


<b>EASA</b>	<b>COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
	<p align="center"><b>EASA PAD No. 15-123</b></p> <p align="center"><b>[Published on 11 September 2015 and officially closed for comments on 09 October 2015]</b></p>

**Commenter 1: Bond Offshore Helicopters – Ronnie Wright – 14/09/2015**

**Comment # 1**

The requirements for inspection and time interval have been applied through Turbomeca SB A298 72 2832.

With regard to the 50 Hr repetitive inspection, is there any plans to extend the inspection interval following two successful inspection of an engine.

The 50hr inspection interval does impact on maintenance workload.

**EASA response:**

*Comment understood but not agreed. EASA understand the burden that the repetitive inspection as required by this AD represent for an operator but this inspection with the compliance times is fully justified by the risk assessment. Turbomeca might support you for being in compliance with this AD. In addition, it is worth to mention that a modification is in progress, which should constitutes terminating action for the repetitive boroscope inspection of the of the ferrule of diffuser. More information on that modification can be obtained from Turbomeca.*

*No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.*

**Commenter 2: CHC Helicopter Services – Jens Schwarz – 15/09/2015**

**Comment # 2**

With reference to the TM mandatory service bulletin 298 72 2832 version A and the proposed EASA PAD 15-123 we would like to highlight that for us as a global helicopter operator of a large fleet of aircraft with this type engine installed – the interval of 50FH is very restrictive and limiting, affecting the day to day operation significantly and is resulting in an increase in maintenance. With currently no solution being available from TM at this stage and with the permanent repair to be carried out during an engine overhaul at TM/France, these inspections will be present for the foreseeable future.

1. With this in mind we are hoping that EASA together with TM is taking into consideration that after the completion of various inspection cycles over the next Month and based on the data/feedback collected by TM, this very restrictive interval of 50FH can be increased to a less restrictive interval (eg every 300H or 400H etc) preferably to be aligned with an already existing maintenance action.

2. Furthermore we are hereby requesting the cancellation of the requirement to conduct a ground run post the inspection which currently is mandated through TM MSB 298 72 2832 Para 2.4.3. The latest TM maintenance manual workcard for the removal/installation of igniters does not instruct to carry out a ground run and we have not seen this being a requirement post a single boroscope inspection. We do not understand the justification of a ground run in this case other than it is even more restrictive in combination with the 50FH inspection interval.

Thank you for your consideration.

**EASA response:**

***For point 1: Comment understood but not agreed. See answer to Commenter 1.***

***For point 2: Comment agreed. The ground run following a boroscope inspection has been deleted in the instructions of Turbomeca MSB N° 298 72 2832 Version B. The final AD has been amended and requires the use of Turbomeca MSB N° 298 72 2832 Version B and provides credit for an inspection accomplished in accordance with Turbomeca MSB N° 298 72 2832 Version A.***