The PANDA®, Variable Energy Lightweight Dynamic Cone Penetrometer : A quick state of art

Miguel Angel BENZ-NAVARRETE[a,1], Pierre BREUL[b], Claude BACCONET[b] and Philippe MOUSTAN[a]
[a] *Sol-Solution, Research & Innovation Department, , France*
[b] *Institut Pascal, Civil Engineering, Clermont Auvergne University, France*

Abstract. Dynamic penetrometer is a worldwide practice in geotechnical exploration and Panda® lightweight variable energy is the most developed device nowaday. Widely used in France, in Europe and many other countries, Panda® remains unknown. A brief state of art is presented. The principle, the use and interpretation as well different relationship with other methods and geotechnical parameters are presnted

Keywords. Panda, Dynamic penetrometer, soil characterization, in-situ test, compaction control, soil correlation

1. Introduction

Dynamic penetration tests (DPT) are a worldwide technique for soil characterization. Due to its rapid implementation, affordability and suitability for a large range of soils, DPT are present in many countries. This is certainly the oldest one technique for geotechnical soil characterization. The first known experiences of the DPT date back to the 17th century in Europe. Goldmann described a dynamic penetrometer as a method of hammering a rod with a conical tip where penetration per blow can be recorded to find differences in the soil stratigraphy. At the beginning of the 20th century, the first major development also took place in Germany with the development of a lightweight dynamic penetrometer, the *Künzel Prüfstab*, later standardized in 1964 as the "Light Penetrometer Method" (fig. 1.a).

With the European development of DPTs and because of its simplicity, many developments have taken place around the world. Scala developed in Australia the Scala dynamic penetrometer, which has been widely used for design and control of pavement. Sowers and Hedges developed the Sowers penetrometer, for in-situ soil exploration and to assess the bearing capacity of shallow footings. Webster et al. and the US Army Corps of Engineers developed the dual mass DCP, well known in North America (ASTM 6951). The Mackintosh probe was developed recently by Sabtan and Shehata.

---

[1] Corresponding Author: Miguel Angel Benz-Navarrete, Research, Development and Innovation Department, Sol Solution, France; E-mail: mbenz@sol-solution.com

Figure 1. (a) Prüfstab Künzel-Paproth" (b) Panda® lightweight dynamic variable energy penetrometer: first generation and (c) Panda 2®: second generation.

Low driving energy and limited probing depth caused the development of heavier devices in Europe and USA (*SPT, Borros…*). Several generations of DPTs have followed one another and we can find today a wide variety of them and their use and features are described by ISO 22476-2. Nevertheless, despite the wide variety of DPTs developed the last century, the mean principle, the equipment and technology no changes and remains the same as that described by Goldmann in 1699 and the *Künzel Prüfstab*. In fact, in contrast to the CPT, which has undergone significant technological development, DPTs stayed away from these advances and remain old and rudimentary.

It was at the end of the 1980s that the first major improvements took place. In France, Roland Gourvès developed the first instrumented lightweight dynamic variable energy penetrometer: The Panda® (fig. 1.b).

2. The PANDA® penetrometer

Created in 1989, the mean idea was to design an instrumented and autonomous measuring dynamic system, at low cost, that is lightweight, but with sufficient penetration power to probe most of shallows soils. Variable energy driving, allowing to adapted driving according to the soil compaction encountered during a test, is the main originality of the device. Currently, two version of Panda® have been developed and a third is being prepared.

2.1. Measuring principle, equipment & practical use

Panda® principle is the same of DPTs. Nevertheless, for each blow the energy is measured at the anvil by means of strain gauges. Other sensors measure cone penetration per blow. The HMI, named TDD, receives both measurements and dynamic cone resistance *qd* is automatically calculated by modified Dutch formula; where potential energy is replaced by kinetic energy in the first version and by the elastic strain energy in the second version of Panda®.

The device is composed by 6 main elements: hammer, instrumented anvil, rods, cones, central acquisition unit (UCA) and TDD (fig. 2.b). The total weight is less than 20Kg, which makes it easily transportable.



Figure 2. (a) General principle of Panda® (from french Pénétromètre Autonome Numérique Dynamique Assisté par ordinateur), (b) Panda 2® set (2002): main components and (c) examples of Panda® penetrograms obtained in-situ (a very high resolution of sounding logs can be observed).

The UCA is an electronic device designed to control the measurements and recordings made by the different Panda's sensors. The TDD is a PDA interface (HMI) and facilitates communication between the operator and Panda®, site edition, test programming and their visualization at the end. The instrumented anvil includes strain gauges and immediately after one blow, deformation signal is transmitted to the UCA, as well as penetration per blow. Cone resistance *qd* is calculated and recorded immediately.

In practice, it is recommended to obtain penetration per blow from 2 to 20mm along the test. In this way, measurements are almost continuous with depth and makes the test a powerful means of identifying the thickness of layers or pathogenic sections in depth (Fig. 3.c). Used rod diameter and length is 14mm and 500mm, while cone section commonly employed is respectively 2cm^2 (surface compaction control) and 4cm^2 (deep soil characterization). Penetration power that a man can generate is enough to penetrate soil layers having cone resistances below 50MPa and the total sounding depth can reach 6 meter. About soil characteristic, grain size is limited to $D_{max} < 50$mm. Panda® is currently used for soil shallow characterization; compaction control of earthworks, railways control, assessment of the bearing capacity, liquefaction risk evaluation…

3. Processing, interpretation and explode

One of the great advantages of the Panda® is that it allows a very fine sounding of soil layers having very low to very high cone resistance. The main result, the penetrogram, provide a very high spatial resolution signal in depth (fig. 2.c). In addition, the ease of repeating field test, facilitates the implementation of statistical analyzes that allow characterizing the soil mechanical response and establish their spatial variability. However, in most cases, signal processing must be performed on raw penetrograms, especially when analyzing deep soil investigation tests. In this way, it is common to make a signal clipping (outliers remove), then a smoothing and/or a regularization with a sliding windows of constant width W_j (10mm).

$$qd^* = \frac{\sum qd_i \cdot e_i}{\sum e_i} \tag{1}$$



Figure 3. (a) **Panda**® test for earthwork compaction control and (b) Fundamental principle of interpretation, (c) geotechnical investigation tests and (d) raw, smoothed and regulated Panda® penetrograms.

Where qd_i and e_i are respectively the cone resistance and blow penetration measured into the window W_j. Moreover, since measurements of *qd* correspond to the net cone resistance, it is recommended, for calculations purposes, to consider the overburden pressure effects.

$$qd_1 = qd\left(\frac{p_a}{\sigma'_{vo}}\right)^n \tag{2}$$

Where *qd* is the raw or smoothing cone resistance, p_a is atmospheric pressure (1atm ≈ 0,1 Mpa), σ'_{vo} is effective stress and *n* a normalization exponent (often take as 0,5).

3.1. Compaction control, density and bearing capacity (CBR) estimation

Compaction control by using dynamic penetrometer has been developed over the last thirty years and is described by French standard (NF 94-105). It consists to compare the penetrogram obtained with two references curves respectively, q_R and q_L. These curves, determined usually in the laboratory by calibration for different materials, compaction degrees and water content, are included in a database. In fact, univocally relationship between con resistance, dry density and water content has been shown. The general established model is shown in (Eq. 3) where A, B and C are the regression coefficient determined for each soil and included in the database. Recently, it has been considered the saturation degree (*Sr*) in order to improve sand density prediction (Eq. 4). If soil and water content are unknown, it can be considered the (Eq.5). Bulk density (Eq. 6) can be also estimated with a good agreement for all soils.

$$\gamma_d = A(w) + Bln(qd) + C \tag{3}$$

Relative density (D.R) can be also approach with Panda®. For silty sands and mine waste rock, a correlation between (*D.R*) and qd_1 has been propose (Eq. 7). Moreover, for normally consolidated sands it can be considered (Eq. 8) and in all cases it can be accepted (Eq. 9):

California bearing ration CBR. Several studies have established a correlation (figure 5.a) between the Panda® test and the CBR value determined according to the recommendations of ASTM 6951 (Eq. 10).

Table 1. Density and compaction control using Panda® - Synthesis of correlation.

Soil parameter	**Expression**	**Soil type – coefficients values**				**equation**
		Soil type	A	B	C	
Dry density	$\gamma_d = Aln(Sr) + Bln(qd) + C$	*gravels & sands*	*1.88*	*0.73*	*18.49*	(eq. 4)
		sandy soils	*2.48*	*0.47*	*18.53*	
		Clay and silts	*3.20*	*0.84*	*17.25*	
Dry density	$\gamma_d = 1{,}06 \cdot ln(qd) + 15{,}82$	*All soils*				(eq. 5)
Bulk density	$\gamma_T/\gamma_w = 0{,}36 \cdot log\left(\frac{qd}{p_a}\right) + 1{,}43$	*All soils. (adapted from CPT test)*				(eq. 6)
Relative Density	$D.R = 28{,}5 \cdot \ln\left(\frac{qd_1}{pa}\right) - 65{,}40$	*silty sands and mine waste rock*				(eq. 7)
	$D.R = 100 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{qd_1}{300 \cdot pa}}$	*normally consolidated sands*				(eq. 8)
	$D.R = 4{,}22 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{qd_1}{pa}} + 17{,}71$	*All sandy soils*				(eq. 9)
CBR (%)	$CBR = \alpha \cdot (qd)^{\beta}$	Soil type	α	β		(eq. 10)
		All soils	*1.56*	*1.10*		
		Plastic clays and silts	*3.27*	*1.00*		
		Clays and silts of low plasticity (CBR< 10)	*0.304*	*2.00*		

(*) pa atmospheric pressure 1atm = 0.103Mpa

3.2. Correlation with other geotechnical tests

Several works have been carried out to correlated the cone resistance qd of Panda® and other geotechnical tests (*CPT, SPT, PMT…*) (Table 2).

Correlation with SPT (N_{60} - qd). Considering great similarity of the tests and despite the high variability of the results obtained with the SPT probe, it has been demonstrated that there is a good relationship between the cone resistance *qd* and N_{SPT} or N_{60} blows number. This depends mainly on the grain size distribution of the soil (Eq. 11-12).

Correlation with the CPT (qc - qd). When drive energy is controlled and adapted, it has been found that dynamic resistance qd has a good correspondence with net resistance qc of CPT. Different studies have shown that there is a very good correlation between Panda® and CPT. In most cases it can be considered qd qc (Eq 13-14)

Correlation with the PMT (pl - qd, EM - qd). Although the pressuremeter is most widely test used in France, very few comparative studies with dynamic penetrometer Panda® was carried out. Nevertheless, several correlations between the cone resistance *qd* of Panda® and Ménard pressuremeter results (p_L and E_M) for different soils are presented and can be considered (Eq. 15)

Correlation with the DCP (IDCP - qd). Widely known in America (ASTM 6951) and around the world, DCP is close to Panda®. Given its similarity, it has been shown that there is a very good correlation between cone resistance qd and penetration index IDCP of DCP. It is depended on hammer weight of DCP (Eq. 16).

Table 2. Soil characterization by using Panda® - Synthesis of regression coefficients.

Geotechnical test	Expression	Soil type – coefficients values			equation
Standard penetration test SPT	$\frac{\left(qd/pa \right)}{N_{60}} = \alpha$	Soil type	α		(eq. 11)
		Organic clays	*1,8 à 2,4*		
		Clays	*2,2 à 3,0*		
		Silt, clayey silts and silt mixtures	*2,8 à 3,6*		
		Silty and clay sand	*3,0 à 4,5*		
		Sands	*4,4 à 6,8*		
	$\frac{\left(qd/pa \right)}{N_{60}} = A \cdot {D_{50}}^{B}$		*A*	*B*	(eq. 12)
		All soil	*5.44 - 6.64*	*0.2 - 0.28*	
Cone penetration test CPT	$qc \cong (0{,}93 \text{ à } 1{,}05) \cdot qd$	*All granular and cohesive soils normally consolidate*			(eq. 13)
	$qc = 0{,}94 \cdot qd + 0{,}39$				(eq. 14)
Pressuremeter test PMTt	$\left(\mathrm{qd}/\mathrm{p_L} \right) \approx \alpha_{\mathrm{pl}}$	*Soil type*	α_{pl}	β_{EM}	(eq. 15)
		clays	*2,2 à 4,0*	*3,0 à 5,7*	
	$\left(\mathrm{E_M}/\mathrm{qd} \right) \approx \alpha_{\mathrm{E_M}}$	*silts*	*2,8 à 5,6*	*2,0 à 4,2*	
		sands	*7,2 à 9,4*	*0,9 à 1,8*	
Dynamic cone probing DCP (ASTM 6951)	$qd = \alpha IDCP^{-1} + \beta$	*DCP hammer*	α	β	(eq. 16)
		4.7kg weight	*62.4*	*0.37*	
		8.0kg weight	*108.7*	*0.27*	
		All cases	*97.8*	*0.31*	

3.3. Soil characterization parameters

Panda ® is a very interesting and powerful tool to characterize shallow soils. Several works have been carried out in order to correlate cone resistance and some geomechanical parameters of soils (Table 3).

Estimation of friction angle. For sands and sandy mixtures, friction angle can be estimated using (Eq. 17-18). Recently, [57] [69] [70] propose some relationships to relate friction angle, cohesion, cone resistance qd Panda® and saturation degree for fine soils

Estimation of undrained shear strength (s_u-qd). Classically, it is assumed that the undrained shear strength on fine soils is very good correlated with the dynamic cone resistance *qd* of dynamic penetrometer. (Eq. 19) can be used with Panda® cone resistance in fines soils.

Estimation of the shear wave velocity (Vs-qd). In general, a good estimation of shear wave velocity can be obtained from cone resistance qd and (Eq. 20-21). In addition, by knowing the shear wave propagation rate and dry density (Eq. 4-5), the shear modulus G (Mpa) can be determined (Eq. 22) with a good agreement.

Estimation of the deformability modulus (E-qd). Elastic modulus can be approached using penetration cone resistance qd (Eq. 23); particularly odometer modulus (E_{oed}). Linear relationship has been proposed in literature between q_d and E_{oed} for different soils (Eq. 24) and a good estimation can be found.

Table 3. Soil characterization by using Panda® - Synthesis of correlations.

Soil parameter	Expression	Soil type – coefficients values		equation
friction angle (ϕ')	$\phi' = 14{,}4 + 5{,}61 \cdot \ln({}^{qd_1}/_{pa})$	*For sands and sandy mixtures*		(eq. 17)
	$\phi' = 17.2 \cdot ({}^{qd_1}/_{pa})^{0.185}$			(eq. 18)
undrained shear strength (s_u)	$s_u = \dfrac{qd - \sigma_{vo}}{N_{kt}}$ *Where* $N_{KT} \approx 0.285 * IP + 7.64$	N_{KT}*(*)*	*IP range*	(eq. 19)
		11	*10 to 12*	
		13	*12 to 25*	
		17	*25 to 40*	
		23	*> 40*	
shear wave velocity (Vs)	$\log Vs = (0.12 \cdot \gamma_T + 0{,}194 \log z)$	*Adapted from CPT literature*		(eq. 20)
	$Vs = 78{,}15 \cdot qd^{0{,}39}$	*All soils*		(eq. 21)
Shear modulus (G)	$G = V_s^{\,2} \cdot \gamma_d$			(eq. 22)
Elastic Young's Modulus (E)	$E = 2 \cdot (1 + \mu) \cdot G$			(eq. 23)
Oedometric modulus (E_{OED})	$E_{oed} \approx \alpha \cdot qd$	*Soil type*	α	(eq. 24)
		Compact clays	*3.0 - 5.0*	
		Soft clays (qd <1.0Mpa)	*5.0 - 9.5*	
		Sandy clays	*2.8 - 3.6*	
		Clayey silts	*2.5 - 4.0*	
		Silt, sandy silt	*1.0 - 2.0*	
		Clayey sands, silty sands	*2.0 - 5.0*	
		Sands	*1.0 - 2.0*	

3.4. Other cases studies

Panda® is used to evaluate bearing capacity of shallow foundation, to improve slopes soil characterization as well as to assess the liquefaction risk of tailings dams. earthwork compaction control, transport and railways structures sounding…

Shallows foundations: ultimate and admissible bearing capacity. dynamic penetrometer is an efficient and reliable tool to assess the admissible and ultimate bearing capacity according to ELU and ELS. Formulas commonly used:

$$Q_{adm-ELU} \approx \frac{qd}{5 \text{ à } 7} \qquad\qquad Q_{adm-ELS} \approx \frac{qd}{14 \text{ à } 20} \tag{25}$$

Precise evaluations of bearing capacity or settlement of shallow foundation can be made through the theory of bearing capacity (Terzaghi, 1943; Meyerhof, 1956; Brinch Hansen, 1968; Boussinesq; Magnan et al, 2014) and considering soil nature (cohesive or non-cohesive) as well as different soil parameters estimated from Panda® (Sanglerat, 1972; Fabian, 2002; Sanhueza and Villavicencio, 2010).

Determination of liquefaction risk. A realistic model of soil behaviour and liquefaction risk requires a fine detailed characterization as well as vertical evolution of the physical, mechanical and dynamic properties of soils. From in-situ test, the main objective is to assess the variation of cyclic resistance ratio (CRR) considering an earthquake whit magnitude (M_w: 7.5). Based on the (Seed and Idriss, 1971; Robertson and Wride, 1997; Robertson and Fear, 1998, Robertson, 2009) works, (Lepetit, 2002) proposes a method to assess liquefaction potential with Panda®. Here the main parameters of Robertson's method are substituted by cone resistance qd and soil permeability coefficient k (Duchesne et al. 2004).



Figure 4. Panda® surveys conducted for compaction control and liquefaction risk assessment of Tailings dams (c.f. Espinace et al. 2013), (b) Evolution of the safety factor for deep liquefaction from qd_{N1cs} (M_W : 8.0 & a_{max} : 0.271g) (c.f. Villavicencio, 2009) and (c) example of a post-seismic resistance map (top) and a Panda® liquefaction safety factor mapping (c.f. Lepetit, 2002)

Recently, as part of the assessment of the stability of Chilean tailings dams (Villavicencio, 2009; Villavicencio et al., 2010; Villavicencio et al., 2011; Villavicencio et al, 2012; Espinace et al. 2013a; Espinace et al., 2013b; Villavicencio et al., 2016), propose a study to estimate the CRR7.5 coefficient based on the dynamic cone resistance qd of Panda®. This method also builds on the work of (Robertson and Fear, 1998) by considering the relationship proposed by (Idriss and Boulanger, 2004). For the evaluation of the IC behaviour index, it is calculated from fines contents (%FC).

4. Conclusions

Dynamic penetrometer Panda® is a practical, quick and efficient method for shallow soil characterization. The repeatability, reliability and sensibility of the results make it an appropriate in-situ tool for assessing spatial variability of soil mechanical parameters, even in areas difficult access. Panda® represents today a very important advance in technology. Studies carried out during the last 30 years have made possible to define correlations based on the cone resistance qd to assess orders of magnitude of soil geotechnical values as well as relationship with other geotechnical testing.

References

[1] B. Broms et N. Flodin, «History of soil penetration testing,» *in Proc. of International symposium on penetration testing, ISOPT 1, Orlando, Vol. 1,* pp. 157-220, 1988.

[2] N. Goldmann, «Comprehensive guidelines to the art of building (Vollständige Anweisung zu der Civil Bau-Kunst),» Germany, 1699.

[3] E. Künzel, «The Test Rod, a simple tool for soil testing. Ten instructive examples of soil testing-15 possibilities of further application,» *Bauwelt No. 14,* pp. 327-329, 1936.

[4] Paproth, «The Künzel test rod, a device for soil investigation.,» *Construction engineering ,* pp. 327-340, 1943.

[5] A. Scala, «Simple Methods of Flexible Pavement Design Using Cone Penetrometers,» *New Zealand Engineering,* pp. 34-44, 1956.

[6] D. J. Van Vuuren, «Rapid Determination of CBR with the Portable Dynamic Cone Penetrometer,» *The Rhodesian Engineer, Vol. 7, No.5,* pp. 852-854, 1969.

[7] E. Kleyn, The Use of the Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP), South Africa: Report No. 2/74 Transvaal Road Dept., 1975.

[8] M. DeBeer, «Use of the dynamic cone penetrometer in the design of road structures geotechniques in the African environment,» *Balkema, Rotterdam, The Netherlands,* pp. 167-183, 1991.

[9] M. Abu-Farsakh, K. Alshibli et E. Seyman, «Apploication of Dynamic Cone Penetrometer in Pavement Construction Control,» *In Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 1913,* pp. 53-61, 2005.

[10] G. Sowers et C. Hedges, «Dynamic Cone for Shallow In-Situ Penetration Testing,» *Vane Shear and Cone Penetration Resistance Testing of In-Situ Soils, ASTM STP 399,* pp. 1-29, 1966.

[11] S. Webster, R. Grau et T. Williams, «Description and Application of Dual Mass Dynamic Cone Penetrometer,» *Report GL-92- 3, Department of the Army, Washington DC,* pp. 1-19, 1992.

[12] A. Sabtan et W. Shehata, «Mackintosh Probe as an exploration tool,» *Bulletin of the International Association of Engineering Geology,* pp. 89-94, 1994.

[13] E. Menzenbach, The applicability of probes for testing the strength properties of the subsoil, Springer-Verlag, 1959.

[14] R. Gourvès, «Le PANDA - pénétromètre dynamique à énergie varaible,» *LERMES CUST, Université Blaise Pascal. Clermont-Ferrand,* p. 10, Mars 1991.

[15] G. Sanglerat, The Penetrometer and Soil Exploration. Developments in Geotechnical Engineering, New York: Elsevier Publishing, 1972.

[16] T. Lunne, P. Robertson et J. Powell, Cone Penetration Testing in Geotechnical Practice, New York: Blackie Academic Spon/Routledge Publishers, 1997.

[17] P. Mayne, «Cone Penetration Testing State-of-Practice,» *Transp. Res. Board. Synth. Study, NCHRP Project 20-05, Topic 37-14,* 2007.

[18] F. Schnaid, In Situ Testing in Geomechanics : The Main Tests, Taylor & Francis. CRC Press. , 2009.

[19] R. Gourvès et R. Barjot, «The Panda ultralight dynamic penetrometer,» *in Proceeding of ECSMFE, Copenhagen, Denmark; Vol. 3, 11,* pp. 83-88, 1995.

[20] R. Gourvès et S. Zhou, «The in situ characterization of the mechanical properties of granular media with the help of penetrometer,» *3rd International Conference on Micromécanique of Granular Media,* pp. 57-60, 1997.

[21] D. Langton, «The Panda lightweight penetrometer for soil investigation and monitoring material compaction,» *Ground Engineering 32(9),* pp. 33-37, 1999.

[22] S. Zhou, «Caractérisation des sols de surface à l'aide du pénétromètre dynamique léger à énergie variable type PANDA,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, 1997.

[23] M. A. Benz Navarrete, «Mesures dynamiques lors du battage du pénétromètre Panda 2,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2009.

[24] L. Chaigneau, «Caractérisation des milieux granulaires de surface à l'aide d'un pénétromètre,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2001.

[25] L. Lepetit, «Etude d'une méthode de diagnostic de digues avec la prise en compte du risque de liquéfaction,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2002.

[26] G. Villavicencio, C. Bacconnet, P. Breul, D. Boissier et R. Espinace, «Probabilistic evaluation of the parameters governing the stability of the tailing dams,» *Conference Paper,* 2010.

[27] C. Sastre Jurado, M. Benz Navarrete, R. Gourvès, P. Breul et C. Bacconnet, «Automatic methodology to predict grain size class from dynamic penetration test using neural networks,» Queensland, Australia, 2016.

[28] C. Sastre, «Exploitation du signal pénétrométrique pour l'aide à l'obtention d'un modèle de terrain,» Thèse de doctorat en Génie civil, Université Clermont Auvergne, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2018.

[29] C. Sastre, P. Breul, C. Bacconnet et M. Benz, «Probabilistic three-dimensional soil modeling through dynamic penetrometer,» *in Proceedings of the XVII ECSMGE-2019 ,* 2019.

[30] S. Liao et R. Whitman, «Overburden correction factors for SPT in sand,» *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering. ASCE 112(3),* pp. 373-377, 1986.

[31] R. S. Olsen et J. K. Mitchell, «CPT stress normalization and prediction of soil classification,» *Proc., Int. Symp. on Cone Penetration Testing, CPT 95, Linkoping, Sweden,* pp. 257-262, 1995.

[32] «Normalizing the CPT for overburden stress,» *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering,* 2006.

[33] I. P. Maki, R. W. Boulanger, J. T. DeJong et R. A. Jaeger, «"Overburden normalizations of CPT data in sands to clays,» *Third International Symposium on Cone Penetration Testing, Las Vegas, NV.,* pp. 2-34, 2014.

[34] A. Quibel, «Control of backfill compaction using the PDG 1000 LPC penetrodensitograph,» *Laboratory reports. Geotechnics - Soil Mechanics and Terra Science GT-35, LCPC,* pp. 1-21, 1989.

[35] M. Dissly et P. Bombeli, «Contrôle du compactage des fouilles en tranchée par pénétromètre dynamique léger,» Département fédéral de l'environnement, des transports, de l'énergie et de la communication Office fédéral des routes, Suisse, 2001.

[36] M. Morvan et P. Breul, «Optimisation of in-situ dry density estimation,» E3S Web of Conferences, 2016.

[37] G. Villavicencio, P. Breul, C. Bacconnet, A. Fourie et R. Espinace, «Liquefaction potential of sand tailings dams evaluated using a probabilistic interpretation of estimated in-situ relative density,» *Revista de la construcción. 15,* pp. 9-18, 2016.

[38] P. Mayne, «In-situ test calibration for evaluating soil parameters,» *In-situ testing. Singapore Workshop,* pp. 1-56, 2006.

[39] G. Fletcher, «Standard Penetration Test: Its uses and abuses,» *Journal Soil Mechanics Foundations Division, ASCE, Vol. 91, No. SM4,* pp. 67-75, 1965.

[40] H. Mohr, «Discussion of Standard Penetration Test: Its uses and abuses,» *J. Soil Mechanics Foundations Division, ASCE, Vol. 92, N° SM1,* pp. 196-199, 1966.

[41] G. Bondarik, «Dynamic and Static sounding of soils in engineering geology,» *Israël Program for scientific Translations, Jerusalem,* pp. 1-137, 1967.

[42] K. Massarsch, «Cone Penetration Testing – A Historic Perspective,» *In Proc.of 3rd International Symposium on Cone Penetration Testing, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA,* pp. 97-134, 2014.

[43] E. Gaouar, Probabilistic approach to the stability of earth dams by simulating random fields, Clermont Ferrand: Phd Thesis repport, 1997.

[44] P. Breul, «Endoscopic characterization of granular media coupled with penetration testing,» *French Geotechnical Review,* 1999.

[45] A. Athapaththu, T. Tsuchida, K. Suga, S. Nakai et J. Takeuchi, «Evaluation of in-situ strength variability of masado slopes,» *Doboku Gakkai Ronbunshuuu C, 63(3),* pp. 848-861, 2007.

[46] A. Athapaththu, T. Tsuchida et S. Kano, «A new geotechnical method for natural slope exploration and analysis,» *Natural Hazards, 75(2).,* 2015.

[47] F. Deplagne et C. Bacconnet, «Structural analysis of a clay dike,» *Geostatistics Papers,* pp. 181-188, 1993.

[48] F. Schnaid, D. Lourenço et E. Odebrecht, «Interpretation of static and dynamic penetration tests in coarse-grained soils,» *Géotechnique Letters. Volume 7 Issue 2, June, 2017,* pp. 113-118, 2017.

[49] A. P. Butcher, K. McElmeel et J. J. M. Powell, «Dynamic probing and its use in clay soils,» *Advances in site investigation practice. Thomas Telford, London,* 1996.

[50] J. J. Powell, «In situ testing – Ensuring Quality in Equipment, Operation and Interpretation,» *8th James K Mitchell Honour lecture.19th ICSMGE Seoul, South Korea.,* 2017.

[51] A. Van Wambeke, «Les corrélations entre caractéristiques géotechniques,» *Annales des Travaux Publics de Belgique, N°4,* 1975.

[52] M. Cassan, Les essais in situ en mécanique des sols Vol. 1. Réalisation et interprétation, Paris: Eyrolles, 1978.

[53] A. Van Wambeke et D'Hemricourt, «Correlation between the results of static or dynamic probings and pressuremeter tests,» *in Proceedings of the second European Symposium on Penetration Testing, Amsterdam, Balkema, Rotterdam,* pp. 941-944, 1982.

[54] I. Shahrour et R. Gourvès, Investigation des terrains in situ, Paris: Hermès - Lavoisier, 2005.

[55] T. Tsuchida, A. Athapaththu, S. Kano et K. Suga, «Evaluation of In-Situ Shear Strength of Natural Slopes Vulnerable to Heavy Rainfall by Lightweight Dynamic Cone Penetrometer,» *In: Liu H., Deng A., Chu J. (eds) Geotechnical Engineering for Disaster Mitigation and Rehabilitation. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg,* 2008.

[56] A. Athapaththu, T. Tsuchida, K. Suga et S. Kano, «A lightweight dynamic cone penetrometer for evaluation of natural masado slopes,» *Journal of Japanese Society of Civil Engineers-C, 63(2),* pp. 403-416, 2007.

[57] A. Butcher, K. McElmeel et J. Powell, «Dynamic probing and its uses in clays soils,» *Proceedings International Conference on Advances In Site Investigation Practice,* pp. 383-395, 1995.

[58] M. Khodaparast, A. Rajabi et M. Mohammadi, «The new empirical formula based on dynamic probing test results in fine cohesive soils,» *International Journal of Civil Engineering, 13(2),* pp. 105-113, 2015.

[59] G. Otoko, I. Fubara-Manuel, M. Igwagu et C. Edoh, «Empirical Cone Factor for Estimation of Undrained Shear Strength,» *Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 21(18),* pp. 6069-6076, 2016.

[60] A. Palacios, «Theory and measurements of energy transfer during standard penetration test sampling,» Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, Florida (USA), 1977.

[61] L. Duchesne, J. Fry et N. Racana, «Use of a high-performance geotechnical geotechnical investigation method on the development of Vallabregues,» 2004.

[62] P. Magnan, N. Dronuic et Y. Canepa, «Les méthodes de calcul de la bearing capacity des fondations superficielles,» *FONDSUP, vol. 2,* 2014.

[63] G. Villavicencio, C. Bacconnet, P. Breul, D. Boissier et R. Espinace, «Estimation of the Variability of Tailings Dams Properties in Order to Perform Probabilistic Assessment,» *Geotechnical and Geological Engineering, vol. 29, no 6,* pp. 1073-1084, 2011.

[64] P. K. Robertson et C. Wride, «Evaluatinf Cyclic liquefaction potential using the cone penetration test CPT,» *Canadian Geotechnical engineering, N°35,* pp. 442-459, 1998.

[65] P. K. Robertson et C. Fear, «Liquefaction of sands and its evaluation,» *Proceedings, 1st Int. Conf. on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering, Keynote Lecture, Tokyo, Japan,* 1995.

[66] J. H. Schmertmann et A. Palacios, «Energy dynamics of SPT,» *Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, ASCE, 105(GT8),* pp. 909-926, 1979.

[67] S. Timoshenko et J. N. Goodier, Theory of elasticity, McGraw-Hill, 1951.

[68] F. Y. Yokel, «Energy transfer in standard penetration test,» *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Division, ASCE, Vol. 108 No. GT9,* pp. 1197-1202, 1982.

[69] E. Escobar, «MIse au point et exploitation d'une nouvelle technique pour la reconnaissance des sols : Le Panda 3,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2015.

[70] C. Fairhust, «Wave Mechanics of Percussive drilling,» *Mine and Quarry Engineering, ,* pp. 122-130, 1961.

[71] B. d. S. Venant, «Mémoire sur le choc longitudinal de deux barres élastiques de grosseurs et de matières semblables ou différentes,» *Lu à l'Académie des Sciences,* 1866.

[72] B. de Saint Venant, «Mémoire sur le choc longitudinal de deux barres élastiques de grosseurs et de matières semblables ou différentes,» *Lu à l'Académie des Sciences ,* 1866.

[73] G. Villavicencio, «Méthodologie Pour Evaluer La Stabilité Mécanique Des Barrages de Résidus Miniers,» Thèse de l'Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2009.

[74] C. Sastre Jurado, «Sur l'intérêt et les apports de la géo-spatialisation et des outils numériques à la reconnaissance géotechnique de surface,» Mémoire de Recherche, Contrat Erasmus Université de Granada, España, Clermont Ferrand, France, 2015.

[75] C. Sastre Jurado, P. Breul, M. Benz Navarrete, C. Bacconnet et R. Gourvès, «Estimation de la nature du sol à partir d'un essai Panda 2® avec un reseaux de neurones artificiel,» Nancy, France, 2016.

[76] H. Arbaoui, R. Gourvès, P. Bressolette et L. Bodé, «Mesure de la déformabilité des sols in situ à l'aide d'un essai de chargement statique d'une pointe pénétromètrique,» *Revue Canadienne de géotechnique,* vol. 4, n° %143, pp. 355-369, 2006.

[77] C. Sanhueza et G. Villavicencio, «Estimación de Parámetros Resistentes a Partir del Ensayo de Penetración PANDA y su Aplicación en el Cálculo de la Capacidad de Soporte y Asentamientos del Suelo de Fundación,» *Revista de la construccion,* vol. 9, n° %11, pp. 120-131, 2010.

[78] F. Kulhawy et P. Mayne, «Manual on estimating soil properties for foundantion design,» Report EL-6800, Electric power research institute, Palo Alto, Califronia, 1990.

[79] P. K. Robertson, R. G. Campanella et A. Wightman, «SPT-CPT correlations,» *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering,* vol. 11, n° %1109, pp. 1449-1459, 1983.

[80] L. Escande, «Etude des corrélation entre le Panda et divers essais géotechniques in-situ,» MSc. Rapport. Genie Civil, Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont Ferrand, 1994.

[81] L. Escande, «Study of the correlations between the Panda and various in-situ geotechnical tests,» MSc. Report. Civil Engineering, Blaise Pascal University., Clermont Ferrand, 1994.