

EASA Proposed CM-PIFS-013 Issue 01 – The integrity of nickel powder metallurgy rotating critical parts for gas turbines – Comment Response Document

Comment				Comment summary	Suggested resolution	Comment is an		EASA	EASA response
NR	Author	Section, table, figure	Page			observation (suggestion)	substantive (objection)	comment disposition	
1	GE Aviation			GE Aviation has no objections				Noted	
2	Rolls-Royce	Title	1	Clarification	The integrity of nickel powder metallurgy rotating critical parts, as per CS-E 515 for gas turbines	Yes	No	Not accepted	The appropriate regulatory requirement is identified under regulatory requirements, also on page 1.
3	Rolls-Royce	Section 2	3	2 nd and 3 rd paragraphs state "serviced" and "Surfaced" induced anomalies. Which is it?	Clarify which it is or remove the word 'induced'.	Yes	No	Accepted	The CM has been amended.
4	Rolls-Royce	Section 3.1.2	6	Tightly controlled radial forging	Remove the word "radial"	Yes	No	Accepted	The CM has been amended.
5	Rolls-Royce	Section 3.1.2	6	The material may also be used in an as-compacted form (such as post Hot Isostatic Pressing (HIP)) to manufacture components.	This should not be included in a document discussing rotating critical parts, please delete.	Yes	No	Partially accepted	The CM has been amended.
6	Rolls-Royce	Section 3.1.2	6	Fluorescent particle inspections	Should be fluorescent penetrant inspections	Yes	No	Accepted	The CM has been amended.
7	Rolls-Royce	Section 3.1.2	6	Sentence - work to understand the impact of the etchant should be included within the fatigue programme.	Suggest that the sentence ends: fatigue programme, unless surfaces are subsequently not shot peened. Effects of etchant, if any, are mitigated by shotpeening.	Yes	No		The EASA does not concur with the commenter. The use of etchant within the finished part should be accounted for within the applicant's submission. Furthermore, where any difference in surface finish between test specimen and finished component exists, then this should be accounted for within the assessment.
8	UK CAA	Section 3.1.2	6	NDT cannot confirm the absence of cracks. When the POD has been appropriately determined NDT can verify that cracks exceeding the POD criteria are not present in the part with a 90% probability	2	Yes	No	Accepted	The CM has been amended.