunction with the aircraft manufacturer, give detailed consideration to requiring the incorporation of Service Bulletin 747552027on UK registered Boeing 747 aircraft. (Recommendation madeMarch 1997).