

## COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 22-032-CN

[Published on 25 March 2022 and officially closed for comments on 08 April 2022]

### Commenter 1: Deer Jet – Song Shen – 26/03/2022

#### Comment # 1

We understand the EASA 2021-0180R1 will be cancelled because of the adoption of FAA AD 2022-04-09. We cannot understand why EASA AD cannot prevail instead of the FAA AD. As an A320 operator, we have been monitoring the AD issued by EASA, not the FAA. So we would like to know the relationship between the EASA AD and the FAA AD, and we would also like to know the general rule regarding the adoption of ADs.

#### EASA response:

##### Comment not agreed.

*All operators have to comply with the Mandatory Continued Airworthiness Information as issued or adopted and enforced by the State of Registry (SoR) of its aircraft. Usually, they also monitor (and may accomplish) the ADs issued by the Primary Certification Authorities (PCA) for the products (aircraft, engine, APU, or propeller) and/or (installed) parts and appliances which they operate, unless such ADs are superseded or complemented by State of Registry ADs.*

*When EASA formally (fully or partially) adopts a foreign AD (especially ADs for products for which EASA is not the Primary Certification Authority or does not represent the State of Design (SoD), EASA acts as SoR (on behalf of the Memberstates), when the AD is related to the safety of the design, which means, that this adoption makes the AD applicable to all affected aircraft registered in EASA Member States. Each AD adopted by EASA is therefore equivalent to an AD issued by EASA, and its requirements shall be complied with, as applicable.*

*In the present case, EASA determined (as SoR) a potential unsafe condition affecting 'equipment' (part or appliance) installed on several (particular) product(s) for which EASA is the PCA, and consequently issued AD 2021-0180 (later revised). Subsequently, the FAA, as SoD of the affected 'equipment' (part or appliance), completed their analysis, and thereafter issued (as SoD) their 'Parts and Appliances' AD, ref. 2022-04-09, which applies to ALL aircraft (worldwide) with an affected part or appliance installed.*

*It is clear that addressing any determined (similar) unsafe condition by two ADs is useless; and therefore, retaining only the AD of the SoD for subject 'equipment' (part or appliance) appeared sensible; hence the adoption by EASA of the FAA AD and the proposed cancellation of the EASA AD, (refer to PAD 22-032-CN).*



*However, upon closer review of FAA AD 2022-04-09, (prompted by received comments), it turned-out that the requirements of EASA AD 2021-0180R1 had not been fully taken over in the FAA AD, because the EASA AD refers to Revision 3 of the affected SAFRAN (AVOX) SBs, which introduced (in Appendix 2) ‘additional s/n of affected shipments’, which are not (yet) subject to the requirements of the FAA AD, that refers (only) to Revision 2 of the affected Vendor SBs.*

*Consequently, instead of cancelling AD 2021-0180R1 as proposed, EASA issued Revision 2 of AD 2021-0180, to clarify the situation and to explain EASA’s considerations and decision.*

*It is expected that the FAA will issue a new AD to require the use of Revision 3 (or a later revision) of the affected SAFRAN (AVOX) SBs. Once such an AD, which ensures complete coverage of all requirements of subject EASA AD, is published, it is expected that EASA will adopt that AD, and then cancel EASA AD 2021-0180R2.*

#### **Commenter 2: Thai Airways International PCL. – Kanokwan Kanganachumpon – 27/03/2022**

##### **Comment # 2**

Would you please clarify in detail the propose of EASA PAD 22-032-CN?

Even if the EASA AD 2021-0180R1 is cancelled, the operator still has to comply with FAA AD 2022-04-09. Is this correct? Please confirm.

##### **EASA response:**

**Comment partially agreed. The commenter’s assumption is correct; see EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**

#### **Commenter 3: All Nippon Airways Co., Ltd – Yamamoto Daisuke – 29/03/2022**

##### **Comment # 3**

Could you please let us know whether the current EASA AD 2021-0180R1 will be revised to R2 or a new EASA AD will be released to cancel the AD?

##### **EASA response:**

**Comment partially agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**



**Commenter 4: Austrian Airlines – Martin Pfannhauser – 29/03/2022****Comment # 4**

Cancellation of AD 2021-0180R1 would lead to an unsafe condition.

FAA AD 2022-04-09 mandates following Avox SB: 10015804-35-01, Revision 02, dated October 16, 2019.

EASA AD 2021-0180R1 mandates following SB: SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03 dated June 07, 2021.

The main difference between SB Rev. 02 and Rev.03 is that Rev. 03. is adding additional affected serial numbers (Batch 2).

Cancellation of AD 2021-0180R1 and reliance on adopted FAA AD 2022-04-09 would lead to the effect that many serial numbers (Batch 2) will not be addressed correctly which would lead to an unsafe condition.

In addition, we would like to encourage EASA to get in contact with FAA in order to get FAA AD 2022-04-09 revised accordingly to address also missing Batch 2 serial numbers as defined in SB Rev. 03.

**EASA response:**

**Comment partially agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**

**EASA confirms being in close contact with the FAA regarding any future AD issuance on this subject.**

**Commenter 5: Philotech Ibérica SL – Enrique Lara del Vigo – 29/03/2022****Comment # 5**

We have noticed that EASA AD 2021-0180R1 refers to AVOX VSB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03, which includes more affected s/n that previous VSB revisions. However, adopted FAA directive US-2022-04-09, that will be the one which must be followed after 2021-0180R1 is cancelled, only covers Revision 02 of AVOX VSB 10015804-35-01, leaving affected s/n of VSB Revision 03 out of the scope.

We need clarification about these new affected s/n in accordance with VSB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03. Should we take them into account (as it is requested in AD 2021-0180R1) or is it allowed to consider them as not affected until a new AD revision is released taking into account VSB Revision 03?

**EASA response:**

**Comment partially agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**



**Commenter 6: Privilege Style – Raúl Heras – 29/03/2022****Comment # 6**

EASA PAD 22-032-CN proposes to cancel EASA AD 2021-0180R1, since FAA AD 2022-04-09 has been adopted by EASA. PAD is stating that: “FAA AD 2022-04-09 [Effective Date 04 April 2022] has been adopted by EASA, which takes over all the requirements from EASA AD 2021-0180R1”.

Nevertheless, EASA AD 2021-0180R1 includes, as affected parts, those parts of the extended applicability from SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03 (Batch 2 in EASA AD). On the other hand, FAA AD 2022-04-09 is identifying those parts listed in SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 02, which does not include Appendix 2 (Batch 2 in EASA AD).

Please confirm whether parts listed in SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03 Appendix 2 will no longer be affected by AD requirements, or if otherwise there may be a misunderstanding or mismatch between AD requirements.

**EASA response:**

**Comment not agreed. With the co-existence of subject EASA AD and FAA AD, the affected parts (s/n) listed in Appendix 2 of VSB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03 (batch 2) are (remain) affected by the requirements of EASA AD 2021-0180R2 (i.e. when installed in certain Airbus aircraft).**

**The requirements of FAA AD 2022-04-09 apply to all other aircraft with an affected part installed. See also EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**

**Commenter 7: Lufthansa Technik AG – Christian Veckenstedt – 30/03/2022****Comment # 7**

- A. If LHT component shop can conclusively determine that no affected valve assy P/N 807206-01 was used during any maintenance event and that no swapping of valve or cylinder within a CVA can happen by work procedures, would that be an acceptable way to determine, that no affected valve is installed by record review?
- B. How can we ensure for AD §(k) “Parts Installation Limitation”, that no affected part will be installed in future when the s/n of the sub-assies (cylinder and valve assy) are not printed on any certificate or OEM delivery data? Will there be a changed AMM task that advises the check for affected sub-assies before installation?
- C. Is it permissible to perform the GAP inspection as per AD on each unit without checking the identification for affected part as per AD §(h) before?



**EASA response:**

- A** *Comment not agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.*
- B.** *Comment not agreed. Paragraph (i) of subject FAA AD gives clear reference to required ‘parts marking actions’, as applicable, depending on the inspection results. SAFRAN / AVOX can be contacted to clarify parts markings to assist proper identification.*
- C.** *Comment partially agreed. Each requirement of an AD must be accomplished with, as applicable, unless otherwise agreed by the Agency (i.e. EASA approved AMOC). In case of any questions or if there is a need for more information about subject FAA AD, the commenter can contact the FAA, according paragraph (n) ‘Related Information’ in the AD.*

**Commenter 8: Company name – Wengie Wong– 31/03/2022****Comment # 8**

PAD 22-032-CN was issued to propose a cancellation of AD 2021-0180R1 due to the adoption of FAA AD 2022-04-09 by EASA.

Ref/1/: PAD 22-032-CN

Ref/2/: AD 2021-0180R1

Ref/3/: FAA AD 2022-04-09

Ref/4/: AOT A35N012-19

Ref/5/: AVOX Systems Inc. Alert Service Bulletin 10015804-35-01, Revision 02

Ref/6/: AVOX Systems Inc. Alert Service Bulletin 10015804-35-01, Revision 03

Ref/2/ is covering batch 1 and batch 2 of oxygen cylinder s/n while Ref/3/ is only applicable to batch 1. It is because that Ref/2/ refers to Ref/6/ and Ref/3/ refers to Ref/5/ instead. The number of appendices in VSB are different; and there is no credit when Ref/6/ implemented as per Ref/3/.

Therefore, once the Ref/2/ is cancelled, the airline is required to comply with Ref/4/ and Ref/3/ while the gap remains between Ref/4/ and Ref/3/ as listed below:

- A. Ref/3/ does not allow for checking “Blue dot” from oxygen bottle as the means of compliance for shop action. Re-installation is required for checking “gap”.
- B. Ref/3/ is not covering the credit by Ref/6/ accomplishment.
- C. Report of gap inspection result is required either acceptable or failure in the inspection.



**Desired actions:**

Per EASA perspective, is the limitation on batch 2 required after Ref/2/ cancellation? Can airlines credit from Ref/6/ implementation?

**EASA response:**

*Comment partially agreed. See EASA responses to Comments # 1 and # 7 above.*

*Regarding credit for (certain) requirements of the FAA AD, after timely accomplishment of the required inspections and related corrective actions in accordance with the instructions of AVOX Systems Inc. VSB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03, the commenter can contact the FAA or the competent authority.*

**Commenter 9: EasyJet – Konstantinos Tsaknakis – 01/04/2022**
**Comment # 9**

The FAA AD 2022-04-09, which has been adopted by EASA, does not refer to Crew OXY Cylinders of Batch 2, which were introduced through Rev.03 of VSB 10015804-35-01. The applicability of the FAA AD contains only Batch 1 units, which were noted up to Rev.02

Rev.03 has been released post consultation period of the FAA AD (Jun-2020) and is not referenced in the industry information. EASA ADs generally have the provision to comply with future revision of SBs/VSBs. American Airlines AAL did recommend for future revisions to be included in the FAA AD, however, the FAA disagreed (highlighted on the attached FAA AD) and therefore the FAA AD retains Service Information up to Rev.02.

To our view EASA AD 2020-0180R1 is more restrictive than FAA AD 2022-04-09.

Can a more restrictive AD be cancelled and replaced by a less restrictive AD?

Will the FAA AD be revised to include additional Service information?

**EASA response:**

*Comment agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.*



**Commenter 10: British Airways – Dan Walpole – 05/04/2022****Comment # 10**

BAW would like to understand if EASA will be fully cancelling AD 2021-0180 and 2021-0180R1? Or will a bilateral acceptance AD be issued in its place? I.e EASA AD to state “comply with FAA AD 2022-04-09 within time frame defined in this AD”.

**EASA response:**

**Comment partially agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**

**Commenter 11: Air New Zealand – Jacques Briones – 12/04/2022****Comment # 11**

From an operator’s perspective, we believe cancelling EASA AD 2021-0180R1 is counterproductive for this particular issue at hand. We have seen FAA AD 2022-04-09 and, in my opinion, is inferior to the EASA AD in a sense that this FAA AD is a little too late for everything. The FAA AD is still mandating Rev.02 (no Batch 2 parts) of the Safran SBs when the latest revisions (Rev.03) were already released last year. If FAA is really serious about the problem at hand, then the least they can do is release an FAA AD that matches to that of EASA AD 2021-0180R1. We have already addressed the problem using the latest revision of the Safran SB in compliance to EASA AD 2021-0180R1, therefore we can say we are up to date in dealing with the problem. Thereby I could not see the logic behind why EASA would say that AD 2021-0180R1 is no longer necessary when the FAA AD is not even up to date for the problem at hand. In fact cancelling AD 2021-0180R1 would potentially actually create a compliance dilemma for Air NZ, in a way that the inspections/repair done in accordance with the Airbus AOT and the Safran SB. We hope that EASA would reconsider this decision and keep EASA AD 2021-0180R1.

**EASA response:**

**Comment agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**



**Commenter 12: Qantas Airways Limited – Alfredo Fortunato – 28/04/2022****Comment # 12**

Ref [A] EASA PAD 22-032-CN issued on 25 March 2022.

Ref [B] FAA AD 2022-04-09 Effective Date 04 April 2022.

Ref [C] SAFRAN / AVOX Systems, Inc. SB 10015804-35-01 original issue dated 06 March 2019.

Ref [D] SAFRAN / AVOX Systems, Inc. SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 01 dated 06 July 2019.

Ref [E] SAFRAN / AVOX Systems, Inc. SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 02 dated 16 October 2019.

Ref [F] SAFRAN / AVOX Systems, Inc. SB 10015804-35-01 Revision 03 dated 07 June 2021.

Ref [G] EASA AD 2021-0180R1 issued on 23 August 2021.

In the 'REASON' section of the PAD, Ref [A], (hereinafter referred to as the PAD), it is stated:

*"Since EASA AD 2021-0180R1 was issued, FAA AD 2022-04-09 [Effective Date 04 April 2022] has been adopted by EASA, which takes over all the requirements from EASA AD 2021-0180R1, which is therefore no longer necessary."*

In the PAD 'DEFINITIONS' section it is stated:

*"**Batches:** Batch 1 are affected parts having a serial number (s/n) as listed in the Appendix 1 of the SB at original issue. Batch 2 are affected parts having an s/n as listed in the Appendix 2 of the SB at Revision 03."*

However Ref[B] para (h) [**Identification of Affected Cylinder and Valve Assemblies**] specifically refers ONLY to Appendix 1 of Ref [E] with no mention of the use to a later revision. Ref [B] para (l) [**Credit for Previous Actions**] provides credit for the actions performed before the effective date of Ref [B] but ONLY if Ref [C] and/or Ref [D] were used.

This condition leaves Ref [F] Appendix 2 outside the intended scope of Ref [G].

**EASA response:**

**Comment agreed. See EASA response to Comment # 1 above.**

