

**EASA PAD No. 07 - 042**  
**COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT**  
**[consultation period closed 05/04/2007]**

<b>PAD / DOC PARAGRAPH COMMENTED</b>	<b>COMMENT / PROPOSAL</b>	<b>AUTHOR OF THE COMMENT</b>	<b>DATE OF COMMENT</b>	<b>PCM RESPONSE</b>
Compliance	When we checked the compliance date, we found discrepancies between PAD 07-042 and SB A320-27A1179. We know that the AD thresholds are mandatory but after all there are differences.	Diogo Pedrosa  Aircraft Maintenance Systems Engineering  TAP	08/03/2007	There is an error in the AD. Compliance time will be changed to " within 600FH, 750FC or 100 days" as it is in the SB.
Compliance:	Compliance time should be : within 750 FC, 600 FH or 100 days ...(and not 750 FH , 600 FC or 100 days....).  The sentence: "correct any installation errors before further flight"  could lead to confusion, indeed depending on the installation error reported some specific additional inspection and/or actions could be required , so we would propose to replace this sentence by for example the following one  "and perform any necessary actions in accordance with SB".	Christine Escala  Single Aisle Aircraft Continued Airworthiness Engineer  Product Integrity Division – EAS AIRBUS	08/03/2007	Agreed. Changes will be introduced in AD.
Compliance	PAD compliance column described; "within 600 flight cycles or 750 flight hours..."  However, SB compliance column described; "600 FH or 750 FC..."  So, there is disagree of the units.	Noriaki Toguchi  Assistant Manager Aircraft Systems Engineering Department  ALL NIPPON	09/03/2007	See answer to first comment.

		AIRWAYS CO.,LTD.		
Compliance	In EASA PAD 07-042 the compliance "Unless already accomplished,within 600 flight cycles or 750 flight hours or 100 days after the effective date of the AD", But in AIRBUS SB "Threshold :600 FH or 750 FC or 100 days, whatever occurs first, from release of this Service Bulletin. "So it is very obvious that there is conflict. Could you please tell which compliance we should obey?	Chenheji  Engineering &Technical Department CEA  Engineering &Technical Corporation Hongqiao	22/03/2007	See answer to first comment.
Compliance	Recently, EASA released a proposed AD applicable to certain Airbus model A318, A319, A320 and A321 airplanes that would require a one-time inspection of the trimmable horizontal stabilizer actuator (THSA). ATA received comments from a member regarding this proposed rule, pointing out the frequent replacement frequency of the THSA and, as a result, the inadequacy of a one-time inspection as put forward in the proposed rule. Pursuant to these comments, ATA suggests a recurring inspection of the THSA at 10 month intervals.	Craig Fabian  Director of Technical Operations  Air Transport Association	30/03/2007	The inspection required by Airbus SB A320-27A1179 is to be incorporated as a repetitive inspection in SB A320-27-1164 revision 6. Today AD 2006-0223 mandates SB A320-27-1164 revision 4 – this AD will be revised/replaced to mandate the revision 6. The inspection check described in the SB 27-1179 will also be incorporated into the AMM THSA installation procedure, as an additional check step (AMM revision date to be confirmed )