provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (b) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the cargo door hinges caused by stress corrosion and/or fatigue cracks, which could result in decompression of the airplane, and possible in-flight separation of the cargo door; accomplish the following:

(a) Within 12 months after the effective date of this AD, replace the hinges on the forward, center, and aft belly cargo doors with improved hinges in accordance with Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3, as applicable, of the Accomplishment Instructions of Fokker Service Bulletin F28/52–110, dated April 7, 1993.

(b) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 2: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(c) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(d) The actions shall be done in accordance with Fokker Service Bulletin F28/52–110, dated April 7, 1993. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Fokker Services B.V., Technical Support Department, P.O. Box 75047, 1117 ZN Schiphol Airport, the Netherlands. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 3: The subject of this AD is addressed in Dutch airworthiness directive 93–055 (A), dated April 23, 1993.

(e) This amendment becomes effective on October 20, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 28, 1998.

Vi L. Lipski,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–24249 Filed 9–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–123–AD; Amendment 39–10737; AD 98–18–21]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) Model C–212 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to all CASA Model C–212 series airplanes, that requires implementation of a corrosion prevention and control program either by accomplishing specific inspections or by revising the maintenance inspection program to include such a program. This amendment is prompted by reports of incidents involving corrosion and fatigue cracking in transport category airplanes that are approaching or have exceeded their economic design goal; these incidents have jeopardized the airworthiness of the affected airplanes. The actions specified by this AD are intended to prevent degradation of the structural capabilities of the airplane due to the problems associated with corrosion.

DATES: Effective October 20, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of October 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A., Getafe, Madrid, Spain. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Norman B. Martenson, Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (425) 227–2110; fax (425) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all CASA Model C–212 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on February 5, 1997 (62 FR 5350). That action proposed to require implementation of a corrosion prevention and control program either by accomplishing specific inspections or by revising the maintenance inspection program to include such a program.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Request To Shorten Initial Compliance Time

Several commenters request that the one year compliance time for accomplishment of initial corrosion inspections, as specified in the proposed AD, be shortened to be effective immediately upon issuance of the AD. The commenters consider the one year period for implementation of the corrosion prevention and control program (CPCP) to be too long, unnecessary, and not in the best interests of public safety.

The FAA does not concur with the commenters' request. In developing an appropriate compliance time, the FAA considered the risk to the affected airplanes, as well as the magnitude and complexity of the CPCP. The FAA does not consider the risk to these airplanes during the one year implementation period to be great, since the requirement to implement the CPCP does not stem from a specific finding of serious corrosion on CASA Model C–212 series airplanes. Rather, the CPCP is proactive in nature, in that it establishes a comprehensive program designed to prevent corrosion from developing in the future to the point that it could affect safe operation of these airplanes.

However, the FAA does consider it necessary to allow operators sufficient time for implementation of the requirements of the CPCP. The tasks to be accomplished as part of the CPCP are complex and time consuming; complete accomplishment of these tasks could require an elapsed time of several weeks. Given the magnitude of the CPCP tasks required by this AD, the FAA considers a one year period to be appropriate, to allow operators time to plan for implementation of these tasks on the fleet of affected airplanes.

In light of these factors, the FAA has determined that no change to the final rule is necessary.

Inspections of All Airplanes At Least Once Per Year

Several commenters request that the proposed AD be revised to require accomplishment of the initial CPCP inspections on all affected airplanes at a minimum rate of once per year. The commenters question if the AD, as proposed, would allow accomplishment of the initial inspection over an extended period of time, amounting to up to ten years in some cases (on a fleet of ten or more airplanes). The commenters state, if this is the case, the proposed AD should not be implemented in this way.

The FAA infers that the commenters are concerned about the length of time prior to accomplishment of the initial CPCP inspections for some airplanes. However, in the example provided by the commenter, an operator would not necessarily be allowed 10 years to accomplish the initial inspections in the CPCP. Rather, the schedule for compliance is dependent on the age of the airplane. For all airplanes over 15 years of age, this AD requires completion of the initial inspection in no more than 4 years. In consideration of the amount of work involved in accomplishing the CPCP, the FAA considers this time frame to be justified. Operators of affected airplanes that are newer would have a longer time to accomplish the initial inspections. However, as newer airplanes are less likely to have corrosion present, the FAA considers this longer time period to be appropriate as well.

Additionally, during any of the CPCP inspections required by this AD, the inspection schedule for airplanes in an operator's fleet is also dependent on any significant corrosion finding (Level 2 or Level 3) made on any airplane in its affected fleet. For example, if an operator were to discover Level 3 corrosion during the inspection of its first airplane, it would then accomplish the requirements of paragraph (d) of the AD. Paragraph (d) would require that operator to propose to the FAA a schedule for timely inspection of the rest of its fleet of affected airplanes, or, to provide data to the FAA substantiating that such a finding of Level 3 corrosion is an isolated occurrence. For FAA approval, the proposed inspection schedule would need to be in concert with the severity of the corrosion finding. The FAA considers this method of preventing and controlling corrosion to be appropriate and adequate to maintain continued operational safety for these airplanes; therefore, no change to the final rule is necessary.

Request To Inspect Airplanes Prior to Repairs

Two commenters request that the proposed AD be revised to require inspection of each airplane immediately preceding any repairs. The commenters state that such a requirement would ensure that the repairs are within the standards, and so that the airplane may regain its airworthy status. The FAA infers that the commenter may be requesting that inspections be accomplished immediately following any repairs. However, the FAA does not concur with such a request. Following any repairs, existing Federal Aviation Regulations already require assurance that the repairs are adequate and that the airplane is in an airworthy condition. Therefore, requiring additional inspection of the repaired area is not necessary.

Request To Retire Older Airplanes

Two commenters express concern about aging airplanes of all models, and suggest that, if airplanes are no longer up to standards, they should not be allowed to operate any longer. The commenters further state that time is being spent to fix something which is constantly being updated. With the advent of new technology, the commenters believe that better, newer airplanes would be available as a substitute for older airplanes which no longer meet the standards. The FAA acknowledges the concern of the commenters. However, the purpose of this AD is to address the identified unsafe condition, and the FAA has determined that the proposed requirements are adequate for that purpose. Therefore, prohibiting operation of affected airplanes is not necessary to address the unsafe condition. No change to the final rule is necessary.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 41 airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD. It will take an average of approximately 7 work hours per inspection to accomplish the inspections of the 59 airplane areas called out in CASA Document CPCP C–212–PV01, ''C–212 Corrosion Prevention and Control Program Document,'' dated March 31, 1995; this represents a total average of 413 work hours. The average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators over a 4-year average inspection cycle is estimated to be $1,015,980, or $24,780 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

The FAA recognizes that the obligation to maintain aircraft in an airworthy condition is vital, but sometimes expensive. Because AD's require specific actions to address specific unsafe conditions, they appear to impose costs that would not otherwise be borne by operators. However, because of the general obligation of operators to maintain aircraft in an airworthy condition, this appearance is deceptive. Attributing those costs solely to the issuance of this AD is unrealistic because, in the interest of maintaining safe aircraft, most prudent operators would accomplish the required actions even if they were not required to do so by the AD.

A full cost-benefit analysis has not been accomplished for this AD. As a matter of law, in order to be airworthy, an aircraft must conform to its type design and be in a condition for safe operation. The type design is approved only after the FAA makes a determination that it complies with all applicable airworthiness requirements. In adopting and maintaining those requirements, the FAA has already made the determination that they establish a level of safety that is cost-beneficial. When the FAA, as in this AD, makes a finding of an unsafe condition, this means that the original cost-beneficial level of safety is no longer being achieved and that the required actions are necessary to restore that level of safety. Because this level of safety has already been determined to be cost-beneficial, a full cost-benefit analysis for this AD would be redundant and unnecessary.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government.

Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined

that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A final evaluation has been prepared for this action and it is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained from the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES.**

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Incorporation by reference, Safety.

Adoption of the Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration amends part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

98–18–21 CASA: Amendment 39–10737. Docket 96–NM–123–AD.

Applicability: All Model C–212 series airplanes, certificated in any category.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

Note 1: This AD references CASA Document Number CPCP C–212-PV01, ''Corrosion Prevention and Control Program Document,'' dated March 31, 1995, for inspections, compliance times, and reporting requirements. In addition, this AD specifies inspection and reporting requirements beyond those included in the Document. Where there are differences between the AD and the Document, the AD prevails.

Note 2: As used throughout this AD, the term ''the FAA'' is defined differently for different operators, as follows:

—For those operators complying with paragraph (a), OPTION 1, of this AD, *the FAA* is defined as ''the Manager of the International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate.''

—For those operators operating under Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) part 121 or 129 (14 CFR part 121 or part 129), and complying with paragraph (b), OPTION 2, of this AD, *the FAA* is defined as ''the cognizant Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI).''

—For those operators operating under FAR part 91 or 125 (14 CFR part 91 or part 125), and complying with paragraph (b), OPTION 2, of this AD, *the FAA* is defined as ''the cognizant Maintenance Inspector at the appropriate FAA Flight Standards office.''

To prevent degradation of the structural capabilities of the airplane due to the problems associated with corrosion damage, accomplish the following:

(a) OPTION 1. Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this AD: Complete each of the corrosion inspections specified in section 5.3 of CASA Document Number CPCP C–212-PV01, ''Corrosion Prevention and Control Program Document,'' dated March 31, 1995 (hereafter, referred to as ''the Document), in accordance with the procedures defined in the Document and the schedule specified in paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this AD.

Note 3: A ''corrosion inspection'' as defined in Section 5.1. of the Document includes, among other things, gaining access for inspection, performing the actual inspection for corrosion, removing corrosion, clearing blocked drains, applying corrosion inhibitors and/or water displacement fluid, and other follow-on actions.

Note 4: Corrosion inspections completed in accordance with the Document before the effective date of this AD may be credited for compliance with the initial corrosion inspection requirements of paragraph (a)(1) of this AD.

Note 5: Where non-destructive inspection (NDI) methods are employed when performing a Special Detailed Inspection (DET), in accordance with Section 5.3 of the Document, the standards and procedures used must be acceptable to the FAA Administrator in accordance with FAR section 43.13 (14 CFR 43.13).

(1) Complete the initial corrosion inspection of each area of each airplane zone specified in Section 5.3 of the Document as follows:

(i) For airplane areas that have not yet reached the ''Implementation Age'' (IA) as of one year after the effective date of this AD, initial compliance must occur no later than the IA plus the (repeat) ''Interval.''

(ii) For airplane areas that have exceeded the IA as of one year after the effective date of this AD, initial compliance must occur within the (repeat) Interval for the area, measured from a date one year after the effective date of this AD.

(iii) For airplanes that are 15 years or older as of one year after the effective date of this AD, initial compliance must occur for all airplane areas within one (repeat) Interval, or within 4 years, measured from a date one year after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs first.

(iv) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a)(1)(i), (a)(1)(ii), and (a)(1)(iii), in all cases, once the initial compliance period has been established for each airplane area, accomplishment of the initial corrosion inspections by each operator must occur at a minimum rate equivalent to one airplane per year.

Note 6: This minimum rate requirement may cause a hardship on some small operators. In those circumstances, requests for adjustments to the implementation rate will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis under the provision of paragraph (h) of this AD.

(2) Repeat each corrosion inspection at a time interval not to exceed the (repeat) Interval specified in the Document for that inspection.

(b) OPTION 2. As an alternative to the requirements of paragraph (a) of this AD: Prior to one year after the effective date of this AD, revise the FAA-approved maintenance/inspection program to include the corrosion prevention and control program specified in the Document; or to include an equivalent program that is approved by the FAA. In all cases, the initial corrosion inspection of each airplane area must be completed in accordance with the compliance schedule specified in paragraph(a)(1) of this AD.

(1) Any operator complying with paragraph (b) of this AD may use an alternative recordkeeping method to that otherwise required by FAR 91.417 (14 CFR 91.417) or 12.380 (14 CFR 121.380) for the actions required by this AD, provided it is approved by the FAA and is included as a revision to the FAA-approved maintenance/inspection program.

(2) Subsequent to the accomplishment of the initial corrosion inspection, extensions of the (repeat) Intervals specified in the Document must be approved by the FAA.

(c) To accommodate unanticipated scheduling requirements, it is acceptable for a (repeat) Interval to be increased by up to 10%, but not to exceed 3 months. The FAA must be informed, in writing, of any such extension within 30 days after such adjustment of the schedule.

(d)(1) If, as a result of any corrosion inspection conducted in accordance with paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, Level 3 corrosion is determined to exist in any airplane area, accomplish either paragraph (d)(1)(i) or (d)(1)(ii) of this AD within 7 days after such determination:

(i) Submit a report of that determination to the FAA and complete the corrosion inspection in the affected airplane area(s) on all Model C–212 series airplanes in the operator's fleet; or

(ii) Submit to the FAA for approval one of the following:

(A) A proposed schedule for performing the corrosion inspection(s) in the affected airplane area(s) on the remaining Model C–212 series airplanes in the operator's fleet, which is adequate to ensure that any other Level 3 corrosion is detected in a timely manner, along with substantiating data for that schedule; or

(B) Data substantiating that the Level 3 corrosion found is an isolated occurrence.

Note 7: Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2 of the Document, which would permit corrosion that otherwise meets the definition of Level 3 corrosion (i.e., which is determined to be a potentially urgent airworthiness concern requiring expeditious

action) to be treated as Level 1 if the operator finds that it ''can be attributed to an event not typical of the operator's usage of airplanes in the same fleet,'' this paragraph requires that data *substantiating* any such finding be submitted to the FAA (ref. Note 2 of this AD) for approval.

(2) The FAA may impose schedules other than those proposed, upon finding that such changes are necessary to ensure that any other Level 3 corrosion is detected in a timely manner.

(3) Within the time schedule approved under paragraph (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this AD, accomplish the corrosion inspections in the affected airplane areas of the remaining Model C–212 series airplanes in the operator's fleet.

(e) If, as a result of any inspection after the initial corrosion inspection conducted in accordance with paragraph (a) or (b) of this AD, it is determined that corrosion findings exceed Level 1 in any area, within 30 days after such determination, implement a means, approved by the FAA, to reduce future findings of corrosion in that area to Level 1 or better.

(f) Before any operator places into service any newly acquired airplane that is subject to the requirements of this AD, a schedule for the accomplishment of the corrosion inspections required by this AD must be established in accordance with either paragraph (f)(1) or (f)(2) of the AD, as applicable:

(1) For airplanes previously maintained in accordance with this AD, the first corrosion inspection in each airplane area to be performed by the operator must be accomplished in accordance with either the previous operator's schedule or the new operator's schedule, whichever would result in the earlier accomplishment date for that inspection. After each corrosion inspection has been performed once, each subsequent inspection must be performed in accordance with the new operator's schedule.

(2) For airplanes that have not been previously maintained in accordance with this AD, the first corrosion inspection for each airplane area to be performed by the new operator must be accomplished prior to further flight, or in accordance with a schedule approved by the FAA.

(g) Within 7 days after the date of detection of any Level 3 corrosion, and within 3 months after the date of detection of any Level 2 corrosion, submit a report to CASA of such findings, in accordance with Section 7 of the Document.

(h) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM–116.

Note 8: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM–116.

(i) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(j) The inspections and submission of report shall be done in accordance with CASA Document Number CPCP C–212–PV01, ''Corrosion Prevention and Control Program Document,'' dated March 31, 1995, which includes the following list of effective pages:

Page No.	Date shown on page
List of Effective Page LEP.1.	March 31, 1995

Note: The document number is indicated only on the Title page; no other page contains this information. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A., Getafe, Madrid, Spain. Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

Note 9: The subject of this AD is addressed in Spanish airworthiness directive 01/96, dated April 30, 1996.

(k) This amendment becomes effective on October 20, 1998.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on August 28, 1998.

Vi L. Lipski,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 98–24250 Filed 9–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98–ANE–07–AD; Amendment 39–10753; AD 98–19–11]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol/ S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Series Turbojet Engines

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol/S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 series turbojet engines. This action requires initial and repetitive X-ray and ultrasonic inspections of exhaust diffuser vanes for corrosion and cracks, and, if necessary, removal from service of cracked exhaust diffusers and replacement with serviceable parts. This amendment is prompted by reports of 17 turbine exhaust diffuser modules with one or more exhaust diffuser vanes cracked. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent exhaust diffuser vane failure, which could result in an adverse effect on the engine oil and reheat systems, possibly causing an inflight engine shutdown or damage to the aircraft.

DATES: Effective September 30, 1998.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of September 30, 1998.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before November 16, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–ANE–07–AD, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299. Comments may also be sent via the Internet using the following address: ''9-ad-engineprop@faa.dot.gov''. Comments sent via the Internet must contain the docket number in the subject line.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Rolls-Royce, PO Box 3, Filton, Bristol BS12 7QE, England; telephone 01–17–979–1234, fax 01–17–979–7575. This information may be examined at the FAA, New England Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jason Yang, Aerospace Engineer, Engine Certification Office, FAA, Engine and Propeller Directorate, 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington, MA 01803–5299; telephone (781) 238–7747, fax (781) 238–7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), which is the airworthiness authority for the United Kingdom (UK), recently notified the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that an unsafe condition may exist on Rolls-Royce Limited, (R–R)Aero Division-Bristol/S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Mk. 610–14–28 turbojet engines. The CAA advises that they have received reports of 17 turbine exhaust diffuser modules containing at least one cracked exhaust diffuser vane. In some