



COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 17-021R1

[Published on 15 February 2017 and officially closed for comments on 09 March 2017]

Commenter 1: Cathay Pacific Airways Limited – Frank Chu – 08/03/2017

Comment # 1

Paragraph (7) of this PAD no. 17-021R1 details the following:

“(7) Modification of an aeroplane in accordance with the instructions of the Airbus SB as specified in Table 2 of this AD, as applicable, constitutes terminating action for the repetitive inspections as required by paragraph (2) of this AD for that aeroplane.”

Enquiry :

Does the modification of an aeroplane in accordance with the instructions of the Airbus SB as specified in Table 2 of this AD also constitutes terminating action for the initial inspection as required by paragraph (2) of this AD for that aeroplane?

If yes, will EASA Safety Information section amend the wording in paragraph (7) of the concerned PAD to include the termination of ‘initial inspection’ as required by paragraph (2) of this AD for that aeroplane?

Cathay intends to incorporate the modification of SB A300-28-6114 on AHK A300-600 fleet directly within 30 months after the effective date of this AD, without accomplishing the required initial inspection (required within 30 months after the effective date of this AD) per paragraph (2) of this PAD.

EASA response: Comment partially agreed.

EASA agrees that no further inspections i.a.w. SB A300-28-6106 are necessary if the modification of SB A300-28-6114 is directly incorporated within the compliance time. Please note the following important text within SB A300-28-6114: “Make sure that the canister hood halves (and fasteners) are removed from the fuel tank in their entirety. If any fragment of a canister hood is found to be missing, make sure that it is removed from the fuel tank.”

No change of the AD has been made as result of this comment.

