

COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT

EASA PAD No. 24-055

[Published on 21 May 2024 and officially closed for comments on 18 June 2024]

Commenter 1: All Nippon Airways CO., LTD. – Shinya Fujita – 18/06/2024

Comment # 1

- A. Does EASA only require operators to keep the confirmation record in accordance with the NMSB?
- B. We would like the definition of affected parts to be clarified as follows, or the affected part number to be listed.
 “High pressure compressor (HPC) mini-disc anti-rotation block which Rolls-Royce SB 72-AK645 is not embodied.” Although it is stated in “Applicability” section, “Corrective Action” section reads as action is required when missing parts are detected, regardless of whether or not SB 72-AK645 has been modified.

EASA response:

- A. Comment noted. EASA requires to keep the confirmation (evidence) record of meeting EHM criteria in accordance with the instructions of NMSB 1000 72-AK540 Revision 2.**
No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.
- B. Comment noted. The Applicability section of the AD excludes engines that have embodied Rolls-Royce modification (mod) 72-AK645 in production, or have embodied the SB (corresponding to mod 72-AK645) in service, consequently, post-mod 72-AK645 engines are not affected by the AD. Therefore, the Corrective Action(s) section of the AD is applicable to pre SB 72-AK645 engines, only. For these (pre SB 72-AK645) engines the NMSB TRENT 1000 72-AK540 requires (see paragraph (3)(A)(3)(d)(i)) removal of the engine if an Anti-Rotation Block is identified missing.**
No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.

