



DEFENCE AVIATION SAFETY AUTHORITY

**COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT
NPA FOR DCP 2022-032 - AMENDMENTS TO DASR 21 NEW
MDOA PRIVILEGES BASED ON EMAR 21 EDITION 2.0**

INTRODUCTION

1. **General.** This Comment Response Document (CRD) outlines DASA's agreed regulation position and finalises the public consultation process in respect of Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) for DCP 2022-032. DASA will consider arguments opposing the views expressed in this CRD only in exceptional circumstances.
2. **Background.** DASA released NPA for DCP 2022-032 Amendments to DASR 21 New MDOA privileges Based on EMAR 21 Edition 2.0 for regulated community comment on 21 Dec 22. The period for public comment on the proposals contained in this NPA closed 3 Feb 23.

ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS

General

3. DASA received two responses to NPA for DCP 2022-032. Both responses to the NPA stated that the 'The proposal is acceptable'. In addition, further internal feedback was provided which resulted in minor changes.
4. All comments received external and internal were assessed by DASA and a formal position was agreed, some proposed improvements were shared by DASA and corresponding changes have been made. A summary of the comments raised along with the DASA's responses are included at Annex A. The resulting text changes are summarised in Annex B.

AUTHORITY

5. The content of this Summary of Responses has been reviewed and is authorised.

DAN GROSSE

EL2

Director – Directorate of Initial Airworthiness

Defence Aviation Safety Authority

Tel: (03) 9200 0756

Annex:

- A. Summary of responses
- B. Resulting text changes



CRD NPA FOR DCP 2022-032

ANNEX A TO SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
N/A	Full NPA	Respondent 1 (R1)	The proposal is acceptable but would be improved if the following changes were made.	Noted. See responses to individual comments below (LSN 1 – 4)
N/A	Full NPA	Respondent 2 (R2)	The proposal is acceptable but would be improved if the following changes were made.	Noted. See responses to individual comments below (LSN 5 - 48)
1.	AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Paragraph 1(c)	R1	<p>Suggest rewording para 1(c) in a similar style to para 1(a). E.g. “major repairs to products or APUs for which the MDOA holder executes the obligations of the type-certificate holder, as described by DASR 21.A.44.”</p> <p>As proposed, sub-paragraph (c) does not flow on well from the paragraph stem.</p>	Agreed. On review Para 1(c) has been identified as a duplicate function of para 1(b) and as such deleted. The intent of the Australian unique green text regarding MDOA holders executing the obligations of the type-certificate holder is met by the intent of para 1(b)

¹ Please note: community feedback, explanation or suggested change has been shortened here for brevity.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
2.	<p>AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Paragraph 1.1</p> <p>AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Figure 2</p> <p>AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Paragraph 3</p> <p>AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Paragraph 4</p>	R1	<p>Clarify if paragraph 1.1 also applies to MDOA holders who execute type-certificate holder obligations.</p> <p>Clarify if the Figure 2 right-most pathway would also apply to MDOA holders who execute type-certificate holder obligations.</p> <p>Clarify if paragraph 3 also applies to MDOA holders who execute type-certificate holder obligations.</p> <p>Clarify within the first bullet that paragraph 4 also does not apply to MDOA holders who execute type-certificate holder obligations.</p> <p>AMC1 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) paragraph 1(c) green text adds a third category of applicability for the 21.A.263(c)(5) privilege (i.e. MDOA holders who execute the obligations of the TC holder) compared to the baseline EMAR.</p> <p>The applicability of many paragraphs within the proposed AMC1 and AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) is defined by whether the MDOA holder is also the TC holder.</p> <p>Further clarity within AMC1 and AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) regarding applicability to MDOA holders who execute the obligations of the TC holder would be beneficial.</p>	<p>Agreed. As per the comments LS1 the Australian unique text has now been deleted, MDOA holders executing the obligations of the type-certificate holder is met by the intent of para 1(b). As such, they are required to meet the criteria 3(a), (b) and (c) of AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) Scope and criteria.</p>
3.	<p>AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) – Paragraph 4</p>	R1	<p>Delete duplicated text.</p> <p>Paragraph 4 has been duplicated in NPA document.</p>	<p>Agreed. Typographic error. Duplicated text deleted.</p>

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
4.	21.A.263	R1	<p>Provide further information to the regulated community about the process for updating existing MDOA certificates (will DASA do this, or do MDOA holders need to initiate?) and expectations regarding timeframes to update expositions, noting that the NPA states “the new regulations will become effective immediately upon the DASR release”.</p> <p>Notable changes to currently awarded privileges include removal of 21.A.263(c)(3) and (4), and changes to the wording and applicability of 21.A.263(c)(5). The NPA provides no information regarding responsibility for updates to existing MDOA certificates, and expectations regarding updates to expositions following release of the proposed changes.</p>	<p>Noted. A transition period of 6 months will allow MDOA holders to update references within their Design Organisation Exposition (Handbook) and existing certificates. DASA will provide assistance as required within the transition timeframe. Further guidance will be provided in the DASR Release note and via future DASA engagement.</p>
5.	Multiple	R2	<p>There needs to be a clear delineation between the responsibilities of the TCH and the MDO. Some of the regulations and AMC incorrectly call out the TCH performing approval when in fact only a MDO can approve. There are also instances of text stating that the MDO performs some TCH obligations – this is not correct as it is the TCH services organisation who performs those tasks, reaching into the MDO for help where required.</p> <p>The term ‘approval’ may be the confusing element as it looks to be used for both MDO Approval and regulatory approvals made by an MTCH who is also the DoSA.</p>	<p>Noted. However, responsibilities of the MTCH and MDO are not affected by this DCP.</p> <p>This talks about privileges that can be awarded to either. The regulations allow a MTCH, with relevant privileges, to perform approvals under strictly specified conditions.</p> <p>Depending on the type of approval and the circumstances, some are allowed to be performed by either the MTCH and/or a MDO when certain criteria are met.</p> <p>This change specifically introduces the ability of the MTC holders and MDOA holders to carry out 'approvals' which previously could only be carried out by DASA. The term 'approval' is still appropriate as the same function is being performed when the same requirements are being met. The difference is the organisation is doing it under their own privilege as opposed to DASA doing it as part of their Authority role. Hence the changes to 21.A.97.</p>

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
6.	Multiple	R2	Some of the AMC is quite unwieldy and difficult to follow and is written in a way which suggests that it is regulation rather than AMC. It also places many caveats on privileges that need more clarity in their definition/boundary. In some cases the range of applicable caveats may render the regulation unviable.	Noted. The large majority of AMC is a direct extract from the EMAR. The intent is to align with EMAR wherever practicable. The AMCs are standards adopted by the Authority to illustrate means to establish compliance for the Implementing Rules. Guidance and education can be developed and/or delivered if areas of the changes require further clarification.
7.	Multiple	R2	Terminology is inconsistent – modification, repair, change to TC, change to STC, change to type design, design changes to type design, change to design. Understand this may be directly lifted from EMAR but there is opportunity to be consistent. Suggestion: Simplify as a mod, repair or tech data. A TC or STC is only the output mechanism.	Not supported. Generally, EMAR (and EASA) are explicit and deliberate in identifying specific applicability. The terminology is to remain aligned to EMAR to the extent practicable. If there are specific cases of inconsistency, request this be individually highlighted by clause as to allow further investigation by DASA.
8.	21.A.97(a)(2)	R2	Approved design organisation – is this civil, military, both, DASA approved, NAA approved? If this is specific to an approved design organisation under DASA then consistency of terms would be beneficial. 21.A.263(c)(1) and (8) as well as 21.A.263(d) only allow for a (design) organisation to approve major changes to a type cert. This is rather confusing that the holder of a type cert, that may not be an approved design organisation, can approve major changes to type certificate. Suggestion: action of classification and approval can only come from an approved design organisation or the Authority.	Noted. Clarification: where the clause states "within the scope of its privileges provided for in (1) and (8) of DASR 21.A.263(c) or (2) of DASR 21.A.263(d), as recorded in the terms of approval." This means an MDOA or a MTC holder with a privilege and terms of approval issued under DASRs. Further 21.A.97(a)(2) does not mandate approval for any MTC holder to classify and approve any major change. It specifically limits it to MTC holders under 21.A.263(d)(2), as referenced in the regulation clause and AMC. This privilege can only be enlivened through application and DASA award, for which will only allow approval of an already approved modification from a recognised NAA directly applicable to a Defence type that is ostensibly equivalent to the civilian type and CRE.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
9.	AMC 21.A.97 (Para 3, 4 and 5), AMC 21.A.115.d	R2	Regulation is clear so AMC may not be required. Suggestion: Reword to make clear that alternatives providing the same level of assurance are acceptable or make it a regulation.	Not supported. Refer to comments in LSN 6. Further, Alternate Means of Compliance (AltMoC) are able to be proposed by an applicant for any regulation. Recommend reading Factsheet – Establishing Compliance with DASR.
10.	21.A.115(b)(2)	R2	Clarification: This could be read two ways. It's not a change to a type certificate, it is a supplement to the type cert. A change to a type cert requires the original TC and TCDS to change whereas a STC does not.	Not supported. The change that is being approved under an STC still needs to comply with the TCB established under 21.A.101.
11.	21.A.233 (third paragraph)	R2	Contradicts 21.A.263, which now allows for MDOs to classify and approve Major if their scope allows. Suggestion: Remove 'minor'	Noted. Typographical error in NPA, sub-clauses a) and b) now included. 21.A.233 discusses 'eligibility as an applicant'. 21.A.233(a) provides the 'demonstration of capability' references related to STC's, major changes or major repairs. 21.A.233(b) covers the eligibility for approval of minor changes or minor repair design.
12.	AMC 21.A.234	R2	Suggestion: Change Exposition to Handbook	Agreed. Incorporated.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
13.	GM to 21.A.235	R2	Specific question on application. Does this extend sub-contractors being a part of the MDO design support network and thereby sub-contractor satisfying the DASR 21 requirements as the default position?	Noted. Not relevant to this NPA. Please contact the relevant DASA DIA-DOA team desk officer for further advice.
14.	GM1 to DASR 21.A.239(a) Para 2.2.2	R2	Not sure of difference between second and third statements. Both require compliance to the regulation?	Agreed. Omission in text. The third point has been rectified to state "to demonstrate this compliance to the Authority."
15.	GM1 to DASR 21.A.239(a) Para 3.1.2 b	R2	Is an authorised representative actually the CVE?	Noted. No change from existing DASR. The CVE has a specific function distinct from the HoD in signing the declaration of compliance. While the HoD's 'authorised representative' may also be a CVE, this isn't the same function as the CVE role.
16.	GM1 to DASR 21.A.239(a) Para 3.1.5.a	R2	This is outside the scope of a MDO unless there is a safety issue or non-compliance issue with the instruction. Any in-service experience is via the CAMO and MTCH. Suggestion: Clarify 'establish a system to collect in-service experience to be used for the improvement of the instructions'	Not supported. This clause effectively improves the guidance material to improve maintenance and operating instructions that a MDO produces.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
17.	GM1 to DASR 21.A.239(a) Para 3.1.5.b	R2	These are MTCH requirements, not MDO. It should be contextualised for Australian Defence to state that all of the maintenance and ops instructions are made available to the MTCH for distribution.	Not supported. This is extant DASR and no change has been made. It has always been on an MDO to make sure any instructions it produces are delivered to operators. This may be achieved in the Defence context via the MTCH, and the MTCH has an obligation to make sure that operators have a full set of ICA and manuals (irrespective of which design organisation the ICA and manuals come from). Hence DASRs are not written to specify individual circumstances and will instead remain flexible.
18.	AMC 21.A.239(b)(4)	R2	This para is unclear given that an approval is required from a MTC instead of an MDO.	Noted. It is only applicable to MSTC applicants who are also MTC holders and MDOA holders.
19.	21.A.243(a)(1)	R2	Flight tests may be conducted for functional performance testing of mission systems that have no airworthiness impact – such flight tests do not require a flight test manual / handbook. This should be made clear in the GM/AMC Suggestion: This should be limited to for the purpose of airworthiness compliance showing.	Noted. Not within scope of this DCP. DASA will be covering remaining elements of flight test in EMAR 2.0 Edition in subsequent DCP's.
20.	AMC1 21.A.243(a)	R2	Handbook not Exposition?	Agreed. Title has been amended/updated to "Handbook (Design Organisation Exposition) requirements"

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
21.	AMC1 21.A.243(a) (Para 14)	R2	This is not a MDO responsibility. This is a TCH responsibility. Suggested Change: Remove	Not supported. No change from existing DASR. See comments in LSN 5.
22.	GM 21.A.249 (Para 3)	R2	In the civil system, this normally reverts back to the airworthiness authority. It might be worth having that as the initial action with an option of the MDO continuing subject to a review.	Noted. GM states what 'may' be able to happen, and does not limit alternative scenarios.
23.	21.A.263(d)	R2	Term approved organisation is confusing. Is this an approved DESIGN organisation – not sure what other organisations would have a design assurance system leading to an approval.	Partially Agreed. Additional green text “or holder of a MTC approved organisation” included. Further, this is meant to be read in conjunction with Australian unique green text AMC1 21.A.263(d)(1) Declaration of applicability for a holder of a type certificate (AUS) and AMC1 21.A.263(d)(2) Approval for a holder of a type certificate (AUS). The MTC approved organisation privilege requires application and DASA award as discussed in LSN 8.
24.	AMC2 21.A.263(c)(1) and (2)	R2	There is a lot of similarity between this AMC and the previous AMC. Simpler and less AMC might be beneficial to readers. Looking at it more holistically, classification should be one simple process irrespective if it is a change to TC, STC, TSO or a repair – the classification criteria should be common and those criteria that are not applicable simply get assigned as N/A. Classification should be one of the first steps and signed by a person in the MDO authorised to do so (typically the CVE).	Noted. While we agree the AMC are very similar, they are directly from EMAR and does not fit 'exceptional circumstance' to warrant a change.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
25.	GM 21.A.263(c)(7)) B Category 4 Note	R2	Suggestion: Also include airworthiness requirements?	Noted. Extant DASR, not in scope for this DCP. Will be considered under future DCP involving a green text review.
26.	AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) (Scope and Criteria) Section 2	R2	How will DASA view (or define) 'similarity' and 'repetitiveness' in the case of platforms built on foreign TCs – which heavily rely on recognition for approval of subsequent changes to these TCs.	Noted. Similarity and repetitiveness are defined in para 3. This will be explored individually through the application process with the MDOA holder.
27.	AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) (Para 2.1.e)	R2	We process a considerable number of changes made mandatory by Foreign AD (e.g. every ALS variation and lots of the AFM changes are included in this), but very few made mandatory by DASA AD which I would read this to mean. Is the intent to exclude changes made mandatory by a Foreign NMAA (but not a DASA AD).	Noted. There is no explicit statement that excludes changes made mandatory by a Foreign NMAA. This would be considered during the application process.
28.	AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5),(8) and (9) Para2.1.i and Para 2.i.j	R2	Would like to seek more specific confirmation of intent here? I am assuming, basically, we are looking at excluding eligibility of things where an updated System Safety Assessments (SSAs) would say that a new Catastrophic Failure Condition has been introduced, or there would otherwise be some form of exacerbation of and existing Catastrophic Failure Condition. If so, intent makes sense, but making this judgment may not always be straightforward.	Noted. Paragraph 2.1 defines Criteria for limitations on eligibility and proper context would be required as part of the application process. T The intent is that any change to such parts or systems is deemed to be of such importance that it makes them ineligible to be approved under the privilege of point 21.A.263(c)(8)(9) without DASA being involved.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
29.	AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) 2.1.j	R2	The way this point is worded almost reads like all Engine changes are hazardous and therefore excluded? Assuming the intent similar to 2.1(i), in that changes to a part or system of an Engine, where single failure of which may have a hazardous effect are excluded – but other changes to an Engine are okay. Can we confirm?	Noted. See comment in LSN 28.
30.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9)	R2	Overall, this AMC is confusing in some sections about what it is trying to achieve. There is mixing of applying to DASA for major approval privilege and exercising of a major approval privilege.	Noted. The intent of this AMC "describes to process to be followed in order to obtain and use the privilege". AMC directly from EMAR and does not fit 'exceptional circumstance' to warrant a change.
31.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) first para	R2	Suggestion: Include AMC 21.A.97(4)	Not supported. AMC 21.A.97(4) talks about MDOAs using the privilege at 21.A.263(c)(8) - which is 'certain major changes' which is already covered both by the text of the first para and the reference in this para to point 2. of AMC 1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9).
32.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) note bottom page C- 38	R2	What is third-country validation? Why would validation be sought post approval if the change has already been certified as airworthy? Are we mixing airworthiness compliance with functional performance here? If approval is from another MAA why would DASA need to be involved?	Agree. Note deleted, it is not anticipated in the Australian context that an MDOA holder applies for a third-country validation. This will be covered through recognition processes.
33.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) section 3.	R2	Inconsistent with second para. The first para is missing "MDOA" as it is present in the second para or is the second para incorrect?	Noted. Both are correct, MDOA holder in the second paragraph is not to be read as separate to the TC, STC or AUSMTSOA holders (who would theoretically also hold an MDOA, but do not always in our context). Section 4 applies to MDOA holders who do not hold the TC/STC/AUSMTSOA.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
34.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) section 3.	R2	TC holders can't approve a major repair design as they are not a design organisation. Typically the TCH engages the services of a design organisation to provide the approval	Noted. While this is true in our Defence context, the regulations are written in such a way that this is permissible where a TC holder is a design organisation (which would normally be the case under EASA/EMAR). But it does not mean all TC holders can do this, or that they can do this without a privilege, and they would not be able to gain a privilege without demonstrated capability and award of an MDOA.
35.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) (Para 3b)	R2	Why need provide to Authority for review. This contradicts para 1 above which states that "If all the above conditions are met, the privilege may be used and the approval of major repairs, major changes or STCs, as applicable, can be obtained by the MDOA holder without the Authority's involvement."	Noted. This does not suggest Authority involvement but highlights documents are to be made available to Authority for the purposes of ongoing oversight.
36.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) 4.2	R2	Same as line 34.	Noted. This para only talks about which forms the MDOA should use for approval under privilege and where to get them from. It does not talk of authority approval.
37.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9)	R2	Differences between section 3 and 4 are limited – could combine and have the differences identified.	Not supported. Suggestion does not fit 'exceptional circumstance' to warrant a change.
38.	AMC 21.A.263(d)(1)	R2	Suggestion: Replace derivate with derivative	Not supported. Suggestion does not fit 'exceptional circumstance' to warrant a change.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
39.	AMC 21.A.263(d)(1) 2 a	R2	Last words or para – access to data relating to the modification. Requiring access to Type Design required a significant amount of data that will not be applicable to the modification. Suggestion: Change ‘type design’ to ‘modification’	Not supported. If an MDOA is seeking an ongoing privilege, the basis involves access to relevant type design data, not data related to a specific modification, as the privilege is issued before a specific modification approval is being sought.
40.	AMC1 21.A.263(d)(1)	R2	The regulation refers to an MDOA but the AMC refers to a MTCH.	Noted. AMC1 21.A.263(d)(1) has been specifically added to all the MTCH organisation to seek this privilege where it aligns with the requirements.
41.	AMC 21.A.263(d)(2)	R2	Rather than approval of the entire change, it may be better to simply seek 21J approval of the aspects which require further demonstration of compliance, with the remainder of the change leveraging off prior demonstration.	Not supported. The purpose of this regulation is to allow approval of an already approved mod/ICA/manual. If it requires further demonstration of compliance, it can't be approved under this regulation and needs to go back through the normal approval process for a minor/major change (which may leverage prior demonstration of compliance to a large extent). The third para within 1. makes this clear - "In case the applicability to the specific definition of the derivative needs further demonstration of compliance (ie the assessment of “no impact” is not confirmed) the applicant will apply the relevant procedures of its military design assurance system for getting approval of the change".
42.	AMC 21.A.263(d)(2) 2 e	R2	Suggestion: Add in ‘and provide’ after privilege to	Not supported. Suggestion does not fit ‘exceptional circumstance’ to warrant a change from EMAR.

LS N	NPA Reference	Originator	Community Feedback, Explanation or Suggested Change ¹	DASA Response
43.	AMC1 21.A.263(d)(2)	R2	Regulation provides for approval by an MDOA whereas AMC provides it for a MTCH. If a design change then only the MDOA can provide the approval which may be under contract to the MTCH. Having multiple organisations approving changes could result in configuration issues unknown to other parties.	Not supported. This allows the MTCH to carry out approval where NO design work is required, hence DASA is allowing the MTCH this privilege in very limited circumstances. In these specific cases, applying to DASA adds no value This is already the case (DASA and multiple MDOAs can approve changes), this add the MTCH for a limited set of changes. The MTCH will still hold all the major changes/STCs and is responsible for being aware of the configuration.
44.	21.A.263(d)	Internal Review	Approved organisation as referenced “d) For a military product derived from a civil type certified product, the holder of a MDOA or approved organisation shall be entitled...” may introduce ambiguity. Suggest this reflect the term used in the accompanying AMC.	Agreed. Insert green text in 21.A.263(d) “holder of a MTC approved organisation”
45.	AMC1 21.A.263(d)(1)	Internal Review	Changes are required to improve readability of AMC.	Agreed. Replace “confirm” with “assess” in Para 2a). Insert “a” before modification in Para 2a). Replace “consumption” with “applicability” in Para 2b) iii.
46.	AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9)	Internal Review	There is no Section 2.2, this appears to be a mistake in the EMAR 2.0 content.	Agreed. Remove “Section 2.2” from Paragraph 4.1

ANNEX B TO CRD NPA FOR DCP 2022-032

RESULTING TEXT CHANGES

NPA Reference	Description	NPA	Final
GM1 to DASR 21.A.239(a) – Design assurance system	Insert Para 2.2 (third point) “to the Authority”	- to demonstrate this compliance	- to demonstrate this compliance to the Authority.
AMC1 21.A.243(a) - Handbook (Design Organisation Exposition) requirements	Title change-insert “Handbook” and brackets.	<u>AMC1 21.A.243(a) - Design Organisation Exposition requirements</u>	<u>AMC1 21.A.243(a) - Handbook (Design Organisation Exposition) requirements</u>
21.A.263 – Privileges	Insert green text in 21.A.263(d) “holder of a MTC”	d) For a military product derived from a civil type certified product, the holder of a MDOA or approved organisation shall be entitled...	d) For a military product derived from a civil type certified product, the holder of a MDOA or holder of a MTC approved organisation shall be entitled...
AMC1 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) Scope and criteria	Remove Para 1(c)	(c) An MDOA holder executing the obligations of a type-certificate holder on their behalf, as described by DASR 21.A.44 - Obligations of the holder, shall also be entitled to seek an Authority privilege to include the approval of designs for 'MAJOR' repairs.	(c) An MDOA holder executing the obligations of a type-certificate holder on their behalf, as described by DASR 21.A.44 - Obligations of the holder, shall also be entitled to seek an Authority privilege to include the approval of designs for 'MAJOR' repairs.

NPA Reference	Description	NPA	Final
<p>AMC2 to 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9) Procedure for the approval of a major repair, a major change to a type certificate (TC), or a supplemental type certificate (STC) by a military design organisation approval (MDOA) holder under their privileges</p>	<p>Remove "NOTE" at the end of Paragraph 1 Remove "Section 2.2" from Paragraph 4.1</p>	<p>Note: If a MDOA holder applies for a third-country validation after having approved a modification under its MDOA holder privilege, the Authority may review some of the compliance demonstration data in order to support the validation activity.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>4.1 Eligibility of the proposed major repair, major change or STC</p> <p>The MDOA holder should assess the proposed major repair, major change or STC against the 'list associated with the privilege' and the 'justification document' of 'certain major repairs', 'certain major changes' or 'certain supplemental type certificates' in order to determine whether the criteria of AMC1 to DASR 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9), Section 2.2, are met.</p>	<p>Note: If a MDOA holder applies for a third-country validation after having approved a modification under its MDOA holder privilege, the Authority may review some of the compliance demonstration data in order to support the validation activity.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>4.1 Eligibility of the proposed major repair, major change or STC</p> <p>The MDOA holder should assess the proposed major repair, major change or STC against the 'list associated with the privilege' and the 'justification document' of 'certain major repairs', 'certain major changes' or 'certain supplemental type certificates' in order to determine whether the criteria of AMC1 to DASR 21.A.263(c)(5), (8) and (9), Section 2.2, are met.</p>

NPA Reference	Description	NPA	Final
<p>AMC1 21.A.263(d)(1) Declaration of applicability for a holder of a type certificate (AUS)</p>	<p>Replace “confirm” with “assess” in Para 2a). Insert “a” before modification in Para 2a). Replace “consumption” with “applicability” in Para 2b) iii. Lower case in the beginning of sentences 2b) ii, iii and iv. Insert semi-colon and full stop.</p>	<p>a) Agree with the authority the procedures to confirm within the scope of its organisational capability per DASR 21.A.14(c), modification, or an instruction for continuing airworthiness, or a modification to the flight manual or a modification to the maintenance manual being already approved by a recognized NAA. Such procedures shall include obtaining the ICA and manuals related to the change and addressing any caveats or conditions of the NAA recognition.</p> <p>b) Develop its own internal procedure addressing the following points as agreed with the Authority:</p> <p>i. confirm the certification is within the scope, conditions and caveats specific to DASA Recognition of the certifying NAA;</p> <p>ii. Identification of any CRE deltas requiring assessment</p> <p>iii. confirm no CRE delta impacts consumption of the NAA approved product</p> <p>iii. Document to formalize the declaration of applicability and conditions</p> <p>iv. Records</p>	<p>a) Agree with the authority the procedures to confirm assess within the scope of its organisational capability per DASR 21.A.14(c), a modification, or an instruction for continuing airworthiness, or a modification to the flight manual or a modification to the maintenance manual being already approved by a recognized NAA. Such procedures shall include obtaining the ICA and manuals related to the change and addressing any caveats or conditions of the NAA recognition.</p> <p>b) Develop its own internal procedure addressing the following points as agreed with the Authority:</p> <p>i. confirm the certification is within the scope, conditions and caveats specific to DASA Recognition of the certifying NAA;</p> <p>ii. Identification of any CRE deltas requiring assessment</p> <p>iii. confirm no CRE delta impacts consumption applicability of the NAA approved product;</p> <p>iii. Document to formalize the declaration of applicability and conditions;</p> <p>iv. Records</p>