

Chronology of Defect
Potential separation of ball joint at front suspension lower control arm
on MY 2004 RX-8

December, 2005 Mazda received the first field report from U.S market. Mazda couldn't recover the failure part in order to start an investigation.

April, 2006 As a result of the investigation, the cause of the failure was not clear. Mazda determined that there were not frequent occurrences and continued to monitor occurrences in the field.

September, 2007 Mazda received a field report from Japan market and started an investigation.

October to November, 2007 As a result of investigation of the returned part, it was confirmed this failure occurred due to an abnormally large load. Mazda determined that failures had occurred during circuit driving, and there was no potential of frequent occurrences. Mazda determined to monitor occurrences in the field.

January to February, 2008 Mazda received a field report from Japan market. Because this failure occurred during racing circuit driving, Mazda determined to monitor occurrences in the field.

July to September, 2008 Mazda received 2 field reports from Japan market. As a result of the fracture analysis, a rapid fracture was confirmed. Also, these vehicles were equipped with altered parts. Mazda presumed that vehicles drove on a racing circuit and determined to monitor occurrences in the field.

June to August, 2009 Mazda received a field report from Japan market. As a result of the investigation, racing circuit driving was not confirmed, but this vehicle was not equipped with standard suspension, but a Mazdaspeed-produced suspension. However, the installation of Mazdaspeed suspension was not believed to influence the occurrence of the failure. As a result of investigation of the returned part, a rapid fracture was confirmed and Mazda presumed that an abnormally large load was applied in the direction of the separation of the ball joint. Mazda determined that there was no potential for frequent occurrences and continued to monitor occurrences in the field.

October to December, 2009 Mazda received a field report from Japan market. The failure occurred on a racing circuit. As a result of the investigation, a rapid fracture was confirmed. Mazda presumed that the failure occurred due to an abnormally large load caused by race circuit driving and continued to monitor the field.

January, 2011 Mazda received a field report from Japan market. The vehicle was equipped

with altered parts. As a result of the investigation, Mazda presumed the cause of the failure occurrence was an abnormally large load applied to the suspension.

February, 2011 Mazda determined to start an investigation of good parts returned from the field because failures had not occurred frequently on vehicles manufactured in 2003.

March, 2011 During the part manufacturing history, there was a design change to improve the allowable central axis deviation of the ball joint. Mazda started to investigate the influence of the axis deviation on this concern. Also, Mazda started to investigate good parts returned from the field.

November, 2011 Mazda received a field report from Japan market. However, it was determined that an altered part was installed on the vehicle.

June, 2012 Mazda received a field report from Japan. However, Mazda could not receive the failure part in order to investigate.

November, 2012 As a result of the investigation, it was confirmed that the axes of the cracked parts were deviated and the separation load of ball joints in cracked parts was lower than that of normal (non-cracked) parts. However, the separation load was determined not to occur under normal driving conditions.

December, 2012 The cause of the failure already had been identified and improvements were implemented. Mazda determined to continue monitoring the field and restart the investigation if failures occurred at a higher frequency than Mazda ' s prediction.

December, 2013 to December, 2014 Mazda received 8 field reports from Japan and 1 report from U.S. market. As a result of the investigation, Mazda confirmed either the installation of altered suspension or racing circuit activity along with a rapid fracture event. Therefore, Mazda continued to monitor the field.

March to April, 2015 Mazda received a field report regarding a vehicle which was equipped with standard suspension and drove on a racing circuit in Japan. Mazda restarted an investigation.

June, 2015 Based on the information from vehicles with standard suspension and no racing circuit activity, Mazda re-confirmed the frequency of occurrence, and determined that the failure occurrence rate was within design estimates and continued to monitor the field.

Chronology of Defect
Potential separation of ball joint at front suspension lower control arm
on MY 2004 RX-8

July, 2015 Mazda determined that there was a safety defect on the ball joint separation concern for a different model. However, the cause of the other model's defect was different from this failure.

October to December, 2015 Mazda searched all field reports for accidents, to determine whether this concern should be examined for the necessity of a field action.

January, 2016 Mazda started to consider a field action because the vehicles may become unable to drive due to this failure.

March, 2016 Regarding the crack at the caulked area, Mazda investigated whether there was an inappropriate process during the manufacturing process or some other cause.

April to July, 2016 Mazda continued to investigate the cause of the failure mechanism, affected vehicle population and so on.

August, 2016 Mazda began developing a field inspection procedure for the affected vehicles but couldn't find an effective inspection method.

September to October, 2016 Mazda considered the procedure for a field action to minimize inconvenience to customers

January to April, 2017 Mazda continued to investigate the cause of the failure mechanism.

May 29, 2017 Mazda decided to conduct a recall for MY 2004 RX-8 vehicles.