ticketless carrier. The statistics do not indicate how many of the remaining complaints may have involved ticketless transactions, but of the 36 overcharge complaints against Major U.S. carriers (i.e., airlines with revenues over $1 billion per year), only three were against Southwest Airlines or United Airlines, two Major carriers with the earliest electronic ticketing programs.

We have no rules that require reservation or fare information to appear on conventional tickets, and we will not require this information to be furnished in writing to ticketless passengers at this time. As far as we are aware, all airlines that offer electronic ticketing provide a paper itinerary showing the fare and reservation status either automatically or upon request. With most carriers, passengers also have the option of a conventional paper ticket if they prefer. A large percentage of ticketless transactions are paid for by credit card, and those passengers have the dispute-resolution procedures of the Fair Credit Billing Act available to them in the event of a problem. Nonetheless, we will continue to monitor complaints in these areas and will not hesitate to take further action in the future if it is warranted.

Likewise, the Department will continue to monitor the evolution of ticketless travel and any consumer problems that may arise from the practice. The compliance policy stated herein will be reconsidered if circumstances so justify. However, before making any substantive change in the policy, we will provide public notice of our planned actions.

We note that under present rules, certificated carriers must maintain consumer complaint records for a period of three years, flight coupons from tickets for a period of one year, and other records related to errors, oversales, irregularities, and delays in handling of passengers for a period of one year. (14 CFR 249.20.) While we see no need at this time to impose additional recordkeeping requirements on carriers using electronic ticketing systems, we encourage all carriers to maintain records sufficient and in such a fashion as to help the Department make informed decisions in the future in this important and evolving area of air transportation.

The compliance policy set forth above is an attempt to provide carriers the maximum flexibility to develop their ticketless travel systems while at the same time providing a measure of protection to consumers from unfair or deceptive practices prohibited by 49 U.S.C. 41712. At the same time, however, carriers may find it advantageous to continue to provide the written DOT ticket notices to ticketless passengers in advance or to consider implementing the innovative notification systems discussed in the comments submitted in this docket (some of which are summarized above). In this regard, carriers may ultimately decide that it is in their overall best financial interest to do so considering that the preemption protections of 49 U.S.C. 41713 and 14 CFR 253.1 may not apply unless notice of contract of carriage terms is provided to ticketless passengers at the time of sale either orally or by contemporaneously mailed (or faxed, emailed, etc.) written notice.

The policy described here does not affect the existing notice requirements for conventional paper tickets. Those tickets must continue to be accompanied by the written notices described in DOT regulations.

Accordingly, it shall be the compliance policy of the Department that ticket notices required by Department regulations shall be given or made readily available to electronically ticketed passengers in writing in a manner such as described above no later than the time that they check in for the first flight in their itinerary.

Issued this 8th day of April, 1997 at Washington, D.C.

Charles A. Hunnicutt,

Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–10147 Filed 4–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–61–AD; Amendment 39–9995; AD 97–08–07]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 Series Airplanes and Model MD–88 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment supersedes an existing airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes, that currently requires an inspection to determine the type of fluorescent light ballasts installed in the cabin sidewall; and installation of a protective cover on the ballast, replacement, or removal/disconnection of the ballast, if necessary. That action also requires, for some airplanes, removal of the dust barriers from the outboard ceiling panels, and installation of modified outboard ceiling panels. This amendment would add a requirement to replace certain ballasts on which a protective cover is installed with other ballasts, or removal/disconnection of the ballast. This amendment is prompted by additional reports of heavy smoke and fumes emitting from the ceiling panels in the forward passenger cabin due to the failure of the fluorescent light ballasts. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent a fire in the passenger compartment, which could result from failure of the fluorescent light ballast of the upper and lower cabin sidewall, and consequent failure of the dust barriers of the outboard ceiling panel.

DATES: Effective May 7, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997, as listed in the regulations, is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of May 7, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain other publications, as listed in the regulations, was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register as of June 17, 1996 (61 FR 27251, May 31, 1996).

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before June 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–NM–61–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: J. Kirk Baker, Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Equipment Branch, ANM–130L, FAA, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California 90712; telephone (310) 627–5345; fax (310) 627–5210.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 22, 1996, the FAA issued AD 96–11–13, amendment 39–9638 (61 FR 27251, May 31, 1996), applicable to certain McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes. That AD currently requires a one-time visual inspection to determine the type of fluorescent light ballasts installed in the cabin sidewall; and installation of a protective cover on the ballast, replacement, or removal/disconnection of the ballast, if necessary. That AD also requires, for some airplanes, removal of dust barriers from the outboard ceiling panels, and installation of modified outboard ceiling panels. That action was prompted by reports of smoke, fumes, and/or electrical fire emitting from the baggage bin of the aft passenger compartment and from the dust barriers of the outboard ceiling due to the failure of the fluorescent light ballasts. The actions required by that AD are intended to prevent a fire in the passenger compartment, which could result from failure of the fluorescent light ballast of the upper and lower cabin sidewall, and consequent failure of the dust barriers of the outboard ceiling panel.

Actions Since Issuance of Previous Rule

Since the issuance of that AD, the FAA has received two reports of heavy smoke and fumes emitting from the ceiling panels in the forward passenger cabin on McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 series airplanes. Investigation revealed that the most recent incident occurred following accomplishment of the installation of a protective cover on a certain Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast, as required by AD 96–11–13. This ballast failed and consequently caused electrical arcing that penetrated the protective cover, which resulted in a fire that damaged the upper insulation blanket and outboard ceiling panel at station 1022. At this time, the FAA is unaware if such an installation has been accomplished on the Model DC–9–80 series airplane involved in the other incident.

The FAA has determined that installation of a protective cover on certain Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballasts, as required by AD 96–11–13, does not adequately preclude failure of such fluorescent light ballasts of the upper and lower cabin sidewall, which could result in a fire in the passenger compartment.

Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Additionally, since issuance of AD 96–11–13, the FAA has reviewed and approved McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997. These alert service bulletins supersede (but do not cancel) the procedures identified in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996 (which is referenced in AD 96–11–13 as the appropriate source of service information). The procedures in these new alert service bulletins are essentially identical to the procedures in Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107; however, the procedures for installation of a protective cover have not been retained in the new alert service bulletins.

Explanation of Requirements of Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of this same type design, this AD supersedes AD 96–11–13 to continue to require a one-time visual inspection to determine the type of fluorescent light ballasts installed in the cabin sidewall; and replacement, or removal/disconnection of the ballast, if necessary. This AD also continues to require, for some airplanes, removal of dust barriers from the outboard ceiling panels, and installation of modified outboard ceiling panels. This AD would add a requirement to replace the currently installed Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballasts, on which a protective cover is installed, with a Bruce Industries Incorporated ballast. All actions except the removal/disconnection would be required to be accomplished in accordance with alert service bulletins described previously.

Operators should note that, in addition to the recommendations of the alert service bulletins described previously, this AD provides the following two additional options for airplanes on which any Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast that has a protective cover is installed:

1. Replacement of the Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast and protective cover with an FAA-approved solid state electronic light ballast system, in accordance with an applicable Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) or other method approved by the FAA. Or

2. Removal or electrical disconnection of the ballast, stowage of the ballast, and protection of the loose wiring.

The FAA finds that accomplishment of these actions will address the identified unsafe condition for the affected airplanes.

Operators should also note that the applicability of the proposal differs from the applicability of AD 96–11–13 in the following two respects:

1. The applicability of this AD references two new alert service bulletins that are not referenced in the applicability statement of AD 96–11–13: McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, and Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997. The applicability of AD 96–11–13 references: McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996. The FAA finds that the effectivity listing of either of the two new alert service bulletins includes the same airplanes as those listed in the effectivity listings of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletins MD80–33A107 and MD80–25A353 combined.

2. The applicability statement of this AD also includes the phase, ''excluding airplanes equipped with solid state electronic light ballasts.'' (The applicability statement of AD 96–11–13 does not include this phrase.) The FAA finds that operators could misinterpret the applicability statement of AD 96–11–13, as currently worded, to indicate that airplanes equipped with these ballasts are subject to the requirements of this AD when they are not. The FAA finds that, even though the effectivity listings of the referenced alert service bulletins specify such an exception, referencing the alert service bulletins alone could lead to a misinterpretation.

Determination of Rule's Effective Date

Since a situation exists that requires the immediate adoption of this regulation, it is found that notice and opportunity for prior public comment hereon are impracticable, and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective in less than 30 days.

Comments Invited

Although this action is in the form of a final rule that involves requirements affecting flight safety and, thus, was not preceded by notice and an opportunity for public comment, comments are invited on this rule. Interested persons are invited to comment on this rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications shall identify the

Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES**. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments will be considered, and this rule may be amended in light of the comments received. Factual information that supports the commenter's ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the AD action and determining whether additional rulemaking action would be needed.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the rule that might suggest a need to modify the rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA-public contact concerned with the substance of this AD will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this rule must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket Number 97–NM–61–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

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.

The FAA has determined that this regulation is an emergency regulation that must be issued immediately to correct an unsafe condition in aircraft, and that it is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866. It has been determined further that this action involves an emergency regulation under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979). If it is determined that this emergency regulation otherwise would be significant under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures, a final regulatory evaluation will be prepared and placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it, if filed, 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 removing amendment 39–9638 (61 FR 27251, May 31, 1996), and by adding a new airworthiness directive (AD), amendment 39–9995, to read as follows:

97–08–07 McDonnell Douglas: Amendment 39–9995. Docket 97–NM–61–AD. Supersedes AD 96–11–13, Amendment 39–9638.

Applicability: Model DC–9–81 (MD–81), DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), and DC–9–87 (MD–87) and Model MD–88 airplanes, excluding airplanes equipped with solid state electronic light ballasts; certificated in any category; and listed in the following McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletins:

- Both McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996.

Or

- McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997.

Or

- McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise 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 (e) 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 fluorescent light ballast of the upper and lower cabin sidewall, and consequent failure of the dust barriers of the outboard ceiling panel, accomplish the following:

(a) For airplanes listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996: Within 90 days after June 17, 1996 (the effective date of AD 96–11–13, amendment 39–9638), perform a one-time visual inspection to determine the type of fluorescent light ballasts installed in the upper and lower cabin sidewall, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996.

Note 2: Inspections accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, or Revision 1, dated March 3, 1997; are considered acceptable for compliance with the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD.

(1) If any Bruce Industries Incorporated ballast is installed (specified as Condition 1 in the alert service bulletin), no further action is required by this paragraph for that ballast.

(2) If any Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast is installed (specified as Condition 2 in the alert service bulletin), prior to further flight, accomplish either paragraph (a)(2)(i) or (a)(2)(ii) of this AD.

(i) Replace it with a Bruce Industries Incorporated ballast, in accordance with Condition 2, Option 2, of the alert service bulletin. Or

Note 3: Replacements accomplished prior to the effective date of this AD in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, or Revision 1, dated March 3, 1997, are considered acceptable for compliance with the replacement required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this AD.

(ii) Remove or disconnect it electrically, stow it, and protect the loose wiring.

(b) For airplanes having manufacturer's fuselage numbers listed in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996: Within 90 days after June 17, 1996, remove the dust barriers from the outboard ceiling panels, and install modified outboard ceiling panels, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996.

(c) For airplanes on which the installation of a protective cover, as described in McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, has been accomplished [required by paragraph (a)(2)(i) of AD 96–11–13]: Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, accomplish paragraph (c)(1), (c)(2), or (c)(3) of this AD.

(1) Replace the Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast and protective cover with a Bruce Industries Incorporated ballast, in accordance with Condition 2 of the Accomplishment Instructions of Boeing Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, or Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997. Or

(2) Replace the Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast and protective cover

with an FAA-approved solid state electronic light ballast system, in accordance with an applicable Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) or other method approved by the Manager, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office (ACO), FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Or

(3) Remove the Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast and protective cover or disconnect it electrically, stow it, and protect the loose wiring.

(d) As of the effective date of this AD, no Day-Ray Products Incorporated ballast, having any part number identified in paragraph 1.2 of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997, or McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997, shall be installed on any airplane.

(e)(1) 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, Los Angeles ACO. Operators shall submit their requests through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Los Angeles ACO.

Note 4: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Los Angeles ACO.

(2) Alternative methods of compliance, approved previously in accordance with AD 96–11–13, amendment 39–9638, are approved as alternative methods of compliance with this AD.

(f) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 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.

(g) The inspection and replacement shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996; McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, dated February 25, 1997; and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A110, Revision 1, dated March 11, 1997. The removal of the dust barriers and installations shall be done in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996. The incorporation by reference of McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–33A107, dated April 25, 1996, and McDonnell Douglas Alert Service Bulletin MD80–25A353, dated March 14, 1996, was approved previously by the Director of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51 as of June 17, 1996 (61 FR 27251, May 31, 1996). The incorporation by reference of the remainder of the service documents listed above is 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 McDonnell Douglas Corporation, 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, California 90846, Attention: Technical Publications Business Administration, Department C1–L51 (2–60). Copies may be inspected at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

(h) This amendment becomes effective on May 7, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on April 9, 1997.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–9710 Filed 4–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97–NM–60–AD; Amendment 39–9996; AD 97–08–08]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777–200 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD), applicable to certain Boeing Model 777–200 series airplanes. This action requires repetitive visual inspections of the forward mounts of certain engines to detect damaged, missing, or failed parts, and eventual modification of those engines. Accomplishment of this modification terminates the requirement for repetitive inspections. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that bolts that attach the yoke of the forward mount to the fan case of the engine have failed due to fatigue cracking. The actions specified in this AD are intended to prevent fatigue cracking in these bolts, which could lead to failure of these bolts and consequent separation of the engine from the wing.

DATES: Effective May 7, 1997. The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of May 7, 1997.

Comments for inclusion in the Rules Docket must be received on or before June 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM–103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97–NM–60–AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056.

The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from General Electric Aircraft Engines, GE90 Product Support, One Neuman Way, Cincinnati, Ohio 45215–6301. This information may be examined 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.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stan Wood, Aerospace Engineer, Airframe Branch, ANM–120S, FAA, Seattle Aircraft Certification Office, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; telephone (206) 227–2772; fax (206) 227–1181.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: During certification testing of the General Electric (GE) 90 engine, fatigue cracking was detected in the bolts that attach the yoke of the forward mount of the engine to the fan case of the engine. Fatigue cracking in the bolts that attach the yoke of the forward mount of the engine to the fan case of the engine, if not prevented, could lead to failure of these bolts and consequent separation of the engine from the wing.

An analysis revealed that these bolts had a short fatigue life due to the large forces that the yoke exerted on them. As a result, the original yoke design was not certified as meeting the damage tolerance standards of part 25 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 25). The engine manufacturer subsequently redesigned the yoke and fan case to those standards in order to prevent fatigue cracking in the bolts.

Although the airplane manufacturer did not install GE90 engines with the original yoke design on any Model 777–200 series airplanes, the engine manufacturer shipped some of these engines to operators as replacement engines. The engine manufacturer had apparently concluded, in error, that if the yoke complied with the strength requirements of part 33 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 33), it could ship engines containing yokes of the original design for use as spare engines for these airplanes. The yoke must, in fact, meet both the strength standards of part 33 and the damage tolerance standards of part 25 in order to be certificated for installation on the Boeing Model 777–200 series airplane. The discrepant yokes are installed in GE90 engines having serial numbers 900–104, –105, –106, –108, –109, –110, and –111.