STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MOC 2512 (SORA M2 MEDIUM ROBUSTNESS)

Hereby, I, Bruce Cheung, *accountable manager of DJI,* declare under my sole responsibility that:

The UAS model, hardware and software configuration as defined in table 2, when being installed with the kit having model, hardware and software configuration as defined in Table 3, is compliant with the EASA MOC Light-UAS.2512-01 / SORA M2 medium robustness, issue 1 of 06.07.2023[1]. The installation of the kit does not require any modification to the UAS.

	Model [2]	HW configuration identifier [2]	SW configuration identifier [2]
UAS			
UA	Matrice 400	N/A	17.02.50.07
CMU[3]	RC Plus 2	N/A	01.64.08.18/17.2.5.23

Table 2: UAS designation

	Model [2]	HW configuration identifier[2]	SW configuration identifier [2]
Mitigation means	AP100	N/A	00.01.29.01
Ground segment of the mitigation means	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air segment of the mitigation means	AP100	N/A	00.01.29.01

Table 3: KIT designation

Additional information

The mitigation means (check only if applicable):

☒ needs activation and the activation relays on external systems / services not part of the UAS (e.g. LTE, GNSS);

☐ is also used to demonstrate compliance with the EASA MOC Light-UAS.2511-01 and I have declared compliance with EASA MOC Light-UAS.2511-01 with the dedicated form;

☐ is also used to demonstrate compliance with the EASA MOC Light-UAS.2511-01 and I have a DVR which demonstrate this compliance.

I moreover declare that:

1. The mitigation means complies with the following example of chapter 3 of the MoC (tick as appropriate):

1 referred herein below as "the MoC".
2 Not all fields of Tables 1, 2 and 3 should be filled, please refer to the published SAIL III MoC to OSO#2 for explanations.
3 Control and monitoring unit (ground segment of the UAS)

An agency of the European Union

TE.CERT.00075-002© European Union Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA-Internet/Intranet.

☐ Example 1

☒ Example 2

☐ Example 3

☐ Example 4

➔ If the mitigation means does not comply with one of the examples, please refer to your National competent authority.

2. The mitigation means requires activation:

   ☒ YES, automatic activation

   ☒ YES, manual activation

   ☐ NO

   If YES has been ticked, I declare that the probability of inadvertent activation of the mitigation means has been substantiated as applicable for the referenced example.

3. The tests prescribed by the example referenced in point 1 have been executed with positive outcome, an appropriate root cause analysis of failed tests, if applicable, has been performed, and all tests have been repeated after having fixed the cause identified by the root cause analysis.

4. Flight manual (referred also as Manufacturer's instructions), including maintenance instructions for the UAS and/or kit, as applicable, have been developed and will be made available to UAS operators. They provide all information and necessary limitations to appropriately operate and maintain the mitigation means, including (and may not be limited to):

   - maximum operational envelope of the UAS (speed, height, ...) such that the mitigation is properly actuated. This may encompass also the distance from CMU and antenna in case the actuation requires any signal transmission from ground;
   - weather restrictions.

Management of configuration changes

What herein reported applies to the design organization of the:

- UAS designer (case A of this form) regarding HW / SW changes to the UAS configuration or
- Kit designer (case B of this form), regarding changes to the Kit configuration

applied after the issuance of this form.

The design organization of my company has a configuration control system in place and, for each configuration change (HW and / or SW), will [4]:

[4] A change may group one or more SW and HW changes

An agency of the European Union

TE.CERT.00075-002© European Union Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA-Internet/Intranet.

(1) Define the model and the configuration identifier(s) to which the configuration change is applied
(2) Define the new configuration after the application of the configuration change
    a. Change the model whenever the configuration change has an appreciable effect on the conduction of SORA by affecting any of the parameters in Annex B5 or when, due to the design change, a change of the flight manual is necessary to preserve operational safety
(3) Define the configuration change: whether it affects the UA and/or the CMU, or the Kit, whether it relates to HW and/or SW, what is the reason / objective of the configuration change
(4) Determine if the change may potentially impact the compliance with the MoC to SORA M2 MEDIUM subject of this declaration (yes/no)
    a. In this determination, and particularly for SW changes, consider the possibility that such changes may inadvertently influence SW functions beyond those subject to change.
(5) If the answer to (4) is yes, recheck compliance witn the MoC.
(6) Complement, update and produce the documents which provide the evidence of compliance, re-issuing the affected documents in a new version. Such new version must be clearly linked with the HW and SW configuration identifiers after the change.
(7) Keep a record of all the elements produced for points 1 to 6 above in the company's internal configuration control system

If the mitigation is activated with RF transmission from ground, the tests prescribed by the MoC will be repeated when the change of configuration affects radio frequency bands utilized and/ or maximum operational distance for activation of the mitigation

I will issue a new statement of compliance (SoC) referred to the new model in case of change of model,

I will provide to known operators of the product, without undue delay, information regarding unsafe conditions and recommendations on adoption of changes aimed at addressing unsafe conditions (e.g. identified SW errors which may lead to unsafe operation).

If I authorize the operator of the product to implement a change, I will provide the authorizations to operators in written and I will record it in the internal configuration control system.

All the documentation, including the configuration control system and appropriate management of changes will be made available to the competent authority for audit.

I am aware that several product harmonisation legislations may apply to the UAS or to the kit when placed on the EU market. For instance the Radio Equipment Directive 2014/53/EU, Low Voltage Directive 2014/35/EU, Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive 2014/30/EU, Regulation 2023/1230/EU - machinery | Safety and health at work EU-OSHA (europa.eu) , RoHS Directive 2011/65/EU, etc.

It is my responsibility to identify applicable legislations and requirements. Once conformity to all applicable requirements has been demonstrated, I will draw up an EU declaration of conformity and affix the CE marking on their product.

Evidence:

[5] The list includes the main parameters affecting the SORA conduction and, potentially, the operational authorization. The design organization may further change the model whenever, for any reason (e.g. commercial), it considers such change appropriate.

An agency of the European Union

TE.CERT.00075-002© European Union Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA-Internet/Intranet.

The documentation identified in the referenced example has been developed according to table 4 and will be made available if requested by the competent authority.

Evidence required	Document Title and version of the document[6] containing the evidence	Chapter of the document where the evidence can be found
Example #1, #2 #3: Description of the mitigation and of the involved systems as required by 2.1 of selected example Example #4: Description of the UAS as required by 2.1 of example #4.	DJI AP100 Parachute User Manual	Chapter 1
Example #1, #2, #3: Evidence for the reduction of ground impact effects as required by 2.2 of selected example. Example #4: evidence of determination of terminal velocity by drop test or calculation, as required by example #4	AP100 Parachute Compliance report	Chapter 2
Example #1, #2, #3: Evidence that the mitigation means works with sufficient reliability in the event of a loss of control, as required by 2.3 of selected example N/A for example #4	AP100 Parachute Compliance report	Chapter 3
Evidence that the mitigation means does not introduces additional risk to third parties, as required by 2.4 of selected example N/A for example #4.	AP100 Parachute Compliance report	Chapter 3
Flight Manual (dedicated document)	DJI AP100 Parachute User Manual	All
Maintenance instructions (dedicated document)	DJI AP100 Parachute User Manual	Chapter 5
Pre-Flight check procedures (dedicated document)	DJI AP100 Parachute User Manual	Chapter 4.1

Table 4: supporting evidence demonstrating compliance

Further evidence may be requested by the competent authority for oversight purposes.

2026.0713
Date, place,

Bruce Cheung
Signature of the accountable manager

[6] To establish compliance, please follow for each item of the table the indications of the selected example. Where a dedicated document is required, this is specified. If not specified, the applicant may opt to address the required evidence in one or more documents.

An agency of the European Union

TE.CERT.00075-002© European Union Aviation Safety Agency. All rights reserved. ISO9001 Certified.
Proprietary document. Copies are not controlled. Confirm revision status through the EASA-Internet/Intranet.