

COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 23-096

[Published on 17 August 2023 and officially closed for comments on 14 September 2023]

Commenter 1: Eliance EAGS – Cristina de Castro – 24/08/2023

Comment # 1

We are a CAMO (ES.CAMO. 014) managing a little fleet of airplane model Cessna 337 Series operating in Spain in fire fighting.

We are following the FAA 2023-09-09 since its issue date and its effectivity date (17/07/2023) because we have 3 airplanes affected , two of them with the compliance requirement of replacing the V-Coupling in 50 H TIS from effectivity date due to we could not determine the hours in service.

Despite of our early request of the V-Band coupling's replacement (06-23-2023), our MRO is having some troubles acquiring the necessary spare parts (P/N S1921-1) and they have not been able to get them yet. The best TAT from provider TEXTRON AVIATION is November (11/03/2023), but the buyer and the supplier are working hard to improve this date. Our MRO has been looking for them at other providers unsuccessfully.

Our comment is that the FAA AD-2023-09-09 also allows the application of the alternative method of compliance in those cases (FH not determined and 500 FH or more).

Please consider this particular point due to the difficulty in finding / receiving the spare parts from providers/vendors at the set interval in the PAD 23-096 for other cases as Affected Part with FH not determined.

EASA response:

Comment agreed: Final AD has been amended accordingly.

Commenter 2: Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH – Christoph Genster – 28/08/2023

Comment # 2

Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH as former type certificate holder disagrees with the inclusion of DA 40 NG aircraft in the PAD/resulting AD.



Reason

The DA 40 NG does not use v-band clamps to attach the tailpipe to the exhaust port of the turbocharger as part of the type design. No retrofit designs are known to us that use v-band clamps on the location in question.

Explanation

The DA 40 NG does use a v-band clamp similar to the design addressed by the AD on the charged air outlet port of the turbocharger.

The conditions there are very different to the conditions at the exhaust port of the turbocharger.

The unsafe condition addressed in AD 2016-0203 is not the same unsafe condition as addressed by the PAD.

Information

The model "DA 40" has a normal aspirated engine as part of the original type design.

It is not known to us why FAA has included the DA 40 in its AD. Possibly there may be 3rd party approvals that install turbochargers on model "DA 40" aircraft with a v-band clamp to attach the tailpipe.

EASA response:

Comment noted. DA 40 NG has been removed from the Appendix 1. Notwithstanding, EASA cannot exclude that a DA 40 NG could have been equipped with an affected part, installed in service by means of STC or any other modification; in this case, such aeroplane would be affected by this AD, since the AD is applicable to any a/c having an affected part installed.

Consistently with this comment, reference to EASA AD 2016-0203, applicable to DA 40 NG aeroplanes and addressing a different unsafe condition, has been removed in the reason of the AD and in the list of Appendix 2.

Commenter 3: Reinhard Kammerer – 11/09/2023**Comment # 3**

In its generality, your statement "Over the years, this has resulted in a significant number of incidents and accidents (fatal and non-fatal) on both aeroplanes and helicopters" is not supported by factual evidence. There is clearly a distinct difference between the "big" engines of 520, 540 or 550 Cubic Inches of displacement and the smaller T(S)IO-360 Types. Unfortunately this was ignored by the FAA's V-Band working group. Out of 39 events evaluated out of the NTSB database (Appendix A of their final report), just seven concerned the 360 models. In two of these seven cases a problem was caught at an inspection.



Likewise the FAA, and possibly the EASA too, fail to treat the different engine types differently as the evidence would suggest. With the exception of the EASA AD 2016-0203 concerning the DA 40 NG airplanes (and motivated by a faulty batch of clamps), all related ADs cited in Appendix 2 of your Proposed AD are applicable to the "big" engines group. Likewise, the quoted FAA SAI Bs contain either general advice concerning exhaust systems or refer to the "big" engines (in M20M, C206H).

Are you able to let me know where, within the last 20 years, a serious incident or accident happened under EASA's area of responsibility attributed to a V-band-failure on a T(S)IO-360 engine. At least in the German Accident Investigation database I didn't find any.

Thus, I fully support a rigid inspection regime as you propose in the PAD. In fact, I do already include a visual inspection of the V-Band-Coupling in every pre-flight inspection since this is easily done through the turbocharger inspection door in the cowling of my Mooney M20K.

But I definitely oppose the requirement to exchange the V-Band Coupling every 500 FH on the TSIO-360 engines, since there is no evidence justifying this - especially if thorough and regular inspections are being performed.

EASA response:

Comment not agreed. EASA agrees with the FAA considerations that led to the issuance of the AD 2023-09-09, based on the outcome of a dedicated working group, which identified the possible unsafe condition following in-depth review of stress corrosion cracking events.

EASA reminds that AMOC to specific AD requirements can be approved if properly justified. No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.

