


<b>EASA</b>	<b>COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT</b>
	<p><b>EASA PAD No. 14-170</b></p> <p><b>[Published on 04 December 2014 and officially closed for comments on 01 January 2015]</b></p>

**Commenter 1: HiFly – Ricardo Real – 5/12/2014**

**Comment # 1**

The AD only affects the attachment pins P/N 740-2022-501 installed on engine FWD mounts P/N 740-2010-501, however as per CMM 71-21-12 IPL the attachment pin P/N 740-2022-501 can also be fitted on engine FWD mounts P/N 740-2010-503 and 745M0006-501 (currently installed on our A321 MSN 1004). In addition, since these mounts were both overhauled and installed in February 2014, the non-conforming pins could have been installed on them during the repair process.

Can you please clarify if the AD will be only applicable to FWD engine mounts P/N 740-2010-501 or if operators with other P/Ns, such as 740-2010-503 and 745M0006-501 are also required to carry out the inspection specified on paragraph 1.1 of this PAD?

**EASA response:**

*A typing error was detected in Goodrich Aerostructures SB V2500-NAC-71-0323 and, consequently, in PAD 14-170: the engine FWD mounts that have been delivered in production all have P/N 740-2010-503. The Reason and RACT sections, as well as Appendix 1 of the Final AD have been amended accordingly.*

*Only engine mounts listed in Appendix 1 of the AD are affected: no affected spare parts have been provided in the field. Affected pins were installed only on production aeroplanes and only on FWD mounts P/N 740-2010-503. Paragraph (2) of the AD is to verify that no affected parts have been transferred from an affected aeroplane MSN to another as a result of engine mount parts rotability. It is considered unlikely that attachment pins were separated from original engine mounts, as this could have happened only if an engine mount listed in Appendix 1 of the AD was removed from its original MSN.*

*Consequently, paragraph (3) of the AD has been amended to indicate that an affected pin can have been installed on any other engine FWD mount that originally did not have an affected pin.*

**Commenter 2: Royal Flight Oman – Robert O'Neill – 7/12/2014**

**Comment # 2**

Ref the above PAD, could you please consider allowing a records check for identification of affected parts? To give an example of our situation:

The aircraft concerned, MSN 2566, is not listed in appendix 1, so would not ordinarily be affected by the requirements. We have just replaced both engines and can conclusively identify the installed mounts and pins from our records. The affected mounts are not applicable for this aircraft and are prevented from fitment by IPC configuration control. Likewise, we cannot fit the affected pins, as only P/N: 740-2022-505 are allowed to be fitted. The IPC configuration is supported by our actual

records. The quoted Airbus SB is also N/A for this aircraft.

However, per the PAD wording:

**(2) An aeroplane not listed by MSN in Appendix 1 of this AD is not affected by the requirements of paragraph (1) of this AD, unless an engine has been replaced on that aeroplane since 01 March 2011 (date of manufacture of the first aeroplane with affected engine mounts).**

With the current wording, we would have to comply with Para (1) of the (P)AD, requiring an inspection per the instructions of an SB which is non-applicable to the aircraft.

**EASA response:**

**Comment accepted. Paragraph (1) of the Final AD has been amended accordingly.**

**Commenter 3: UTAS Aerostructures – Sergio Rodriguez – 18/12/2014**

**Comment # 3**

UTAS-Aerostructures has reviewed EASA PAD No. 14-170. In consultation with Airbus, we propose the following **MODIFICATION** to the **REASON** section of PAD No. 14-170 (see below).

*“A number of forward engine mount pins, Part Number (P/N) 740-2022-501, intended for IAE V2500 series engines, have been reported as non-compliant with the current certification requirements, due to a quality issue during manufacturing of the raw material. It was also determined that a batch of 88 affected pins are installed on in-service airplanes and the serial numbers (s/n) of the affected pins and the MSN of the related airplanes have been identified. This condition, if not corrected, could lead to the non-compliant pins seeing continued usage in-service in the forward engine mount rather than being replaced by compliant pins at the inspection interval of 7500 flight hours or 5000 flight cycles or 24 months). This condition could lead to the full loss of the primary thrust load path which is an abnormal flight condition, deploying the secondary waiting load path, unaffected by the non-conforming pin. For the reasons described above, this AD requires identification of the affected forward engine mount pins and removal from service of those pins.”*

**EASA response:**

**Comment understood, but not accepted. Standard AD writing indicate that the ultimate consequence(s) of an unsafe condition must be specified in an AD. Although the existence of the secondary load path is acknowledged as mitigating the risk, EASA have determined that in-flight loss of an engine is a possible consequence of this condition.**

**No changes have been made to the Final AD in response to this comment.**