Certification Memorandum

Installation of new parts and appliances without an EASA Form 1

EASA CM No.: CM-21.A-K-001 Issue 02 issued 24 May 2023

Regulatory requirement(s): 21.A.307

EASA Certification Memoranda clarify the European Aviation Safety Agency's general course of action on specific certification items. They are intended to provide guidance on a particular subject and, as non-binding material, may provide complementary information and guidance for compliance demonstration with current standards. Certification Memoranda are provided for information purposes only and must not be misconstrued as formally adopted Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) or as Guidance Material (GM). Certification Memoranda are not intended to introduce new certification requirements or to modify existing certification requirements and do not constitute any legal obligation.

EASA Certification Memoranda are living documents into which either additional criteria or additional issues can be incorporated as soon as a need is identified by EASA.

Log of issues

Issue	Issue date	Change description
01	21.06.2013	First issue.
02	13.06.2023	Updated based on the changes to point 21.A.307 introduced with Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699 amending and correcting Regulation (EU) No 748/2012

Table of Content

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose and scope

The purpose of this CM is to provide additional guidance on the derogations (b)(1)(2)(3) in point 21.A.307 of Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 that allows the installation of parts and appliances without an EASA Form 1. In particular the issue 2 of the CM is providing updated guidance, based on the changes introduced by Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699 (section 3.1 provides an overview of the changes).

1.2. References

It is intended that the following reference materials be used in conjunction with this Certification Memorandum:

Reference	Title	Code	Issue	Date
Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012	Implementing rules for the airworthiness and environmental certification of aircraft and related products, parts and appliances, as well as for the certification of design and production organisations	---	---	03/08/2012
Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699	Amending and correcting Regulation (EU) No 748/2012 as regards the instructions for continued airworthiness, the production of parts to be used during maintenance and the consideration of ageing aircraft aspects during certification	---	---	21/12/2020
Decision 2021/007/R	Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material to Part 21 (Issue 2, Amendment 12) and AMC-20 (Amendment 22)	---	---	28/05/2021
Opinion No 07/2019[1]	Installation of parts and appliances that are released without an EASA Form 1 or equivalent (RMT.0018)	---	---	17/12/2019

1.3. Abbreviations

ELA1 - ELA2	**E**uropean **L**ight **A**ircraft 1 - **E**uropean **L**ight **A**ircraft 2 [2].
CM	Certification Memorandum
ICA	Instructions for Continued Airworthiness
BASA	Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement
TIP	Technical Implementation Procedures
COTS	Commercial Off The Shelf

[1] This document provides the background of the change in the Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699.

[2] As defined in article 1 of Regulation (EU) No 748/2012

OEM	Original Equipment Manufacturer
IPC	Illustrated Parts Cataolgue
SB	Service Bulletin
AMM	Aircraf Maintenance Manual
AFM	Aircraft Flight Manual
FHA	Functional Hazard Assessment
LOI	Level of Involvement

2. Background

Point 21.A.307(a) defines that a new part or appliance is eligible for installation in a type-certified product when it is in a condition for safe operation, marked in accordance with Subpart Q and it is accompanied by an authorised release certificate (EASA Form 1)[3], certifying that the item was manufactured in conformity to approved design data.

Points 21.A.307(b)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) of Commission Regulation (EU) No 748/2012, as introduced by Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699 of 21 December 2020, provide derogations to point 21.A.307(a) for the installation of parts and appliances without an EASA Form 1 (to make the process more proportional when it comes to the installartion of parts and appliances with a low safety risk). For such parts, manufacturing in accordance with the approved design data needs still to be declared but without the need of an EASA Form 1 (see 21.A.307(c)).

AMC and GM to point 21.A.307 have been published through Decision 2021/007/R providing acceptable means of complaince and guidance material.

After the initial workshops and discussions with stakeholders, it emerged that some aspects needed further clarifications, therefore it is by means of this Certification Memorandum that EASA intend to provide additional guidance and interpretations for the implementation of this modified requirementEASA

3. Certification Policy

The additional guidance of this CM is provided according to the following structure:

- → Structure and additional explanations of the regulation and of the related AMC/GM
- → Who can use the derogation of point 21.A.307(b)(1)
- → Who can use the derogation of point 21.A.307(b)(2)
- → Who can use the derogation of point 21.A.307(b)(3)
- → Identification of parts not requiring a Form 1
- → Meaning of “negligible effect”
- → Specific verification activities to be conducted by the installer
- → Conformity, marking, manufacturing aspects
- → Impact on International agreement/arrangements
- → Environmental aspects

[3] Equivalent authorised release certificates are also acceptable as explained in AMC 1 M.A.501(a)(1), AMC1 145.A.42(a)(i) and AMC1 ML.A.501(a)(ii).

3.1. Structure and additional explanations of the new regulation and of the related AMC/GM;

Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/699 has modified point 21.A.307 in the following way:

1) Point 21.A.307(a) is unchanged and identifies the need of an EASA Form 1 for installation of parts. This is the normal scenario, but the next points in 21.A.307 address some derogations to this normal scenario (21.A.307(a)), which is the subject topic of this Certification Memorandum.
2) Former points 21.A.307 (b) and 21.A.307 (c) are modified to become 21.A.307 (b)(1) and 21.A.307 (b)(2), with minor changes to the text (more details in sections 3.2 and 0).
3) point 21.A.307 (b)(3) is introduced and states the following:

(b) By way of derogation from point (a) and provided that the conditions in point (c) are met, the following parts or appliances do not require an EASA Form 1 in order to be eligible for installation in a type-certified product:

(1)..

(2)..

(3) a part or appliance for which the consequences of a non-conformity with its approved design data has a negligible safety effect on the product and which is identified as such by the holder of the design approval in the instructions for continued airworthiness. In order to determine the safety effects of a non-conforming part or appliance, the design approval holder may establish in the instructions for continued airworthiness specific verification activities to be conducted by the installer of the part or appliance on the product;

As explained in section 2.2.2 of the Opinion No 07/2019, the intent of the derogation is to to provide industry with flexibility for the acceptance of parts and appliances with different production background for installation during maintenance, without decreasing the level of safety. This is achieved (Section 2.3.2 of Opinion No 07/2019) by allowing parts for which the consequences of a non conformity (identified as such by the holder of the design approval) has a negligible safety effect to be delivered for installation without a Form 1. It does not change the requirements for compliance demonstration. Furthermore, identification and conformity of those parts have still to be ensured. The “Specific verification activities” are addressed in chapter 3.4.4 of this document.

4) Point 21.A.307(b)(4), has been introduced and states the following:

(4) in the case of the embodiment of a standard change in accordance with point 21.A.90B or a standard repair in accordance with point 21.A.431B, a part or appliance, for which the consequences of a non-conformity with its design data have a negligible safety effect on the product, and which is identified as such in the certification specifications for standard changes and standard repairs issued in accordance with point (a)(2) of point 21.A.90B and point (a)(2) of point 21.A.431B. In order to determine the safety effects of a non-conforming part or appliance, specific verification activities to be conducted by the person that installs the part or appliance on the product may be established in the certification specifications referred to above;

The intent of this derogation is to provide the same possibility introduced by point (b)(3) also for parts belonging to a design approved through standard changes and repairs.

5) Point 21.A.307(b)(5), has been introduced and states the following:

(5) a part or appliance that is exempted from an airworthiness approval in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 965/2012;

The intent of this derogation is to exempt from the need of an EASA Form 1, those parts for which operational rules ((EU) No 965/2012) do not require an airworthiness approval according to EU regulations No 748/2012 and No 1321/2014.

6) Point 21.A.307(b)(6), has been introduced and states the following:

(6) a part or appliance that is an item of a higher assembly identified in points (b)(1) to (b)(5).

The intent of this derogation is to extend the provisions of the above provisions to parts which are part of a higher assembly. The principle is: if the assessment is done at higher level and shows that the assembly has negligible safety effect, then also at subassembly level the parts can be exempted from a Form 1.

7) Point 21.A.307(c) has been introduced and states the following:

(c) Parts and appliances listed in point (b) are eligible for installation in a type-certified product without being accompanied by an EASA Form 1, provided that the installer holds a document issued by the person or organisation that manufactured the part or appliance, which declares the name of the part or appliance, the part number, and the conformity of the part or appliance with its design data, and which contains the issuance date.

The intent of this requirement is to clarify that also for parts listed in point 21.A.307(b), a document declaring conformity to the design shall be provided. This document needs not be in the format of a Certificate of Conformity (further details in section 3.5).

3.2. Derogation referred to in point 21.A.307(b)(1) (standard parts)

The derogation in 21.A.307(b)(1) allow for standard parts to be installed without a Form 1 (this is unchanged from the former derogation of 21.a.307(b)). Conformity will need to be checked in accordance with 21.A.307(c) and marking requirements of subpart Q have to be met. The derogation can be used when the design approval holder introduces a standard part in their design, while for Sailplanes, some standard parts are already defined according to point 2 of AMC 21.A.303 (c).

3.3. Derogation referred to in point 21.A.307(b)(2) (owner accepted parts)

According to point 21.A.307(b)(2), parts and appliances of ELA1 or ELA2 aircraft can be accepted for installation without an EASA Form 1 only when they are:

i. not life limited, nor part of the primary structure, nor part of the flight controls;
ii. identified for installation in the specific aircraft;
iii. to be installed in an aircraft whose owner has verified compliance with the applicable conditions in (i) and (ii), and has accepted responsibility for this compliance;

Potential impact on safety due to the absence of production control in accordance with Part 21 Subpart F or G is mitigated by limiting the concept to non-safety critical parts and appliances (ref. sub point 21.A.307(b)(2)(i)).

This derogation can be used only by the aircraft owner (no action required from the design approval holder) who verifies compliance to this requirement and

- takes the responsibility to use this derogation,
- ensures that the part is marked in accordance with Subpart Q
- ensures that the conformity requirements in point 21.A.307(c) are met.

The following additional guidance is provided:

(i) Not life-limited, nor part of the primary structure, nor part of the flight controls.

The information that is necessary to determine if these criteria are applicable is not always readily available or transposed into data that is available to the owner (E.g. primary structure is not always clearly defined). An owner should consult the documentation published by the desig approval holder or by the competent

Authority related to a certain design approval (e.g. IPC, AMM, SB, STC, TCDS, etc.) when making such assessment. Life-limited parts are the parts that are normally listed in the Airworthiness Limitations Section of the AMM (Or in some cases AFM). When in doubt, the owner can also consult the design approval holder.

(ii) Identified for installation in the specific aircraft.

The part or appliance shall be identifed in the ICA published by the design approval holder (e.g. IPC, Maintenance Manual, etc.). Furthermore the aircraft owner has to record the decision to accept the part or appliance without an EASA Form 1 for installation in their aircraft. An example of such record is provided below (**Figure 1**), which shows that the owner of a specific aircraft (Type and registration) has signed for the acceptance for installation (Specific for each accepted part), and is aware of the responsibilities (Part-21 reference is included).

Records of owner accepted parts

This maintenance record lists parts used during maintenance and records the aircraft owner acceptance of parts in accordance with point 21.a.307(b)(2)

a/c Reg:	Type:	Work Ref. No
Date:		

Part Number	Description	Qty	Part release ref. (document attesting conformity as per point 21.a.307(c))	A/c owner signature for part acceptance (ref. 21.a.307(b)(2))
AB-1234-01	Part A...	1	Conformity document 12345	*Owner signature*
CD-5678-01	Part B...	1	Conformity document 678910	*Owner signature*

I undersigned <aircraft owner> have verified compliance with points 21.a.307(b)(2)(i), 21.a.307(b)(2)(ii) for the parts in the above table for which a form 1 has not been released and I accept the related responsibility for such compliance.

Signed: *Owner signature*

***Figure 1** – example of records of owner accepted parts*

(iii) to be installed in an aircraft whose owner has verified compliance with the applicable conditions in (i) and (ii), and has accepted responsibility for this compliance;

Section 3.5 provides information on how conformity can be established.

Note: It is important to highlight that the acceptance of parts and appliances without an EASA Form 1 by no means is a way of accepting changes to the applicable design.

3.4. Derogation referred to in point 21.A.307(b)(3)

3.4.1. Who can use the derogation

The derogation in 21.A.307(b)(3) can only be used by the holders of the concerned design approvals, since only they have the necessary knowledge to assess whether the consequences of a non-conformity with its approved design data have a negligible safety effect on the product. The use of the provision detailed in

21.A.307(b)(3) is a derogation from 21.A.307(a), i.e. be accompanied of an EASA Form 1. As such, the use of this derogation provision is not mandatory, but rather an optional choice of the Design Approval Holder.

It is not acceptable that a third party uses the derogation since they are not the holder of the approval of that design (it is also highlighted that stand-alone changes to ICA as defined in 21.A.90C can be introduced only by the holder of the design approval for which those instructions have been established).

DAH should be careful to prevent the unproper use of parts without an EASA Form 1 in an hypothetical case where the same part is used in two approved designs and only for one of them the DAH wants to take advantage of the derogation of point 21.A.307(b)(3). One way to prevent misuse of the parts is to assign different part numbers to the same part, depending on whether the derogation is used or not. In accordance with 21.A.307 (b)(3), the holder of the design approval (i.e. holder of a type-certificate, restricted type-certificate, supplemental type-certificate, design change or repair design approval) may assess whether a non-conformity of the part would have a negligible safety effect on the product where the part would be installed. In this respect, the holder of an ETSO authorisation cannot assess the effect of a potential non-conformity of the article at product level and therefore the holder of an ETSO authorisation cannot determine that the article can benefit from the derogation referred to in point 21.A.307(b)(3).

3.4.2. Meaning of "negligible effect"

GM1 21.A.307(b)(3) and (b)(4) Meaning of 'negligible safety effect' provides guidance on the meaning of 'negligible safety effect', differentiating between ELA1/ELA2 aircraft and all other aircraft.

It is expected that the design approval holder using the derogation in 21.A.307(b)(3) performs an assessment to justify that the effect of a non conformity is negligible. Such assessment should be supported with data and information from compliance documents and additional evaluation where required (it is recommended also that the certification programme should inform that the derogation is used). It should start from listing the non conformities that the design approval holder envisages as potentially present on the part and their consequences in relation with possible failure modes and associated hazards. Such assessment should be sufficiently detailed depending on the complexity of the part and its installation. It is expected in general that candidate parts for the derogation in 21.A.307(b)(3) are parts not bearing safety functions and not providing safety related information (for example COTS) and for which the extent and the complexity of the related compliance demonstration is typically reduced

The results of such assessment should be recorded. One way could be a table listing the selected parts, the related potential hazards, failures and effects on safety margins (partial/total loss of the function, effects on other a/c systems, misleading information, failure of the part, fire hazards, separation from the a/c, etc.) as a result of a non conformity.

The 'negligible safety effect' assessment may depend, among other factors, on the location of the part in the aircraft. The same part could be contained in systems with different criticality and its non conformity may have an effect on safety when installed in a particular system and may have a negligible safety effect when installed in another system.

When assessing the consequences of a non-conformity of parts which are installed with redundancy to meet the required probability targets, the assessment should not be limited to the consequence of the failure of the single part but should consider the overall effect of the non conformity on the aircraft safety.

For example, a needed valve whose loss of function is linked to a hazardous failure condition

- if a design solution features two parallel valves instead of one valve based on the (too high) failure probability of a single valve,
- the loss of one out of the two valves is consequently linked to a minor failure condition only
- the consequences of a non-conformity of such one valve need to be considered as an appreciable effect on the safety of the aircraft since the defined probability target would not be ensured. The design solution of two instead of one valve need to be considered as a package. Differently if a valve

provides a function whose failure has no safety effect, then it could be a candidate for the derogation according to point 21.A.307(b)(3).

When assessing the impact on the safety margins, attention should also be given to parts installed outside the aircraft (antennas, equipment, etc.) and their related consequences in the case of separation (to the aircraft itself, to people on ground and to other aircraft). Conservative assumptions could be made in assessing the reduction of the safety margin as a result of a non-conformity and additional verification may be identified for the installer (for example: check that material is of a certain standard/type, etc.).

The assessment should be documented as part of the data supporting the writing of the ICA and their compliance with the related requirements.

In appendix A an example of table that collects the results of the assessment is provided. It is important to highlight though that the assessment required in the frame of this derogation starts from the hazards as a result from a non conformity.

The use of the derogation does not impact the classification of a change (minor/major) required by point 21.a.91.

3.4.3. Identification of parts not requiring an EASA Form 1

Parts for which the derogation in 21.A.307(b)(3) is used have to be identified as such in the ICA. Ideally they would also be identified as such in the installation instructions (e.g. SB / Modification Bulletin / Repair instructions), to easily transmit this information to the installer.

It is not required that the part number of a part is changed only as a consequence of the fact that the part does not require an EASA Form 1. On the other hand, the design approval holder may decide to change the part number of the part not requiring an EASA Form 1, if this provides clearer information (e.g. for traceability purposes, for example if the same part could be classified differently in different aircraft locations). For example, if the same part is installed in several locations on an approved design, and only in some locations (due to different impact on safety) the part is assessed to have a negligible effect on safety, then the approval holder may decide in the ICA to differentiate the part number of the part depending on the location.

In this case the design approval holder should also consider the advantage of not requiring an EASA form 1 and compare it with the disadvantages (due to handling, logistics, storaging, etc) derived from having two different part numbers for the same part design and the added complexity of introducing different part numbers for the same part design. Mitigations may be introduced to prevent mistakes by the manufacturing and maintenance organizations.

3.4.4. Specific verification activities to be conducted by the installer

Point 21.A.307(b)(3) states that *"In order to determine the safety effects of a non-conforming part or appliance, the design approval holder may establish in the instructions for continued airworthiness specific verification activities to be conducted by the installer of the part or appliance on the product".*

This text provides the possibility for the design approval holder to define conformity verifications to be performed by the installer when installing the part. When performing the assessement of the safety effect required by point 21.A.307(b)(3), the design approval holder may consider those design aspects that were relevant in the compliance demonstration of a certain part and identify specific checks that the installer can perform to ensure that the part is in compliance with those design aspects/targets. Such verification activities should be of simple nature and stay inside the responsibility and competence of the approved maintenance organization/person installing the part. It is not the intent of this text to give to the installer the responsibility to complete or perform design compliance demonstration activities, like for example performing compliance tests or making safety assessment. Verification activities should be purely aimed to verify the acceptability of the part for installation by, for example, confirming assumptions made by the DAH when declaring the negligible safety effect of the part. The full responsibility of the assessment required in point 21.A.307(b)(3) lies with the design approval holder and the nature of these verification activities (where found suitable) is

the same as the ones performed in production when stating the conformity of the part against the design data (without expecting a full conformity assessment). These verification activities should be simple enough to be accomplished directly by the installer.

Some examples are provided:

- Check of technical data from the data sheet of the equipment (dimensions, mass, max current/capacity, software version, hardware revision number, etc.);
- Availability of test certificates, with specification of the type of tests and standard where relevant;
- Presence of design features that were identified as relevant in the compliance demonstration. For example if a commercial part has a small lithium battery and it was identified that a containment protection with specific characteristic (material, thickness, etc) was present and was used to address the hazard of a thermal runaway, the installer could be asked to verify the presence of that containment (and related characteristics).

3.5. Conformity, marking, manufacturing aspects

An EASA Form 1 is a an authorised release certificate that certifies that a part was manufactured in conformity with approved design data and is in a condition for safe operation. It is released by a POA holder or a competent Autority.

For all the parts for which the DAH makes use of one of the derogations described in 21.A.307(b) the rule requires in lieu of an EASA Form 1, a document (for instance a certificate of conformity) issued by the manufacturer to properly identify the part and trace it to the original manufacturer (refer to the new 21.A.307(c) for details). In respect of parts referred in 21.A.307 (b), this requirement is fulfilled with a 'dated delivery-note' from the manufacturer stating the name and the part-number."For parts obtained through a part's dealer, the dealer can add a scanned copy of the dated delivery note (or equivalent) from the manufacturer on the shipment of the parts. This also applies to 'owner-accepted-parts'.

Point 21.A.307(c) requires that the manufacturer of the part declares its conformity, also for parts in point 21.A.307(b)(3) for which no arrangement between the DAH and the manufacturing organisation, similarly to the one referred to in 21.A.122/21.A.133, is foreseen. A typical case under point 21.A.307(b)(3) is a commercial part that the DAH has incorporated into its approved design and for which the manufacturer of the part issues such conformity declaration together with each part produced. Such referred document will also permit traceability to the original manufacturer.

By definition, parts which could be involved in an occurrence that could lead to an unsafe condition as per 21.A.3A(b) are not eligible for the use of a derogation as per point 21.A.307(b)(3). Should there be nonetheless such an occurrence, the Design Approval Holder remains responsible for the collection, investigation and reporting as per 21.A.3A(b).

Regulation (EU) 2021/699 is not intended to change the way an aircraft POA holder controls the conformity of parts supplied by other organisations. When an aircraft TCH elects to use the provisions set up in point 21.A.307(b)(3), such parts do not need to be accompanied with an EASA Form 1 neither during the first installation in a new aircraft (the aircraft POA holder has always to establish procedures acceptable to its Competent Authority for the acceptance of parts coming from external parties), nor when a new part is delivered to a maintenance organisation for installation as a spare part (as 21.A.307(b)(3) applies to such part in this case). Note: when the conditions set up in 21.A.307(b) are met, an EASA Form 1 is not required. However, it is not forbidden to issue an EASA Form 1 in this case, provided the production organisation complies with Part 21 requirements (in particular, the production organisation should be granted with the appropriate scope and should ensure the proper coordination with the design approval holder).
Finally, it should be noted that the "EPA" marking does not apply to parts meeting the conditions set up in 21.A.307(b)(3) and (c), thanks to the updated point 21.A.804(a)(3), which excludes the need for "EPA" marking when making use of the derogations set up in 21.A.307(b).

3.6. Impact on International Agreements

In coordination with EASA and the Importing Authority, an EU Design Approval Holder may assess whether a part fulfilling the conditions set up in 21.A.307(b)(3) and (c), would be eligible for simplified acceptance requirements (if available) by the Importing Authority. It is important to note that the acceptance of such parts without EASA Form 1 cannot be guaranteed and is left to the sovereign decision of the importing country.

Similarly, please note that Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreements (BASAs) concluded between the EU and other countries, together with their Technical Implementation Procedures (TIPs) require the use of an Authorized Release Certificate (i.e., an EASA Form 1 for parts manufactured in the EU) when exporting to the other Party. As such, the provisions set up in 21.A.307(b)(3) and (b)(4) **cannot currently be used** until the respective TIPs are updated to include a relaxation, despite some Bilateral Partners having similar relaxations in place (eg, the handling of commercial parts in the US in AC 21-45).

Vice-versa, parts fulfilling the conditions set up in 21.A.307(b)(3) and (c) can be imported from outside the EU without the need for an Authorised Release Certificate, except for parts coming from countries where a BASA with the EU is in place for the reason explained in the previous paragraph.

3.7. Environmental aspects

When performing the assessment required in point 21.A.307 (b)(3), environmental effects need not to be taken into account explicitly. However the design approval holder should pay attention that in those cases where the consequences of a non conformity have an impact on the environmental characteristics of the aircraft, impact on safety is also appropriately taken into account.

3.8. Who this Certification Memorandum affects

This certification memorandum affects

- Aircraft owners of ELA aircraft intending to use the derogation in point 21.a.307(b)(2)
- Design approval holders intending to use the derogation of point 21.A.307(b)(3) and identifying in the ICA parts that can be installed without an EASA Form 1;
- Installers who will install aeronautical parts for which the above derogations are used.

Appendix A – Example for the assessment of the consequences of the non conformity[4]

		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3[5]	Step 4	
Criteria for negligible effects	**Examples of potential consequences of unidntified non-conformity[6]**	**Results of the assessment**	**Part without form 1?**	**Additional mitigations that can be added at design level**	**Additional verification that can be performed by the installer**	**Part without form 1 (after steps 3 and 4)**
For ELA1 and ELA2 aircraft, at worst: (1) slightly reduces the operational or functional certified capabilities of the aircraft or its safety margins; (2) causes some physical discomfort to its occupants; and (3) slightly increases the workload of the flight crew; and	Hazards due to interference (Electro magnetic or other) with other items.	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the function provided by the part being lost or misleading (fails to work as intended => ie no hazard - no credit)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards to other parts or the aircraft in case of failure, mailfunction of the part (Assess all kinds of failures and if mitigations may play a role)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to failure of internal protections (electric, hydraulic, etc.). Are external protections available?	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the suitability of the material not being ensured (fire protection, wire diameter, strength, etc.)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the reliability of the part not being ensured	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Reduction of safety margins	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*

[4] The tables provide examples to collect the results of the assessment to justify the derogation in point 21.a.307(b)(3). The DAH may use the table as a starting point to prepare their means to record such assessment, but they should make sure that the proposed record is adequate for the scope of the proposed design.
[5] Depening on the assessment, and in case of hazards of limited scope, design mitigations and/or verification by the installer could be identified to ensure that the consequence of the non conformity has a negligible safety effect. In this case such mitigations/verifications may be defined in the next columns.
[6] The list is aimed to provide examples and it is not comprehensive. Furthermore there are some examples which may overlap depending on the type of parts. Criteria should be to be defined by the DAH depending on their design.

		Step 1	Step 2	Step 3[7]	Step 4	
Criteria for negligible effects	**Examples of potential consequences of unidentified non-conformity[8]**	**Results of the assessment**	**Part without form 1?**	**Additional mitigations that can be added at design level**	**Additional verification that can be performed by the installer**	**Part without form 1 (after steps 3 and 4)**
for non ELA1 and non ELA2 aircraft: (1) has no effect on the operational or functional certified capabilities of the aircraft, or on its safety margins; (2) causes no physical discomfort to the occupants; and (3) has no effect on the flight crew.	Hazards due to interference (Electro magnetic or other) with other items.	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the function provided by the part being lost or misleading (fails to work as intended => ie no hazard - no credit)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards to other parts or the aircraft in case of failure, mailfunction of the part (Assess all kinds of failures and if mitigations may play a role)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to failure of internal protections (electric, hydraulic, etc.). Are external protections available?	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the suitability of the material not being ensured (fire protection, wire diameter, strength, etc.)	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Hazards due to the reliability of the part not being ensured	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*
	Reduction of safety margins	*[Provide rationale]*	*[Yes/no]*			*[Yes/no]*

[7] Depening on the assessment, and in case of hazards of limited scope, design mitigations and/or verification by the installer could be identified to ensure that the consequence of the non conformity has a negligible safety effect. In this case such mitigations/verifications may be defined in the next columns.

[8] The list is aimed to provide examples and it is not comprehensive. Furthermore there are some examples which may overlap depending on the type of parts. Criteria should be to be defined by the DAH depending on their design.