

# **Response to comments on NPA-E-41**

## **1 - Justification of the NPA**

JAR-E should be used in conjunction with a defined version of JAR-1. The meaning of some engine requirements is based on a given understanding of the definition of some words. If such definitions are changed in JAR-1, then the engine requirements could be changed significantly (for example, this could be the case for the words “ fire resistant ” and “ fireproof ”). The purpose of proposal A1 is to identify the JAR-1 version which is appropriate for the interpretation of the considered JAR-E version.

The proposal A2 is changing one undefined word (“ substandard ”) by a more commonly used and more understandable word (“ non serviceable ”). The intent is not changed.

The proposal A3 corrects a cross reference error which was overlooked in NPA-E-25 which modified the numbering in JAR-E 740 (d).

The proposal A4 corrects an error made in JAR-E change 10 and reverts back to text of JAR-E change 9 (For 'Mass Air Flow', 288 and theta have been transposed).

With regard to application of paragraph 21.101 (b)(3) of amendment 2 of JAR-21, this NPA is considered to have no effect on the level of safety.

## **2 - Economic impact analysis**

It is expected that this change will have no effect on the design or certification of engines because it is only editorial in nature.

## **3 - Comments received during the circulation of the NPA**

Comments were received from the following organisations :

- Authorities of Austria, Denmark, Germany, Malta, United Kingdom and USA
- SBAC (UK), Turboméca

## **4 - Response to comments**

All commenters either accepted, or supported, or provided a “ no comment ” statement on the proposal.