



COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 18-055

[Published on 20 April 2018 and officially closed for comments on 18 May 2018]

Commenter 1: Jetstar Japan – Keiji Sakurai – 23/04/2018

Comment # 1

The PAD does not include the step to check the Part Number (PN) and Serial Number (SN) to identify affected sliding tubes within 500 Flight Cycles (FC) as instructed in the Subtasks 321461-210-401-001 and 321461-210-403-001 of Airbus SB A320-32-1461. JJP feels that the compliance for Group 2 aeroplanes is not clear in the PAD.

EASA response:

Comment noted: identification of the configuration is a prerequisite of the inspection required by paragraph (1) of the AD. As such, it must be accomplished within the same compliance time as identified in paragraph (1). Anyway, since identification of the configuration is not a requisite of the AD, it must not be tracked as compliance with the AD.

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

Commenter 2: Cathay Pacific Airways Limited – Dave Martin – 23/04/2018

Comment # 2

Please see below feedback / queries relating to PAD 18-055.

A) Para (4) (Credit) states:

“An aeroplane embodying Airbus Mod 161202 (EV MLG) is not affected by the requirements of paragraphs (1) to (3) of this AD provided it is determined that no affected parts are installed on that aeroplane.

A review of aeroplane delivery and/or maintenance records is acceptable to make this determination, provided those records can be relied upon for that purpose and the P/N and s/n of the MLG sliding tube can be positively identified from that review.”



Question: Will the AD also state that it is acceptable to determine aeroplane AD Group status (1 or 2) from a review of maintenance records, provided those records can be relied upon for that purpose and the P/N and s/n of the MLG sliding tube can be positively identified from that review?

Remark: SB A320-32-1461 Rev 0 Accomplishment Instructions for PN/SN check states:

“A check of aircraft maintenance records is an acceptable means of compliance.”

Cathay Dragon Engineering has performed a check of maintenance records to confirm that no “affected parts” are installed to the Cathay Dragon A320/A321 fleet and as such are Group 2 aeroplanes. Cathay Dragon has not currently installed EV MLGs.

B) Note Appendix 1 has duplicated SN SS4375.

EASA response:

2A) Comment noted: identification of the configuration is not a requirement of the AD. Consequently, there is no need to give credit to a review of maintenance records for identification of the configuration. No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment

2B) Comment agreed – the Final AD has been updated accordingly

Commenter 3: EasyJet – Geremi Mattei – 20/04/2018

Comment # 3

With reference to the subject PAD during assessment has been identified a duplicate SN on the appendix 1 of the affected parts.

The duplicate is PN 201371302 SN SS4375.

EASA response:

Comment agreed – the Final AD has been updated accordingly

Commenter 4: Lufthansa Technik AG – Sebastian Zwenzner – 25/04/2018

Comment # 4

There is a mistake in the PN and S/N list (SN SS4375).

EASA response:

Comment agreed – the Final AD has been updated accordingly



Commenter 5: United Airlines – Tariq Siddiquie – 11/05/2018**Comment # 5**

United Airlines has reviewed the proposed PAD by EASA and concurs with the recommended actions and compliance intervals

EASA response:

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

