

down time, and maintenance costs associated with the referenced ADs.

The FAA recognizes the potential value of a harmonized approach to address multiple inspections of the same general area based on other ADs, and will take the commenters' suggestion under advisement for future rulemaking actions. However, in this case the identified unsafe condition is an immediate concern properly addressed in a unique AD. Coordinating a comprehensive review of related ADs would further delay issuance of this AD, which, in any event, is not the proper forum to address such a review. No change to the final rule is necessary regarding this issue.

Request To Consider Repair Interference

Two commenters state that the proposed AD does not address the effect of any impingement of repairs (in case of a crack finding) on the inspection areas of various ADs in this area and/or interference between repairs. The FAA infers that the commenters are requesting that the proposed AD be revised to account for the potential effects of repairs that may have been done in the inspection area of this AD.

The details of the effect of other repairs relative to this AD are unknown, so the FAA cannot address the comment other than to state that this subject is discussed in Note 1 of the AD. Note 1 explains the implications and consequences of previous repairs in the subject area relative to compliance with the requirements of this AD. The FAA suggests that, for any deviations due to repairs in the affected area, each operator combine its compliance proposals into a single request for approval of an AMOC to reduce the number of requests for AMOCs this AD may generate. No change to the final rule is necessary regarding this issue.

Request To Allow New Repairs Based on Prior Approved Repairs

Two commenters request that the proposed AD be revised to "take credit for corrective actions (repairs/rework, etc.) in the subject area, approved by either [the FAA] or the DGAC" to "minimize the AMOC process and aircraft return to service." The FAA infers that the commenters request approval for repair of newly discovered cracks based on previously approved repairs.

The FAA does not agree. Because of the nature of the cracking and the complexity of the area subject to the cracking, the FAA finds that a repair method that is appropriate for one crack configuration may not adequately

address all possible crack configurations. The manufacturer has not issued a service bulletin that provides instructions for repair procedures. If such service information is developed and released, the FAA may issue further rulemaking to allow or require crack repair in accordance with that service bulletin. Until then, however, repairs must be approved through the AMOC process, as provided in paragraph (f)(1) of this AD. No change to the final rule is necessary regarding this issue.

Request To Add Service Information

Two commenters request that the proposed AD be revised to incorporate Airbus All Operators Telex (AOT) A300-53-6135, Revision 01, dated February 2002. The commenters state that the AOT provides information such as new reporting procedures, crack length clarification, and nondestructive test methods.

The FAA finds that the AOT would not add any significant meaningful information regarding the requirements of this AD. This AD has discussed reporting procedures and crack length clarification at some length. This AD generally prohibits continued flight with a known crack (unless certain conditions are met, as determined and approved by the FAA or the DGAC). As a result, the AOT provisions are not applicable or necessary. No change to the final rule is necessary regarding this issue.

Request To Cite Latest Service Bulletin Version

Two commenters request that the proposed AD be revised to cite the latest revision of Airbus Service Bulletin A300-53-6029 (which was cited in AD 96-18-18, at Revision 02, and in the proposed AD, at Revision 05, as the appropriate source of inspection information for Model A300-600 series airplanes). The commenters report that Revisions 06 and 07 (which have not been issued) of the service bulletin will include repair procedures. The commenters suggest that reference in the AD to a service bulletin repair will expedite affected airplanes' return to service and reduce the number of requests for AMOCs. One of the commenters requests that the proposed AD be revised to authorize repairs as terminating action for the repetitive inspections.

The FAA does not agree. As stated previously, the service bulletins do not contain repair instructions. Requiring accomplishment of any action in accordance with an as-yet unpublished service bulletin violates Office of the

Federal Register regulations regarding approval of materials that are incorporated by reference. However, affected operators may request approval to use a later revision of the referenced service bulletin (if issued) as an AMOC, under the provisions of paragraph (f)(1) of the AD. If repair instructions are included in a revised service bulletin, the FAA may then consider issuing further rulemaking or an AMOC with general applicability to all affected airplanes. Further, terminating action will not be routinely granted as a part of each AMOC because of the complexity of the procedures required for inspection, measurement, and repair in the subject area. No change to the final rule is necessary regarding this issue.

Request To Clarify Paragraph (c) Requirements

One commenter requests clarification of the requirements of paragraph (c) of the proposed AD. The commenter finds the phrase "reinspect the airplane" nonspecific and potentially misleading, and recommends that the AD clearly identify the area of the airplane that is to be reinspected and the type of reinspection required if discrepancies are found.

The FAA agrees that clarification of the reinspection language would be helpful. Paragraphs (c) and (d) have been revised in this final rule to indicate that, as an option to repair, the FAA may approve reinspection—in accordance with the applicable service bulletin—within specific intervals.

Request To Include Repetitive Inspections in Reporting Requirement

One commenter requests that reports be required following each repetitive inspection specified in paragraph (b) of the proposed AD. The added data from the additional reports would increase the flow of valuable data to Airbus for better and more detailed understanding of the structural behavior and actual crack propagation.

It was the FAA's intent in paragraph (e) of the proposed AD to require a report following each repetitive inspection, as indicated by the phrase, "after each inspection required by paragraphs (a) and (d) of this AD." Paragraph (b) of this AD merely sets forth the conditions and time interval for repeating the inspections of paragraph (a) of this AD. However, for clarification, paragraph (e) has been revised in this final rule to require a report following any inspection required specifically by paragraphs (a), (b), and (d) of this AD.