


EASA	COMMENT RESPONSE DOCUMENT
	EASA PELOS No. ELOS-DVLA.0771-01 [Published on the 03-Mar-2010 and officially closed for comments on the 07-Apr-2010]

Commenter 1 :CAA UK – date 01-Apr-2010

Comment # 1

Page 1, Paragraph No: Title

Comment:

The title is misleading - 'Propeller [Disc] Clearance', is covered by CS-VLA 925, and is not the subject of CS-VLA 771.

Proposed Text (if applicable):

A better title would be for example 'Protection of Pilot and Controls from Propeller Blade Release'

EASA response:

EASA agrees:

The wording of the title is changed to “Pilot Compartment - Protection of Pilot and Controls from Propeller Blade Release”

Comment # 2

Page 1, Paragraph No: (b)(1)

Comment:

The ELOS is not clear, as the condition (b)(1) only seems to require assessment of "the structure above the pilot's/co-pilot's feet and yaw controls". The terminology "above" is confusing, as it would be expected that all of the pilot would be protected by suitable structure. In addition, what about the other 'aerodynamic controls', wherever they may be? Does this mean that the pilot's feet and yaw controls are not required to be protected?.

EASA response:**EASA partly agrees:**

The wording is correct, but the ELOS is written in a way suitable for the specific project only, as here the propeller is located above the fuselage and only yaw control is affected.

Nevertheless the wording is changed to be more general, so that the ELOS can be used directly for future programmes if needed. The protection is all about the pilot and not about the controls. The controls are only covered to that extent as they can hurt the pilot indirectly if hit by the propeller or parts of it, because the pilot is typically in close contact to the controls.

For the new wording see ELOS ELOS-DVLA.0771-01, Issue 1, dated 07-Jul-2010

Note:

When writing the EASA response, the responder should express first whether EASA agrees, partially agrees, or disagrees with the submitted comment /change proposal and should explain the grounds of the response.

[e.g. “we disagree. Vibration trend monitoring is successful in detecting cracked HPT seals, /... / and is the most practical way to prevent an unsafe condition due to cracked HPT seals. The AD remains unchanged.” or “we agree. We have added the aeroplane model to the applicability”]