


| | |
|---|--|
| EASA | COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT |
|  | EASA PAD No. 09-140 [Published on the 17 December 2009 and officially closed for comments on the 13 January 2010] |

Commenter 1 :Aerospace Design – A. Oaten – 12 January 2010

Comment # 1.1

Please note for your reference that we are currently finishing an EASA STC application for the secondary latch mod which is now covered under a new design change number of ADF2007-021 which updates the old design change number that has been listed on the PAD 09-140, that being mod number ADF350/5-101. Could pleaseedit the design change number accordingly.

EASA response:

Noted and the reference will be changed

Comment # 1.2

The original AD's that this PAD originates from, is linked to the UK CAA which included the AS350 series and the AS355 series aircraft. I know that currently EASA have insufficient documented evidence to support the issue of the AS350 AD, but the fundamental design and layout of gearbox cowlings, which are the subject of this AD are identical.

EASA response:

Agree. There is currently insufficient data to support making the AD applicable to the AS350 series.

Comment # 1.3

In support of an AS350 AD, it should be noted that an American Company, Geneva Aviation (www.genevaaviation.com) is now manufacturing replacement AS350 gearbox cowlings. The US has one of the largest AS350 fleets in the world and this company has obviously identified a sufficiently large enough market to warrant the costs of design, tooling, manufacture and certification.

EASA response:

Noted

Comment # 1.4

With further reference to the applicability of the PAD, the AS355 has the following variants E, F, F1, F2, N & NP. The PAD has omitted the N & NP and should be included in the issued AD. The design and layout of the cowlings are the same, and subject to all the same problems as the other variants.

EASA response:

Eurocopter has implemented the installation of their modification 073313 on the production line for models N and NP. The AS355N standard was built at least conforming to EC mod 07-1447. This standard already included a flap which remained lifted when unlatched and the inner side of which was painted for conspicuity. Since 1994, AS355N helicopters conform to modification 07-2614 where the flap was further angled up for improved conspicuity. From 2008 this has also been the configuration for the AS355NP.

No incidents have been reported on the AS355N or NP versions. EASA is of the opinion that mandating the change to the earlier built helicopters would not be justified.

Comment # 1.5

Under the **Reasons** section of the PAD, reference is made to the 3rd paragraph where the modifications listed are

"These modifications and Eurocopter modification 073313 are intended to ensure that unlocked cowlings are detected by the pilot before take-off".

This operation is correct for all other listed modifications except Aerospace Design Facilities Ltd Secondary Latching Mod. Also the wording "ensure" is to guarantee, which is not true of any visual indication as it relies on the pilot to look. This text should be corrected with the suggested wording of:-

"These modifications including Eurocopter modification 073313, but with the exception of Aerospace Design Facilities Mod ADF2007-021 are intended to improve the detection of unlocked cowlings by the pilot before take-off" // "Aerospace Design Facilities Ltd Mod ADF2007-021 introduces a secondary latch that retains the cowling to the airframe before the primary latches are latched"

EASA response:

Agree with the proposed wording except at the end. New wording to be:

"These modifications, including Eurocopter modification 073313, but with the exception of Aerospace Design Facilities Mod ADF2007-021, are intended to improve the detection of unlocked cowlings by the pilot before take-off" // "Aerospace Design Facilities Ltd Mod ADF2007-021 introduces a secondary latch aimed at retaining the cowling to the airframe in the event that the primary latches are not latched"

Comment # 1.6

In the same section **"Reason"** there is a note which references that all helicopters not listed have been modified to modification 073313 or equivalent. This statement is incorrect. To fully embody Eurocopter modification 073313 both the wire springs that hold the cowling open and the conspicuous markings must be installed.

EASA response:

Agree. Note will be deleted.

Comment # 1.7

I am a UK CAA LAE and used to be type rated on the Eurocopter AS355. I also have worked at Mc Alpine Helicopters for 10 years where I started as an apprentice, and left the company as the A&C hangar supervisor for aircraft installations. The AS355N did not have the upstanding wire or conspicuous markings when first

released from the factory. I also strongly doubt that the conspicuous markings have been installed on all AS355NP variants. The mod status of all aircraft should be confirmed by all operators.

EASA response:

EASA agrees that the upstanding wire is not installed on all AS355N helicopters.

EASA disagrees for the AS355NP. EC documentation shows that these markings are installed on the AS355NP.

Comment # 1.8

AD Compliance timescales: I believe the timescale of 24 months is excessive and will encourage a dilution of the AD through political and financial gain. As a design organisation we have actively supported the UK CAA working groups, and it's actions to implement the UK CAA AD. We have also actively supported with demonstrations to the UK CAA and visits to EASA. We will also continue to support the EASA AD when issued, to supply secondary latching kits to operators of the AS355 series aircraft. We will be doing our best to supply a cost effective solution to operators of these aircraft which will be far more difficult to achieve with lengthy implementation timescales, as will have to produce smaller batches which will then of course increase the unit costs. I feel a more sensible timescale should be 12 months.

EASA response:

Noted. A compliance period of 24 months was chosen to allow operators outside of UK, not previously subjected to the content of this AD, sufficient time to comply. A 24 month compliance time is considered acceptable.

Comment # 1.9

As previously mentioned above under the section **"Required Action and Compliance time"**, we have almost completed the update of this design change under an EASA STC. The new Aerospace Design Facilities, design change number is ADF2007-021. Therefore could please edit under the **"Required Action and Compliance time"**, the reference to Aerospace Design Facilities with the following:-

- Install Aerospace Design Facilities Ltd Modification ADF2007-021 _ Installation of cowling secondary safety latch.

EASA response:

Noted. AD will be updated

Comment # 1.10

With reference to the **"Remarks"** section, contact information has been supplied giving details of Eurocopter. I feel therefore it would be appropriate to include contact details for any other party that has requested it be included. Our contact details are as follows:-

4. For any questions concerning the technical content of the requirements in the referenced Aerospace Design Facilities Ltd Design change ADF2007-021, contact can be made through their website www.aerospacedesign.co.uk , which also includes details of the secondary latching system.

EASA response:

Noted. Details will be added to the AD.

Commenter 2: Eurocopter UK – Jon Simpson – 18 December 2009**Comment # 2.1**

There is no reference to CAA AAD 003-10-2001 which originally introduced (and subsequently retained) this requirement for UK registered aircraft (copy attached), or the fact that the CAA approved several Alternative Means Of Compliance (AMOC) to their AAD. It would surely be reasonable that in adopting the UK CAA AAD requirement as an EASA AD, any AMOC approved by the CAA should therefore also be acceptable to EASA.

I would suggest that under “Required Action(s) and Compliance Time(s)”:

“- An alternative means of compliance that provides an acceptable level of safety when approved by EASA”

should be amplified to indicate that any UK CAA approved alternative means of compliance to CAA AAD 003-10-2001 is considered to be acceptable to EASA as an alternative means of compliance to the EASA AD.

EASA response:

Disagree. As this PAD supersedes the UK CAA AAD 003-10-2001 all AMOCs against that AD cannot be considered as AMOCs against the EASA AD. Holders of any existing modifications previously approved as AMOCs against the CAA AAD should apply to EASA for an AMOC against the EASA AD.