



COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 16-075

[Published on 19 May 2016 and officially closed for comments on 16 June 2016]

Commenter 1: American Airlines – Hung Nguyen – 31/05/2016

Comment # 1

As currently written, we interpret the proposed ruling to only reduce the repetitive inspection interval to 2400 cycles only and DOES NOT reduce the initial inspection threshold of 3600 cycles since new. If only the repetitive interval is affected, we would like to see that clarified clearly.

EASA response: Disagree, the intent of the AD is to reduce the initial inspection threshold from 3600 to 2400 cycles, the AD has been modified to clarify its intent. No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment

Commenter 2: Air Asia – Kwee Kang Lee – 14/06/2016

Comment # 2

The AD is going to be issued to mandate the SB requirements which reduce the initial inspection threshold from 3600 cyc to 2400 cyc. However, it is not clearly stated in the PAD. PAD mentioned to start the time compliance with repetitive inspection right away and the initial inspection requirement can only be seen from the table which from our point of view is quite peculiar. It will be more appropriate to mention the initial inspection requirement and followed by repetitive inspection. After all, reducing the initial inspection threshold is the main reason why the SB is revised.

Secondly, it is very much appreciated if the 'credit' part can mention SB 72-AH465 as well. This SB is cross-referred in EASA AD 2014-0031 and our EI-12-166-A333I but not mentioned in the statement below found on the PAD.

EASA response: Agree, based upon the commenters observations the opportunity has been taken to clarify the intent of the AD

