


EASA	COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT
	<p align="center"><b>EASA Proposed Equivalent Safety Finding on CS-E 800 – Bird Strike and Ingestion</b>  <b>[Published on 12 March 2015 and officially closed for comments on 16 April 2015]</b></p>

**Commenter 1: The Boeing Company – Capt. Terry L. McVenes – 8 April 2015**

**Comment # 1**

We note that, in the “Statement of Issue” portion of the ESF, the text states:

*“The bird that was not ingested into the engine was not the one that is per CS-E 800 (d)(1)(v)(A) required to be aimed at the engine core primary flow path, but one of the six birds that per the same regulation are required to be evenly distributed over the engine face area.”*

We recommend that EASA review the applicant’s test and analysis to see if the bird that was not ingested was the bird aimed at the most critical exposed location on the first stage rotor blades.

The medium bird ingestion regulation requires that the second bird fired be aimed at the most critical location on the first stage rotor blades (first fired is at the core). If the bird for the test under question was in fact the second bird, then the analysis should account for the critical location rather than a random location on the engine face.

**EASA response:**

EASA agrees. Whilst the bird the ESF is related to, is not the second one aimed at the most critical location on the first stage rotor blades, the comment is valid and useful. When this ESF is applied, care will be taken in wording the ESF such, that this particularity is fully reflected therein.