

Comment				Comment summary	Suggested resolution	From the commenter point of view a modification of the published text is*: -Not requested; -Recommended; -Requested	EASA comment disposition	EASA response
NR	Name of the organisation commenting	Section, table, figure	Page					
1	AIRBUS	ESF para 3 c)	P1 (PDF p3)	Quote: c) Applicable limitations must be introduced in the AFM <i>if the design</i> of the common oxygen source is not able to provide the minimum oxygen quantity for the scenarios applicable in paragraph a) above. UNQUOTE Subpara 3 c) seems to be in contradiction to subpara 3 a) - which shortfall in design EASA would accept to be covered as limitation issued in the AFM?	Please revise or clarify the content of Compensating Factor 3 c)	Recommended	Accepted	Thank you for your comment, EASA acknowledges that the content should be clarified and has revised the text of compensating factors 3a) and 3 c) accordingly.
2	AIRBUS	Asso. Imper. Material Sect. 1	PDF p4	Quote: [...], and the fire suppression procedure of a Class E cargo compartment (CS 25.857(e)). UNQUOTE Airbus comment: CS 25.857(e) does not provide any fire suppression procedure.(Just the provision.)	Airbus request: Please review the intention of this part of the sentence. Alternative: Change the reference to: AMC 25.857 (4) d, Quote: [...] Shutting off the ventilating airflow to or within the compartment controls a fire in a Class E compartment.[...] UNQUOTE	Requested	Accepted	Thank you for your comment. EASA has revised the text of the associated Interpretative Material accordingly to clarify the intention of this sentence.

* Please complete this column using the drop-down list