



COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 17-131

[Published on 26 September 2017 and officially closed for comments on 24 October 2017]

Commenter 1: Luftsport-Verband Bayern e.V. – Harald Goerres – 27/09/2017 and 28/09/2017

Comment # 1

1. In section (7) in my opinion it should read: “..after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs earlier, remove the propeller blades”.
2. The sentence that the stress analysis determined that 6 screws are required (paragraph 2 of page 2 of the PAD) is contradictory to the fact that 5 screws with increased strength are sufficient too (information on screw quantity out of SB E34 and change letter “B” is not affected by this AD). So the first sentence of para 2 should be deleted from the AD to avoid misunderstandings.

Talking to Hoffmann revealed that all propeller blades listed in the LBA-Kennblatt are covered by the E34/AD. Nevertheless blades, except 160 T, should be in the field only manufactured with 6 screws (letter “A”) – so they should be not affected.

To highlight the fact, that all models are affected, the applicability section of the AD should probably be amended by “HO-V 62 propellers – all models, all serial numbers (S/N)”.

EASA response:

1. **Agreed: The final AD will be corrected. “Later” will be replaced by “earlier”.**
2. **Subtitle 1: Partially agreed: No deletion of the first sentence, but the final AD will add after ... it was determined that the 6-screws configuration “or the 5-screws configuration with increased strength..” is necessary to ensure safe propeller operation.**
Subtitle 2 and 3: Disagreed: The applicability section covers by using “HO-V62 propellers, all serial numbers (s/n)” all potentially affected propeller. The HO-V62 is the only model.

