


EASA	COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT
	EASA PAD No. 13-167 [Published on 13 November 2013 and officially closed for comments on 11 December 2013]

Commenter 1: Air France – Arnaud Rizzetto – 28.11.2013

Comment # 1

Please find hereafter the AFR comments about PAD 13-167:

1/ Supersedure:

DGAC France AD 2001-062 requirement is not resumed in PAD 13-167: SB A320-55-1024 requested one-time inspection within 10 years from EIS or before September 3, 2002, whichever occurs later.

Why to supersede AD 2001-062 by this new EASA AD? Indeed, this compliance time is overdue; all elevators have applied this SB.

2/ Paragraph (2):

The AD interval doesn't take into account that the elevator inspections can be performed in shop and can be installed on aeroplane later (storage period).

Based on the determination as required by paragraph (1) of this AD, for aeroplanes with an elevator installed, as identified in Appendix 1 of this AD, within the threshold defined in Table 1 of this AD, and, thereafter, at intervals not to exceed 6 years since first flight after last inspection, accomplish a thermographic inspection of the affected elevator top and bottom skin panels in accordance with the instructions of Airbus SB A320-55-1046.

3/ Paragraph (7):

Typographical error.

From the effective date of this AD, do not operate an aeroplane with an elevator installed having a P/N and s/n as listed in Appendix 1 of this AD, Table 1 or Table 2, unless that elevator has been already been inspected and re-protected (as previously required by DGAC France AD 2001-062) in accordance with the instructions of Airbus SB A320-55-1024.

4/ Appendix 1, Table 3:

Typographical error.

D55280001011 instead of Q55280001011

5/ Appendix 1, Table 4:

Mod 23558 forgotten in Table 4 title: **Post-mod 23558 and** pre-mod 35515 elevators, having embodied Airbus SB A320-55-1042 (Airbus mod 150390).

EASA response:

Comments partially agreed.

1/ Neither EASA nor Airbus can exclude (however remote the probability) that there may still be some elevators stored, or even installed (e.g. on aeroplanes registered in a country that did not adopt DGAC France AD 2001-062) that have not been inspected and protected. Paragraph (7) of the new AD takes this

eventuality into account by prohibiting flight of aeroplanes with such elevators installed. Having this prohibition in place makes the original DGAC France AD redundant, which is why it is to be superseded. No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.

2/ through 5/ - Comments agreed. The Final AD has been corrected accordingly.

Commenter 2: Lufthansa Technik – Raik Bauer – 10.12.2013

Comment # 2

Please find herewith a short comment to the aforementioned PAD 13-167 on behalf of operator GAF (German Air Force).

PAD paragraph (7):

Please note there is a typing error: [QUOTE: ... elevator has been already been inspected ...]

EASA response:

Comment agreed. The Final AD has been corrected accordingly.