

COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 21-169

[Published on 12 November 2021 and officially closed for comments on 10 December 2021]

Commenter 1: Cathay Pacific – Bharat Yadav – 16/11/2021

Comment # 1

CPA has noted the PAD and with the change from the inspection being P/N and S/N specific rather than by Aircraft level.

Can EASA ensure that the terminating actions are optional and not mandated to be performed?

EASA response:

Comment noted. EASA confirm that the terminating action for the inspection as required by the Final AD is not required.

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

Commenter 2: Swiss International Air Lines Ltd. – Markus Thurnherr – 10/12/2021

Comment # 2

The intention of the new AD is to define the actions and time requirements on the affected part level, and not on aircraft level. Therefore, we think that EASA should add the Service Bulletin A33/34-32-285 to the new AD.

The Service Bulletin A33/34-32-285 should be considered one of the applicable inspection SB, for components which are not installed in an aircraft. Any affected part which passed an inspection in accordance with Service Bulletin A33/34-32-285 should be considered serviceable.

The PAD paragraph (5) particularly points out the replacement of an MLG/CLG with a serviceable part installed, but in this case the inspection of an affected part would be performed in accordance with A33/34-32-285 and not in accordance with the Airbus Aircraft SBs.

EASA response: Comment agreed. The vendor SBs mentioned have been integrated in the Serviceable part Definitions of the Final AD.

