

Comment Response Document

NPA 22E-68

After circulation of the NPA to the JSA and NPA scheme subscribers 3 comments were received:

Comments received

- ACG, Austria
- CAA, United Kingdom
- LBA, Germany

Review of comments

- Two commenters had no comments to offer. They agreed or accepted the proposal.
- One commenter suggested that the text of the proposed JAR 22.1153 does not provide any additional information for the designer and should therefore be deleted from this NPA. The comment was accepted by the group, as JAR 22.1923 stands in its own right.
- Another comment noted that there are now 3 different ways of expressing the same requirement; in JAR 22.1305(h), with the proposed amendment, JAR VLA1305(g) and JAR 23.1305(h). It was suggested that a future NPA should consider the need for standardisation between these codes. The group thought that JAR-22 requirements stand in their own right. We have different aircraft with different requirements. Any Authority could submit an NPA regarding this harmonisation proposal but we must be very careful in making changes in the wording.