

**Comment Response Document (CRD)
to Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) 12/2004**

DRAFT OPINION OF THE EUROPEAN AVIATION SAFETY AGENCY,

for a Commission Regulation amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, as amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 381/2005, laying down implementing rules for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations,

AND

DRAFT DECISION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE AGENCY,

amending Decision No. 2003/1/RM of the Executive Director of the Agency of 17 October 2003 on acceptable means of compliance and guidance material for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations (“AMC and GM to Part 21”)

Miscellaneous Part 21

Explanatory Note

I. General

The purpose of the Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) 12/2004, dated 10-11-2004 was to propose a draft Opinion of the European Aviation Safety Agency, for a Commission Regulation amending Commission Regulation (EC) No 1702/2003, as amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 381/2005, laying down implementing rules for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations, and a draft Decision of the Executive Director of the Agency, amending Decision No. 2003/1/RM of the Executive Director of the Agency of 17 October 2003 on Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations (“AMC and GM to part 21”) introducing miscellaneous improvements.

II. Consultation

The NPA 12/2004 was published on the web site (www.easa.eu.int) on 10-11-2004.

By the closing date of 10-02-2005, the Agency had received 29 comments from 9 national authorities, professional organisations and private companies.

III. Publication of the CRD

All comments received have been acknowledged and incorporated into a Comment Response Document (CRD). This CRD contains a list of all persons and/or organisations that have provided comments and the answers of the Agency.

The Agency’s Opinion and Decision will be issued at least two months after the publication of this CRD in the Official Publication of the Agency to allow for any possible reactions of stakeholders regarding possible misunderstandings of the comments received and answers provided.

Such reactions should be received by EASA not later than 26-06-2006 and should be sent by the following link: CRD@easa.eu.int.

CRD to NPA 12/2004

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
1.	General	Airbus	Airbus welcomes the clarification and corrections introduced by this NPA.	Noted.	unchanged
2.	Para IV 7a	GSAC - Département Production	This wording change should be extended as necessary throughout the rule and AMC/GM, such as: 21A.130(b) 3, AMC n° 2 to 21A.130(b) block 13, 21A.145, GM 21A.145 (b) (2), 21A.147. <u>Justification:</u> For full consistency.	Not accepted. - Where only “emission requirements” are quoted this cannot be replaced by “environmental protection requirements”. - Where “noise, fuel venting and exhaust emission data” is used, this cannot be replaced by “environmental protection data”. - Where “characteristics of noise, fuel venting and exhaust emission” is used, this cannot be replaced by “characteristics of environmental protection”. The above replacements cannot be made because the meaning is not the same.	unchanged
3.	Para IV 7b	CAA-NL	Same correction also for 21.A.112 <u>Justification:</u> Consistency in numbering	Accepted	21A.112A Eligibility
4.	Para IV 7c	CAA-NL	In addition to the proposal: Incorporate a definition of adjustable pitch in CS-Definitions <u>Justification:</u> Clear definitions throughout Europe.	Noted. An adjustable pitch propeller is a propeller, the pitch setting of which can be changed in the course of maintenance but not when the propeller is rotating. A definition may be added to CS-P or CS-Definitions following NPA 05/2005	unchanged

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
5.	Para IV 7h	GSAC - Département Production	<p>This wording change should be extended when necessary throughout the rule and AMC/GM, such as: 21A.130 (c) 3, AMC n°2 to 21A.130 (b) block 14, 21A.139(b) 1 xii, AMC n° 1 to 21A.133 (b) and (c), AMC 21A.163 (c), GMn°4 to 21A.165 (c)</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> For full consistency</p>	<p>Partially accepted: Changes are required for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 21A.165(c)2, - GM No. 1 to 21B.220(c): EASA Form 56 part two of five - AMC No. 2 to 21A.133(b) and (c): arrangement sample form - GM 21A.307 	<p>Replace “airworthiness” by “conformity to approved design data and in condition for safe operation” in the paragraphs and AMC/GM mentioned in the column left of this.</p>
6.	Para IV 7m	CAA-NL	<p>In addition to the proposal delete the ‘Aircraft registration’</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> As discussed in the EASA rulemaking comité in 2003, the registration should be deleted from the form, since the ARC will remain valid when an aircraft is transferred from the register of one member state to the register of an other member state. The registration on the ARC will then not mach with the registration of the aircraft. Identification by the Aircraft serial number is suffusion. (See also comment on Part M)</p>	<p>Noted. According to AMC M.A.903 (b) “Transfer of aircraft registration within the EU” the authority should change the registration on the existing ARC at the time of transfer of the aircraft. This means that the ARC will remain valid but only a limited administrative action is necessary to match the ARC with the new registration. The authority of the new state of registry will anyhow have to issue a new Certificate of Airworthiness and this additional administrative action is not a burden. The Agency believes that a reference to the registration in the ARC is beneficial for its acceptance in the field, notably in non-EU states.</p>	<p>unchanged</p>
7.	Para IV 8a	CAA-NL	<p>Adding to 21A.3(a) the following: “The system shall also include a feedback and rectification loop to maintenance organizations which have notified the holder of a design approval about inaccurate, incomplete or ambiguous procedures, information or maintenance instructions contained in maintenance data used by maintenance personnel.”</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> The reasoning in the explanatory note about coordination between design and maintenance is</p>	<p>Not accepted. Although the principle is sound the Agency does not see a need to regulate the relation between design approval holders and maintenance organisations more than is done currently. It is sufficient to rely on the already existing exchange of information.</p>	<p>unchanged</p>

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
			<p>understood. However, the Agency is asked to reconsider the conclusion that there is no need for such coordination, because it can be doubted that this is completely true. The applicability since September 2003 of requirement A.45.c in Part 145 about notifying design organizations of flaws in maintenance data is an example that coordination is needed. There is however no appropriate related requirement in Part 21 to rectify those flaws.</p> <p>It is evident that maintenance organizations are more willingly to comply with 145.A45.c if they have the feeling that design organizations will respond on their comments and make the data actually better. But not all design organizations, especially component designers, have a practice to update maintenance data on a regular basis or to update it at all. So, there is a chance that many of the reported flaws will not be answered and probably will not be solved, resulting in non-complying maintenance organizations, because they will stop to report.</p> <p>It's agreed that 21.4 is not the appropriate requirement to address the coordination between design and maintenance organizations about maintenance data. 21.3 is a far better place to do so.</p>		
8.	Para IV 8e	CAA-UK	<p>The decision made at IV 8e is accepted in part. However, the approval statement, as written, is not appropriate for an AFM Supplement. The reference yyy would need to be that of either the AFM (in the case of revisions to the AFM) or the AFM Supplement (in the case of revisions to an AFM Supplement).</p> <p>An AFM Supplement might apply to more than one AFM. The reference would, therefore, be that of the supplement alone, without the AFM reference.</p> <p>GM 21A.263(c)(4), para 3.6 advises of a simplified approval statement, when shown on each page: "Approved under the authority of [EASA].J.[xyz]"</p>	Accepted	<p>....</p> <p>4. to approve documentary changes to the aircraft flight manual and supplements, and issue such changes containing the following statement : "Revision nr. xx to AFM (or supplement) ref. yyy, is approved under the authority of DOA nr. {EASA}.21J.[xyz]."</p>

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
			<p>This simplified statement is adequate and appropriate whether the document is an AFM, AFM Supplement or Temporary Revision. There is no value added by quoting the name or reference of the document in the approval statement. It is therefore proposed to use this simplified, and more versatile, statement in lieu of the current statement in Part 21. Applying the corrections already being made to Part 21, the proposed new approval statement becomes: “Approved under the authority of EASA.21J.[xyz]”</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> In order to comply with 21A.263(c)(4), when approving AFM Supplements or AFM Temporary Revisions, the approval statement must be amended.</p>		
9.	Para IV.8f	DGAC-F	<p>The agency’s response is not adequate for two reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 21A.609 (f) is modified to change the references to 21A.3 (b) and (c) into 21A.3. The same rationale would be valid for 21A.606 (c) which also refers to 21A.3 (b) and (c) but is not changed by this NPA. - Contrary to the conditions for issuance of a type certificate (see 21A.21 (c)(4)), there is no requirement placed on the ETSOA applicant in relation to compliance with its obligations (21A.609) at time of issuance of the authorisation. Then, this might result in a situation where an applicant not complying with 21A.609 would receive the ETSOA because there would be no legal means to refuse the granting of the ETSOA. But, it is noted that this authorisation would be immediately invalidated under 21A.619 (a)(2). This would not be a correct procedure : the equivalent of 21A.21 (c)(4) should imposed to ETSOA applicants. The Agency should be sure of the compliance with the obligations before signing the authorisation. 	Accepted	<p>21A.606 (c) Showing that it is able to comply with 21A.3(b) and (c). Expressly stating that it is prepared to comply with 21A.609.</p>

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
			Consequently, it is suggested that 21A.606 (c) should be changed to read as follows : (c) expressly stating that it is prepared to comply with 21A.609.		
10.	21A.35(b)(2)	CAA-NL	Delete “tethered gas balloons” from the exception in 21A.35. <u>Justification:</u> Tethered gas balloons, manned or unmanned are by definition not an aircraft in the Netherlands and as such are not regulated by the CAA-NL. By including them in the exception they become part of the aviation system thru the back door.	Not accepted. Tethered or captive balloons comply with the general definition of aircraft (Any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air other than the reactions of the air against the earth’s surface.) See also table 1 “classification of aircraft” in ICAO Annex 7.	unchanged
11.	21A.183 (b)(1)(ii) and 21A.184 (a)(2)(i)(B)	DGAC-F	There are references to “applicable airworthiness directives”. With regard to the recently issued Agency’s policy on airworthiness directives related to maintenance (which are not addressed by the Agency), to ADs adopted by means of article 2, (3)(b)(iii) of regulation 1720/2003 and to use of article 10.1 of regulation 1592/2002, in addition to the decision on automatic adoption of ADs from the State of Design, the determination of “applicable” ADs is not obvious. Some guidance material (GM) would be welcome. Indeed, in order to comply with 21A.183 and 184, an aircraft should be in a condition for safe operation (21A.183 (b)(2) and 21A.184 (a)(2)(ii)). This is usually understood as, at least, complying with all ADs, related to both design and maintenance. If “maintenance ADs” are not published by EASA, if “article 10.1 ADs” are controversial (article 10.2 of 1592 regulation), how are defined the “applicable ADs” ?	Noted. It should be clear that in the Community terminology airworthiness directives (ADs) are those issued or adopted by the Agency in accordance with 21A.3B. This includes AD’s that are automatically adopted. The applicability is defined in the airworthiness directive (see 21A.3B(d)2.). Airworthiness directives are Agency’s decisions addressed to the design approval holder. They mandate corrective actions and, after notification to the addressee, enter into force as provided in the AD itself (see 21A.3B(d)5). After its entering into force, the Member State of Registry must enforce them and ensure that aircraft on its register comply with the ADs, <i>inter alia</i> in accordance with Part 21 Subpart H. Therefore there is no ambiguity.	unchanged

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
12.	21A.307	Helmut Fendt	<p>No part or appliance (except a standard part and Non-ETSO-devices installed for support and/or documentation of flights for the purpose of air sport), shall be eligible for installation ...</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Over the years (decades), very useful additional equipment has been developed for the gliding and ballooning sport scene. Some of these devices are even improving safety, although they are not ETSO'ed equipment. The best known device is the "acoustic variometer", making it possible for the pilot to watch airspace while optimising the lift in a thermal. These devices were and are not under a regulatory surveillance, their installation was covered by a "non-hazard" approach via annual inspections. An installation advice supplied by the manufacturer of the instrument or the airframe is regarded to be fully sufficient. In the past, installation was handled very liberal and this is regarded justifiable as there are no indications available that these installations caused problems or accidents. The amendment is intended to keep these devices away from unnecessary regulatory approval and documentation.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed concept is too far reaching to introduce at this stage of the NPA process. It is the subject of two separate rulemaking tasks: 21.026 and 21.035.</p>	unchanged
13.	21A.801(d)	CAA-NL	<p>Disagree with the proposal to delete 'free' from the text for balloons</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Tethered gas balloons, manned or unmanned are by definition not an aircraft in the Netherlands and as such are not regulated by the CAA-NL. By including them in the exception they become part of the aviation system thru the back door.</p>	<p>Not accepted. Tethered or captive balloons comply with the general definition of aircraft (Any machine that can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air other than the reactions of the air against the earth's surface.) See also table 1 "classification of aircraft" in ICAO Annex 7.</p>	unchanged

CRD to NPA 12/2004

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
14.	21A.801(d)	CAA-NL	<p>Include a definition of “load frame assembly” in CS-Definitions.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> The terminology “load frame assembly” is to our knowledge not well defined within the airworthiness documentation on balloons. This may cause confusion on which item has to be marked.</p>	<p>Noted. The Agency believes that the term “load frame assembly” is commonly used by experts and well understood.</p>	unchanged
15.	AMC 3 to 21A.129(c)	CAA-NL	<p>To replace "significant component" with "components that have special traceability requirements for continued airworthiness purposes" does not fully clarify which components are targeted. If there is confusion on the term significant, a clear definition in CS-Definition may be a better solution for this confusion.</p>	<p>Partially accepted. The word “special” will be deleted from the new text which will make clear that technical records should be kept for a component that has traceability requirements (not just special traceability requirements, but any traceability requirements) for continued airworthiness purposes.</p>	See next comment
16.	AMC 3 to 21A.129(c) / GM 3 to 21A.165.(c)	FAA, AIR-200	<p>The term “significant components” has been replaced by “components that have special traceability requirements for continued airworthiness purposes.” Is the term “special traceability requirements” defined? What is the meaning of “special” in this context? Proposal is to delete the word “special” in the new text. Propose text to read: “Technical records which identify the location and serial numbers of components that have traceability requirements for continued airworthiness purposes.....”</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Unless the term “special” is defined, it may create the same confusion as “significant components,” which was also not defined. It is preferable to state that technical records should be kept for a component that has traceability requirements (not just special traceability requirements, but any traceability requirements) for continued airworthiness purposes.</p>	Accepted	<p>3 Technical records which identify the location and serial numbers of significant components that have traceability requirements for continued airworthiness purposes including those identified in 21A.801 and 21A.805.</p>

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
17.	AMC 3 to 21A.129(c)	GSAC	<p>Numbering error in GM n° 3 to 21A.165(c) is addressed in NPA.(§7. v)</p> <p>The same error in AMC n° 3 to 21A.129(c) is not addressed in NPA.</p>	Accepted	<p>AMC No. 3 to 21A.129(c)</p> <p>15</p> <p>176 The installed compass and or compass systems have been adjusted and compensated and a deviation card displayed in the aircraft.</p> <p>187 Software criticality list.</p> <p>198 A record of rigging and control surface movement measurements.</p> <p>2019 Details of installations which will be removed before starting commercial air transport operations (e.g., ferry kits for fuel, radio or navigation).</p> <p>240 List of all applicable Service Bulletins and airworthiness directives that have been implemented.</p>
18.	AMC 2 to 21A.130(b)	Air France	<p>Read "EASA Form 1" in lieu of "EASA Form One" at three occurrences.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Editorial comment</p>	Accepted	<p>AMC No. 2 to 21A.130(b) Statement of Conformity for Products (other than complete aircraft), parts, appliances and materials - The Authorised Release Certificate (EASA Form One¹)</p> <p>A INTRODUCTION</p> <p>This GMAMC relates only to the use of the EASA Form One¹ for manufacturing purposes. Attention is drawn to Part 21, and Appendix I to Part 145 which covers the use of the EASA Form One¹ for maintenance purposes.</p> <p>.....</p>

CRD to NPA 12/2004

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
19.	AMC 2 to 21A.130(b)	LBA	Use the wording "EASA Form 1" instead of "EASA Form One" <u>Justification:</u> Make text of AMC consistent with the regulations.	Accepted	See previous comment
20.	EASA Form 25	Air France	The NPA proposed to replace reference to "Article 5(3)" with reference to "Article 5(2)". In the same way, the current applicable document mentioned Article 5(3)(b) in lieu of Article 5(3)(c). In conclusion the NPA have to replace reference to Article 5(3)(b) with reference to Article 5(2)(c). Five words later, the dash (-) between "above" and "mentioned" is missing in order to read "above_mentioned" in lieu of "abovementioned" <u>Justification:</u> To be consistent with the basic regulation. Editorial comment	Not accepted. The NPA is correct in changing the reference to article 5(2)(c). "Abovementioned" without a hyphen is an accepted spelling.	unchanged
21.	EASA Form 52	Airbus	17 Statement of Conformity It is hereby certified that this aircraft conforms fully to the type-certificated design and to the items above in boxes 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. The aircraft is in a condition effor safe operation. The aircraft has been satisfactorily tested in flight." <u>Justification:</u> Typographical error	Accepted	EASA Form 52 "17 Statement of Conformity It is hereby certified that this aircraft conforms fully to the type-certificated design and to the items above in boxes 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13. The aircraft is in a condition effor safe operation. The aircraft has been satisfactorily tested in flight."

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
22.	GM 21A.101	DGAC-F	<p>Although this is not related to the proposal itself, it is noted that the definition of the type certification basis in paragraph 4 (a) uses the word “exemption”.</p> <p>Part 21 has no provision for “exemptions”. Article 3.2 of the certification procedures issued by the EASA Management Board addresses “deviations” : this might be covered by 21A.17 (a)(1)(i).</p> <p>It is suggested deleting the reference to “exemptions” and replacing it by reference to “deviations”.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Consistency with other texts.</p>	Accepted	<p>GM 21A.101 Establishment of the type-certification basis of Changed Aeronautical Products</p> <p>4. EXPLANATION OF TERMINOLOGY</p> <p>The following is a summary of the terminology used throughout this advisory or guidance material. Further explanations of some of these terms can be found in paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8.</p> <p>a. Type-certification basis: the applicable airworthiness codes as established in 21A.17 and 21A.101, as appropriate, special conditions, equivalent level of safety findings; and exemptions deviations applicable to the product to be certificated.</p> <p>Note: This GM is not intended for determining the applicable aircraft noise, fuel venting and engine emissions environmental protection requirements for changed products.</p>
23.	GM 21A.126 (a) (1) bullets 3 & 4 GM N° 2 to 21A.139 (a)	GSAC - Département Production	<p>Not connected to this NPA, but could be considered.</p> <p>In GM 21A.126(a) (1) bullet 4 , There is no consideration for a supplier working under subpart F, although bullet 3 allows acceptance of Form One as evidence of conformity.</p> <p>The last paragraphs of GM N° 2 to 21A.139(a) only considers supplier with a subpart G POA, but ignores possibility of a supplier working under subpart F and providing a Form One.</p> <p>These paragraphs in the two GM could be similar and have the same consideration for a subpart F supplier.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u></p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The comment is not applicable to any of the items addressed by the NPA.</p> <p>Moreover the issue of giving credit to a production organization working with a supplier who is working under Subpart F requires a more extensive debate than introducing it at this stage of an NPA process.</p>	unchanged

CRD to NPA 12/2004

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
			For consistency of acceptance of Form One between subparts.		
24.	GM 21A.145(c)(2)	Air France	Replace "Appendix X" with "Appendix I" Replace "EASA Form Four" with "EASA Form 4" <u>Justification:</u> Editorial comments	Partially accepted. The EASA Form 4 is Appendix X to the AMC/GM to Annex 1 of 2042/2003 and also Appendix I to AMC/GM to Annex II of 2042/2003	submitted on an EASA Form Four 4 (see format in EASA administrative procedures acceptable means of compliance and guidance material to Annex 1 to Commission Regulation (EC) No 2042/2003, Appendix X EASA Form Four 4)
25.	GM 21A.145(c)(2)	LBA	Use the wording "EASA Form 4" instead of "EASA Form Four" <u>Justification:</u> Make text of GM consistent with the AMC material on Part-145 and Part-147.	Accepted	See above
26.	GM 21A.145(c)(2)	DGAC-F	Form 1 can be found in Part 145 as well as in Part 21. Similarly, it would be more appropriate to place the Form 4 in both Parts, so that each of them would be self contained. Consequently, it is suggested placing Form 4 in GM and AMC to Part 21, instead of the proposed cross reference.	Not accepted. The comparison with the Form 1 is not appropriate because that Form is mandatory and Form 4 is only Guidance Material. A cross reference to another Decision of the Agency is therefore sufficient.	unchanged
27.	GM 21A.804	FAA, AIR-200	The new GM states that the intent of 21A.804(a)(1) is to require that a part or appliance be marked with the name, trademark or symbol identifying the manufacturer only when these items are identified in the design data. While it is usually the case with the major manufacturers that these items are incorporated into the design data, there may be many smaller manufacturers where the name, trademark, or symbol of the manufacturer are not typically part of the design data for parts. This new GM could result in parts not being marked with these identification marks. If the title block on the drawings, which most likely	Partially accepted. The text of the requirement is amended to make clear that the design data should include instructions for the manufacturer how to mark the part identifying the manufacturer. This is explained in an amended GM. The requirement is made applicable to new design only in the amending regulation	Commission Regulation xxxx/2006, amending Commission Regulation 1702/2003: Article y This Regulation shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union. The amended Part 21 paragraph 21A.804(a)(1) shall be applicable to designs approved after that date; Identification of parts and appliances

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
			<p>includes the manufacturer's name, trademark, or symbol, is considered by EASA to be part of the design data, this needs to be clarified so that manufacturers understand this to be a part of the design data.</p> <p>Proposal is to delete the new GM 21A.804, and modify 21A.804(a)(1) by adding "or production organisation approval number" to the end of the sentence.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> It is essential for the purposes of continued airworthiness that parts and appliances be traceable to the manufacturer of those parts. The current 21A.804(a)(1) ensures that traceability by requiring the name, trademark, or symbol identifying the manufacturer to be marked on the part or appliance. Unless the regulations also ensure that the name, trademark, or symbol identifying the manufacturer are part of the design data (especially for parts), the new GM provides guidance that reduces the effectiveness of the current requirement. With this new GM, parts may not be marked with these identification marks, and part traceability will be reduced for the purpose of continued airworthiness.</p> <p>By adding the words "or production organisation approval number" to the requirements of name, trademark, or symbol identifying the manufacturer in 21A.804(a)(1), part traceability is improved, and flexibility is maintained for the POA holder.</p>		<p>(a) Each manufacturer of a part or appliance shall be marked permanently and legibly the part or appliance with:</p> <p>(1) a name, trademark, or symbol identifying the manufacturer in a manner identified in the applicable design data; and</p> <p>.....</p> <p>GM 21A.804(a)(1) Identification of parts and appliances</p> <p>It is not the intent of 21A.804(a)(1) to introduce an obligation for a production organisation (manufacturer) to mark new parts or appliances with information which is not identified by the design approval holder. Therefore, the physical marking of parts and appliances is only required when established by the design approval (TC, STC, ETSO, repair, minor change) holder.</p> <p>For designs (TC, STC, ETSO, repair, change) approved after the date of entry into force of Regulation xxxx/2006 amending Regulation 1702/2003, the design approval holder is required to identify to the manufacturer how the marking in accordance with 21A.804(a)(1) should be done. This can be limited to identifying a marking field, possible depth and/or means etc. without prescribing the actual text or symbols to be used.</p>

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
28.	GM 21A.804	CAA-UK	<p>The introduction of this guidance material, whilst well intended, risks introducing ambiguity into the rule 21A.804(a), which is at present very clear and unambiguous in its intent. This would not help identification or traceability, and could result in illegal practices i.e markings not being in compliance with European law.</p> <p>21A.804 refers to marking being to the ‘applicable design data’, however there is no definition of what constitutes ‘applicable design data’ with respect to part marking in the CS design codes, indeed elsewhere in Part 21, Subpart B 21A.44(b) obliges the holder to “specify the marking in accordance with Subpart Q”. There is therefore a lack of prescription elsewhere to allow compliance to anything other than 21A.804.</p> <p>A part number must be sufficiently unique so as to ensure traceability to an individual part manufacturing source. Identical parts, but from different part manufacturers must always have part numbers unique to each manufacturer, but it needs to be proven, that this is always the case. Manufacturers should be encouraged to put as much identification onto each part as is physically possible. In the absence of other identifiers (such as a trademark etc), then reliance is wholly in configuration control documentation, with all its uncertainties.</p> <p>CAA supports the planned review of the rule 21A.804 to ensure it truly captures correct practise, and suggests this proposed guidance material GM 21A.804 should be withdrawn from the NPA whilst a proposal to amend the rule 21A.804 itself is prepared. Guidance material can then be drafted to complement the corrected rule, if necessary.</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> The proposed guidance material risks introducing uncertainty regarding interpretation of the rule.</p>	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>The reference to applicable design data is necessary to avoid that marking is introduced in a manner not agreed by the design approval holder. This is now introduced in the requirement itself in a way which should make the intent clearer. It is further emphasised in an improved GM. An addition to the amending regulation is necessary to avoid retroactive applicability.</p>	See above.

	Para	Comment provider	Comment/Justification	Response	Resulting text
29.	Many paragraphs : editorial comments	DGAC-F	<p>1 – Proposals “h” (21A.307), “l” (EASA Form 1) and “p” (EASA Form 52) are not consistent (“in condition” or “in a condition”). It is also noted that the wording “in condition for safe operation” appears in many other places (see in particular, in this NPA, 21A.183 (a)(2) and (b)(2), 21A.184 (a)(1)(ii) and (a)(2)(ii)). This should be checked and harmonised throughout Part 21.</p> <p>2 – EASA Form 1, block 9. The wording “N/A”, which is added, is not defined. Then, the meaning of “ETSO article N/A” should be explained. Could it be replaced by “not applicable to ETSO articles” ?</p> <p>3 – Part 21 refers to “Form 1”. We can find in many places in this NPA references to “Form One” (see in particular AMC N°2 to 21A.130 (b)). This should be corrected to be consistent with Part 21. A check of all GM and AMC to Part 21 could be made to ensure use of consistent wording.</p> <p>4 – Similarly, to be consistent with numbering of other forms, “Form four” should be “Form 4”.</p>	<p>1. Accepted for the proposals already in this NPA to harmonise the wording to “in a condition for safe operation”</p> <p>2. Noted. “ETSO article N/A” may not very clear. However this wording was agreed between authorities and industry and is considered an improvement to the current text.</p> <p>3. Accepted for the proposals already in this NPA.</p> <p>4. Accepted</p>	Various changes