

COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA AD No.: 2025-0274

[Published on 11 December 2025 and officially closed for comments on 06 January 2026]

Commenter 1: Korean Air – Wooseok Lee – 16/12/2025

Comment # 1

We require confirmation regarding the frequency of the required inspection. Our interpretation is as follows:

Our Interpretation:

The phrase "concurrently with the installation" mandates that the inspection in accordance with the Service Bulletin (SB) must be performed every single time the affected part is installed onto an aeroplane, regardless of the part's maintenance history.

Could you please confirm whether this interpretation is correct, specifically for the replacement scenario below?

We seek confirmation on the following scenario which is critical to our maintenance operations:

- Component Replacement (Installation of a Different S/N): If an installed affected part is removed (e.g., due to a functional failure like a Fire Panel defect) and is replaced with a different affected part (a different Serial Number) that is considered 'serviceable' and subject to this AD, does the act of installing this replacement part require a repeat of the SB inspection immediately prior to its installation? (Our answer: Yes)

EASA response:

Comments agreed. The part has to be inspected with each installation.

No change has been made to the final AD in response to this comment.

Commenter 2: Jet2.com – Phil Pidgeon – 16/12/2025

Comment # 2



No units held by Jet2.com with a S/N listed in Appendix 1. On-wing inspections are scheduled within the 24-month compliance time for Fire Panels installed across the fleet. Measures have been set-up to ensure inspection of units held in stock IAW the SB upon installation to the aircraft.

Query

Parts Installation (5) – It is understood that all affected parts require an inspection IAW the SB upon installation. Please could you clarify the below:

- A. Is this a repetitive requirement? For instance, if a unit has previously been inspected (per Para 2) IAW the SB on-wing and is removed for repair or modification and then returned to Jet2.com, does the unit require inspecting IAW the SB again at installation? Is there a planned date for terminating Para 5 requirements once operator inspection findings have been reviewed by Airbus?
- B. There is an Airbus AMM warning in place to not install units with signs of impact damage, could this not negate the requirement to inspect IAW the SB upon installation?

EASA response:

- A. Comment noted. Indeed it is a “repetitive” inspection, meaning that it has to be inspected with each installation. Currently, no terminating action is foreseen.**
- B. Comment not agreed. Currently, the AMM task is not recognized as AMOC to the AD, as the current AMM instructions are not equivalent to the SB instructions. The AMM task might be revised in the future. If it becomes equivalent to the SB in the future, the AD might be revised to add the AMM as acceptable means to comply.**

No change has been made to the final AD in response to this comment.

Commenter 3: Easyjet – Kassahun Belay – 19/12/2025

Comment # 3

- A. Airbus updated TFU 26.12.00026 on 17-Dec-2025, and one of the updates addresses acceptable and non-acceptable units.
 - I. SB A320-26-1137 and SB A320-26-1138 Rev 02 did not include the above picture, which could lead to it being missed during the inspection.
 - II. EZY performed an inspection of the spares, and two units failed this new inspection. It will be sent to the OEM (SAFRAN ELECTRONICS).

Is EASA planning to revise EASA AD 2025-0274-COR to address all these damages, along with future A320-26-1137/38 revisions?



EZY understands the safety criticality of these units; however, the damage inspection requirements seem somewhat open-ended and could necessitate removal of the entire units from the aircraft.

If that is the case, the current compliance time of two years may not be sufficient.

Furthermore, Airbus has released RIL SA26M25001285, and according to the information provided, production and repair capability will improve after April 2026 onwards.

B. Inspection

(2) For Group 1 aeroplanes that have an affected part installed with a serial number not listed in Appendix 1 of this AD: Within 24 months after 06 November 2025 [the effective date of EASA AD 2025-0234], inspect that affected part in accordance with the instructions of the SB.

Could EASA clarify how these units should be managed after removal, given that the existing VSBs are limited to certain serial numbers? How will SAFRAN ELECTRONICS return units removed from the wing during inspection back to operators, and how can operators accept these units while remaining in compliance with EASA AD 2025-0274?

C. Additional Information

EZY has learned that Airbus is planning to include inspection of the ENG/Fire panel as part of the AMM in the future.

EZY would appreciate EASA's comments on whether this will satisfy the inspection requirement for the unit prior to installation.

If so, would EASA consider a future revision of EASA AD 2025-0274-COR regarding the inspection requirement of affected part numbers prior to installation, if the AMM requirement will suffice?

D. Appendix 1 Listing

EASA AD 2025-0274-COR Appendix 1 lists P/N 330TS08Y S/N 1297.

EZY has P/N 330TS08Y00 and S/N 1297, which was delivered from production back in 2008.

Could EASA confirm the correct P/N?

E. Applicability for new delivery Aircraft

EASA AD 2025-0274-COR states that aeroplanes with an aeroplane reference date later than 11 September 2025 are considered Group 2 aeroplanes, provided that no affected part has been installed after the aeroplane reference date.

Airbus states in TFU 26.12.00026 that no additional inspection is mandated (provided that no affected part has been installed after the aeroplane reference date).

The current SBs A320-26-1137 and A320-26-1138 list future MSNs, and Airbus has indicated they will revise the Service Bulletins in the future.



Question:

Will EASA AD 2025-0274-COR be revised after A320-26-1137 and A320-26-1138 are updated?

Per the statement on EASA AD 2025-0274-Cor, Aircraft will be inspected at airbus Facility and they will be considered in compliance with the AD, unless Part removal/installation is initiated after delivery.

EASA response:

- A. Comment noted. Currently, EASA does not foresee a revision/supersedure of the AD for that reason.**
 - B. Comment noted. For Units from 700 series, there is no repair possibility, parts have to be replaced by a 335 series. For findings on 335 or 330 series, the AIRBUS SB provides instructions to inspect these units.**
 - C. See answer to Question 2B.**
 - D. Comment noted. The VSB appendix 1 lists SN 1297 for 330TS08Y. PN 330TS08Y00 does not exist, it is 335TS08Y00 that exists and serialisation of 330 and 335 series are distinct meaning that same SN may exist for both series but the SN 1297 for a 335 is not affected. To be noted that the appendix 1 lists affected part s/n with associated P/N known at time of delivery to operators. In case of upgrade of the PN of the same family (example from 335TS08Y00 to 335TS08Y01) the s/n will remain unchanged and the part is still affected. This is also valid for the parts having P/N 700TS06Y, 700TS06Y10, 700TS06Y11, 700TS06Y111 or 700TS06Y12.**
 - E. Comment not agreed. The present wording in the AD is sufficient and does not need revision/supersedure of the AD to cover that.**
- No change has been made to the final AD in response to this comment.**

Commenter 4: Hong Kong Express Airways Limited – Hong Lee – 29/12/2025**Comment # 4**

- A.** The newly delivered aircraft (delivered after 11 September 2025) is currently installed with fire panel PN 335TS08Y01 which is classified as an affected part under AD 2025-0274. However, according to Airbus definition, if the fire panel has not been removed or replaced since delivery, that aircraft falls into Group 2. Attached Airbus Tech Request for your reference.
Please consider revising the below highlighted definition to "Aeroplanes having the aeroplane reference date later than 11 September 2025 are considered Group 2 Aeroplanes, provided that the part has not been removed or replaced since production delivery."



- B. Additionally, regarding the inspection prior to installation as per SB A320-26-1137 & 1138 section 3.C.(1)(a)2.b, please consider that the installation of the fire panel as per AMM 26-12-12 is an alternative means of compliance to SB instruction outlined in AD Para. 5, 6 & 7. Any signs of damage on the fire panel are forbidden for installation as per AMM.

EASA response:

A: Comment not agreed. The present wording in the AD is sufficient and has the same intent as the proposed wording by the commenter.

B: See Answer to Question 2B.

No change has been made to the final AD in response to this comment.

Commenter 5: Singapore Airlines Limited – Soh Kian Ann – 31/12/2025

Comment # 5

Can EASA advise whether the intent of AD paragraph (5) requirement that concurrently with the installation , the part passes an inspection (no damage found) in accordance with the instruction of the SB actually means to carry out GVI as per SB section 3.C.(1)(a)2.b.

And just by doing the GVI as per The SB section 3.C.(1)(a)2.b (with no damage found) is enough to demonstrate compliance to this AD Paragraph (5).

EASA response:

Your interpretation is correct.

No change has been made to the final AD in response to this comment.

