


<b>EASA</b>	<b>COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
	<p align="center"><b>EASA PAD No. 12-126</b>  <b>[Published on 02 October 2012 and officially closed for comments on 30 October 2012]</b></p>

**Commenter 1: Lufthansa Technik AG – Peter Brudler – Mon 15/10/2012**

**Comment # 1 [with one PDF attachment re: RR TRENT556-61 EIPC: 72-34-15-05 LP COMPRESSOR REAR CASE Seite 1 von 6]**

Although LHT already made a comment to RR regarding ballot Alert SB 73-AG948 we are surprised and also frustrated with RR way of dealing with our comments on subject SBE.

LHT has made comments to different items on Sep 19<sup>th</sup> 2012 to FRA FSO and this must have been forwarded to [Rolls-Royce] in Derby.

The given comment were input into LHT comments and one item was provided to RR with comment in blue of RR:

Quote LHT:

2. “A review of all possibly required mat will be not done by LHT. But please remember that it is highly important and therefore requested that all mat information given in the SB is without any faults and related figure are all in line and correct. This is a “must” for LHT because of RR SB revisions which were released only for typos and incorrect P/N information (e.g. 71-G627 for T900). This would be really terrible due to high workload to reflect the requirements for AD”.

Unquote LHT

Quote RR:

*We are re-checking the list to ensure there are no typos or incorrect P/N information.*

Unquote RR

As LHT x-checked the released Non Mod Alert SB RB211-73-AG948 against the ballot and x-checked both documents against the RR EIPC discrepancy was found. Two items are shown below as example:

Page 5: P/N FK17275 seems to be wrong => it should be P/N FW17275 iaw RR EIPC Trent500 (72-34-15-05-245) (please find attached the related EIPC figure with P/N overview)

Page 5: P/N FK12473 seems to be wrong => it should be P/N FW12473 iaw RR EIPC Trent500(72-34-15-05-260) (please find attached the related EIPC figure with P/N overview)

There might be more discrepancies which are to be clarified by RR and not be operators, especially when an AD is associated with the SB.

In general the quality level of RR SBs [is] not quite good and [they] are often subject for revisions only due to typos. This problem with SB quality was raised several times to RR and in addition on the Customer Focus Group Meetings (CFG), which is the world-wide forum for all operators.

If possible a comment is highly appreciated from EASA side.

***EASA response:***

***Comment not agreed. This comment will be forwarded to the TC holder in order for the latter to be able to take eventual action.***

***No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment, as the comment does not pertain to the AD, as proposed.***