



## COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 16-010

[Published on 27 January 2016 and officially closed for comments on 24 February 2016]

**Commenter 1: Pilatus Aircraft Ltd – Johan Kruger – 28/01/2016**

### Comment # 1

Pilatus would like to comment the following aspect of the PAD as we have also received the comment from operators.

REASON:

(1) It is stated “Determine if a wing was installed between June 2007 and the effective date of this AD.”

The sentence leads to misinterpretation since aircraft manufactured during this period also have the wing “installed”, but in this case the Torlon plate are installed in the correct sequence using manufacturing data and not the AMM.

We request that the sentence be reworded to identify a wing that has been removed and reinstalled/replaced as the affect item to exclude aircraft manufactured during this period.

Proposal: “Determine if a wing was removed and reinstalled/replaced between June 2007 and the effective date of this AD.”

**EASA response:**

**Comment agreed. The Final AD has been updated accordingly.**

**Commenter 2: DAO Aviation A/S – John Schwarz – 29/01/2016**

### Comment # 2

I kindly suggest to clarify in SB 57-007 and PAD if the issue also concerns wing installations during new aircraft assembly – or if it only concerns wing removed and installed for any reason in the field after first delivery. The wording is slightly different between the two documents in my opinion.

**EASA response:**

**Comment agreed – see EASA answer to Comment #1**

