



**European Aviation Safety Agency  
Rulemaking Directorate**

**EXPLANATORY NOTE**

**AMC-20 Amendment 6**

Executive Director Decision 2010/003/R amends Executive Director Decision No. 2003/12/RM of 05 November 2003 on general acceptable means of compliance for airworthiness of products, parts and appliances (« AMC-20 »).

This Amendment 6 of AMC-20 incorporates the output from the following EASA rulemaking task:

<b>Rulemaking Task No.</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>NPA No.</b>
MDM.034	Composites	2009-06

This NPA has been subject to consultation in accordance with Article 52 of the Basic Regulation<sup>1</sup> and Article 5(3) and 6 of the rulemaking procedure established by the Management Board<sup>2</sup>. The Agency has addressed and responded to the comments received on the NPA. The responses are contained in a Comment-Response Document (CRD) which has been produced for the NPA and which is available on the Agency's website.

Detailed changes incorporated in the NPA are summarised in the following pages for ease of reference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 of 20 February 2008 on common rules in the field of civil aviation and establishing a European Aviation Safety Agency, and repealing Council Directive 91/670/EEC, Regulation (EC) No 1592/2002 and Directive 2004/36/EC (OJ L 79, 19.03.2008, p. 1). Regulation as last amended by Regulation (EC) No 1108/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 (OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 51).

<sup>2</sup> Management Board Decision concerning the procedure to be applied by the Agency for the issuing of opinions, certification specifications and guidance material ("Rulemaking Procedure"), EASA MB 08-2007, 13.06.2007.



**European Aviation Safety Agency  
Rulemaking Directorate**

**EXPLANATORY NOTE**

**TITLE:** AMC-20 Amendment 6

**Rulemaking Task No.:** MDM.034

**Title:** Composites

**NPA No.:** NPA 2009-06

**CRD No.:** CRD 2009-06

**LIST OF PARAGRAPHS AFFECTED**

- Cover + Contents
- New AMC 20-29 added

In response to CRD 2009-06, the Agency received several substantive reactions, which are reproduced below together with the Agency's responses:

Commentor/ Reference	Reaction	EASA Response
Airbus	<p>Airbus regrets that the comment # 9 has not been accepted, keeping reference to metal-to-metal bonding in an advisory material devoted to composite structures, for the following reason:</p> <p>Even if many aspects discussed in the advisory material are applicable to metal-to-metal bonding, the particular issues of metal-to-metal bonding have not been comprehensively addressed (surface preparation, chemical ageing, corrosion aspects, Quality Control using traveler specimens in a systematic way, ...). This could lead to a misunderstanding that the AMC 20-29 addresses sufficiently metal-to-metal bonding, when this is not the case.</p>	<p><b>Partially Accepted.</b></p> <p>The Agency would ideally wish to develop separate guidance for bonded structure in the future. However, until resources are available, the Agency considers that there is still value in identifying the common issues at a generic level, e.g. process dependence, etc. The Agency will make the amendment below to increase awareness of the need to consider further issues for this subject.</p> <p>Change text of 'Purpose' to be:</p> <p><i>'This AMC provides an acceptable means, but not the only means, for airworthiness certification of composite aircraft structure. Guidance information is also presented on the closely related design, manufacturing and maintenance aspects. This AMC primarily addresses carbon and glass fibre reinforced plastic structures, although many aspects of this document are also applicable to other forms of structures e.g. metal bonded structure, wooden structure, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Note: When applying this guidance to other forms of structure, additional design considerations may be necessary and other appropriate references should also be consulted.'</i></p>
Eurocopter	<p><b>Crashworthiness survivability for rotorcraft -</b> Response to comment 32:</p> <p>The differences between the CSs regarding evacuation are not perceived by Eurocopter as minor as they seem to be considered by EASA. An implicit reference to certification specifications for large aeroplanes during the discussion of the certification programme for a rotorcraft would be inappropriate.</p>	<p><b>Accepted.</b></p> <p>The Agency will amend 11(a)(4)(b) to read:</p> <p><i>'(b) At least the minimum number of emergency egress paths must remain following a survivable crash'.</i></p>