



COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 16-043

[Published on 18 March 2016 and officially closed for comments on 15 April 2016]

Commenter 1: Cathay Pacific Airways Limited – John Narang – 23/03/2016

Comment # 1

The inspection threshold and interval state to carry out an inspection within 7500 engine flight hours since the last inspection of the upper bifurcation fairing. We wish for this interval to be amended to 9000 engine flight hours to align with our C-check schedule. Since the repair would take 30 hours, should we have a finding that would require a repair, we would like to carry it out during a longer layover time.

We wish for this amendment to the PAD to minimize operational disruption. We have also made this request to Rolls-Royce with respect to their ballot NMSB72-AJ165.

EASA response:

Comment not agreed. The inspection interval as proposed in the PAD was established based upon evaluation of the potential unsafe condition and the establishment of a continued airworthiness assessment by engine and airframe TC holders.

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

Commenter 2: American Airlines – Malcolm Berry – 12/04/2016

Comment # 2

We propose that the AD is restricted to only the steps of NMSB RB211.72-AJ165 dated 31 March 2016 that address the subject of safety which are sections 3. A. (2) On-Wing Accomplishment and 3.B. (1) In-Shop Accomplishment.

EASA response:

Comment partially agreed. The intent of the PAD was to mandate the inspection and corrective action instructions, not the entire SB. Nevertheless, the Final AD has been amended as requested, to improve clarity.

