



**EUROPEAN AVIATION SAFETY AGENCY**



## **Operational Evaluation Board Report**

**Dassault Aviation MF50, F50EX,  
MF900, F900C, F900EX**

**Revision 1**

**23 October 2012**

**European Aviation Safety Agency  
Postfach 10 12 53  
D-50452 Köln  
Germany**

## Contents

Contents .....	2
Operational Evaluation Board, Revision Record .....	3
Dassault Falcon 50/900 OEB Composition .....	4
Acronyms.....	5
Executive Summary .....	7
1.Manufacturer Application.....	7
2.Evaluation .....	7
3.OEB Recommendations.....	8
Operation Evaluation Report – FCL/OPS Subgroup.....	9
1. Falcon 50/900 “catch-up” process .....	9
1.1 Purpose and Applicability.....	9
1.2 Pilot Type Rating Requirements .....	9
1.3 Master Common Requirements .....	10
1.4 Master Differences requirements tables.....	10
1.5 Operator Differences Requirements .....	11
1.6 Specifications for Training.....	11
1.7 Checking .....	11
1.8 Currency.....	11
1.9 OPS Recommendations .....	12
2. Noise Abatement Departure Procedure.....	12
2.1 Legal requirements for NADP Procedures .....	12
2.2 General Description of the NADP .....	12
2.3 The Evaluation Process .....	12
2.4 Training Areas of Special Emphasis .....	13
2.5 Specification for Training .....	13
2.6 Currency.....	14
2.7 Training Commonality credits .....	14
2.8 Applicability to Specific Airports .....	14
3. Steep Approach Landing Procedure.....	14
3.1 General Description of the Steep Approach.....	14
3.2 The Operational Suitability Evaluation Process.....	15
3.3 EU-OPS Requirements for Steep Approach Procedures .....	15
3.4 Dassault Aviation References.....	15
3.5 Specifications for Training.....	15
3.6 Recent Experience / Currency .....	16
3.7 Training Credit.....	17
3.8 Period of Validity of Competence.....	17
3.9 Checking Requirements.....	17
Attachment 1 Falcon 50 and Falcon 900 Full Type Rating Footprint .....	18
Attachment 2 London City Airport / Other Airport .....	20

# Dassault Aviation Falcon 50/900

## Operational Evaluation Board (OEB)

Captain Thierry Bouchez  
OEB Chairman  
DGAC

Captain Frank Van de Broek  
OEB Coordinator, Operational Suitability - Fixed Wing - Section  
Experts Department, EASA Certification Directorate

Captain Herbert Meyer  
Section Manager, Operational Suitability - Fixed Wing -  
Experts Department, EASA Certification Directorate

### Revision Record

Rev. No.	Content	Date
First Issue	F50EX	1 November 2011
	MF50	1 November 2011
	MF900	28 June 2012
	F900C	29 June 2012
	F900EX Steep Approach Procedure & NADP	5 January 2009
Draft Rev 1	Catch-up process, merging of MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX OEB reports	17 September 2012
Revision 1	No changes to draft revision 1	23 October 2012

## Dassault Falcon F50EX OEB Team Composition

Name	Capacity	Task
Jean BARIL <sup>1)</sup>	EASA	OEB Coordinator
Thierry BOUCHEZ <sup>1) 2) 3)</sup>	EASA	OEB Chairman
Poul JENSEN <sup>1)</sup>	EASA	OEB Team Member
Herbert MEYER <sup>2) 3)</sup>	EASA	OEB Section Manager
Poul RASMUSSEN <sup>1)</sup>	EASA	OEB Section Manager
Philippe RAUL <sup>1)</sup>	EASA	OEB Chairman
Frank VAN DE BROEK <sup>2) 3)</sup>	EASA	OEB Coordinator

- 1) Initial Noise Abatement Departure Procedure evaluation  
 2) Steep Approach Landing Procedure evaluation  
 3) Catch-up Process

Note on references and reference texts:

Where references are made to requirements and where extracts of reference texts are provided, these are at the amendment state at the date of publication of the report. Readers should take note that it is impractical to update these references to take account of subsequent amendments to the source documents.

**Acronyms**

AC .....	Advisory Circular
AFM.....	Airplane Flight Manual
AFCS .....	Automatic Flight Control System
AMC.....	Acceptable Means of Compliance
AOC.....	Air Operator Certificate
AP.....	Autopilot
AT.....	Auto throttle
ATO .....	Approved Training Organisation
CPD .....	Common Procedures Document for conducting Operational Evaluation Boards, dated 10 June 2004
DC .....	Display Controller
DGAC .....	Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (French Civil Aviation Authority)
EFIS.....	Electronic Flight Instrument System
CAS .....	Crew Alerting System
EU-OPS.....	Commission Regulation (EC) No 859/2008 of 20 August 2008 amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 as regards common technical requirements and administrative procedures applicable to commercial transportation by aeroplane.
FAA.....	Federal Aviation Administration
FBS.....	Fixed Base Simulator
FFS.....	Full flight Simulator
FGS .....	Flight Guidance System
FMS .....	Flight Management System
FSB.....	Flight Standardization Board
FSTD .....	Flight Simulation Training Device
FTO .....	Flight Training Organisation
GPWS.....	Ground Proximity Warning System
IEM .....	Interpretative and Explanatory Material
IRS .....	Inertial Reference System
JAA.....	Joint Aviation Authority
MDU .....	Multi-Function Display Units
MDR .....	Master Difference Requirements
(M)MEL.....	(Master) Minimum Equipment List
NADP.....	Noise Abatement Departure Procedure
ND .....	Navigation Display
ODR.....	Operator Differences Requirements
OEB .....	Operational Evaluation Board

PF ..... Pilot Flying  
PDU ..... Primary Display Unit  
PNF ..... Pilot Non Flying  
SOP ..... Standard Operating Procedure  
TCAS ..... Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System  
TRTO ..... Type Rating Training Organisation  
VGS ..... Visual Guidance System  
VNAV ..... Vertical Navigation  
WOW ..... Weight on Wheels

## **Executive Summary**

### **1. Manufacturer Application**

Dassault Aviation made an official request to EASA for an OEB of the Noise Abatement Departure Procedure (NADP) for the Mystère Falcon 50 and Falcon 50EX in March 2011. Similarly, an NADP evaluation together with an evaluation of the Steep Approach Landing Procedure was requested for the Mystère Falcon 900, Falcon 900C and Falcon 900EX.

In April 2012, Dassault Aviation requested a catch-up process for the MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX mentioned above. This evaluation concentrated on the pilot training requirements only, and no other subjects (such as MMEL, Cabin Crew, etc.) were considered. No additional authorities were involved.

### **2. Evaluation**

#### **2.1 Noise Abatement Departure Procedure**

The OEB team evaluated the proposed NADP in an FSTD and assessed the proposed pilot training requirements.

The evaluation was performed on a Mystère Falcon 50 Full Flight Simulator (FFS) for the MF50. Due to similarities between the aeroplane types and the commonalities of the associated NADP procedures, the conclusions of the evaluation made on the Mystère Falcon 50 are also valid for the Falcon 50EX, Mystère Falcon 900 and the Falcon 900C.

For the evaluation of the NADP for F900EX a Falcon 900EX Primus 2000 FFS was used.

#### **2.2 Steep Approach Landing Procedure**

Operational Suitability Evaluations of MF900, F900C and F900EX Steep Approach Procedures were performed using Full Flight Simulators. No flight testing in the aeroplane was deemed necessary by the EASA OEB.

#### **2.3 Catch-up process**

As no OEB report was previously available for the Falcon 50/900 series, this evaluation was performed as a “catch-up” process.

The evaluation was performed in compliance with the applicable Terms of Reference, corresponding complementary procedures, the JOEB/OEB Handbook and the CPD. The following methods were used:

- Review of the FAA Flight Standardization Board (FSB) Report,
- Analysis of NAA approved Falcon 50 and Falcon 900 Type Rating Training Programme (Falcon Training Centre),
- Analysis of NAA approved Falcon 50/900 Differences Training Programme (Flight Safety International),
- Review of aircraft flight manual (AFM) and associated supplements.

### 3. OEB Recommendations

#### 3.1 Noise Abatement Departure Procedure

Thrust reduction height (400 feet AGL) can be applied by operators as an Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) to meet EU-OPS 1.235 provided the provisions of this report are complied with.

Based upon the substantiations provided by Dassault Aviation and the simulator trials undertaken by the OEB, the EASA has determined that a thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL during a close-in Noise Abatement Departure Procedure is safe and acceptable.

Prior to operating the Falcon 50/900 on a close-in NADP with a thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL, the EASA OEB recommends adherence to this report.

#### 3.2 Steep Approach Landing Procedure

The EASA OEB found that MF900, F900C and F900EX are operationally suitable for steep approach landing operations, using associated Operating Manual (MF900 and F900C) or CODDE2 (F900EX) procedures provided by Dassault Aviation.

The EASA OEB has determined that the conduct of steep approach landing operations requires no higher piloting skill level than that of normal 3° approaches. However, the EASA OEB requires flight training, including briefing (no formal academic training, i.e. no classroom training), for competency in conducting steep approach landing operations.

Prior to performing Steep Approach Landing Procedures, the EASA OEB recommends adherence to this report.

#### 3.3 Catch-up process

This report specifies the EASA minimum requirements for the Initial Type Rating Training Course and Differences Training Course, for checking and for currency for the Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX aeroplanes, which are recommended for approval by the EASA member states.

The OEB recommends the same licence endorsement “**Falcon 50/900**” for Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX aeroplanes variants.



Captain Herbert Meyer

Section Manager, Operational Suitability - Fixed Wing -  
Experts Department, EASA Certification Directorate

## Operational Evaluation Report - FCL/OPS Subgroup

### 1. Falcon 50/900 “catch-up” process

#### 1.1 Purpose and Applicability

This report:

- defines the Type Rating assigned to the Dassault Aviation MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX models;
- proposes Master Common Requirements (MCR);
- describes Master Differences Requirements (MDR) for crews requiring differences training;
- makes recommendations for (initial and) difference training;
- makes recommendations for checking; and
- makes recommendations for currency.

#### 1.2 Pilot Type Rating requirements

In reference to JAR FCL 1 Subpart F / Part-FCL Subpart F and to the OEB evaluation procedure, the same Type Rating and, consequently the same Licence Endorsement may be assigned to the Dassault MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and standard F900EX models. The following licence endorsement should be assigned: “**Falcon 50/900**”.

The following table reflects the summarized EASA Class and Type Ratings List and Endorsement List (Aeroplanes) (Table 8) of all airplane variants evaluations contained in this report:

1 Manufacturer	2 Aeroplanes		3	4 Licence Endorsement
	Model	Name		
Dassault		Mystère Falcon 50	(D)	Falcon50/900
		Falcon 50EX		
		Mystère Falcon 900		
		Falcon 900C		
		Falcon 900EX		

Note: Falcon 900EX aircraft equipped with the EASy cockpit have a different Type Rating and Licence endorsement.

### 1.3 Master Common Requirements

MCRs are requirements common for all Dassault Aviation 50/900s.

#### 1.3.1 Aircraft Approach Categories

With reference to EU-OPS Appendix 2 to 1.430(c) the approach categories are as follows:

Aircraft	Category
MF50	C
F50EX	
MF900	
F900C	
F900EX	

**1.3.2** The normal “final landing flap setting” is “Flaps 40 + Slats” for F900 Series and “Flaps 48 + Slats” for F50 Series.

**1.3.3** Training and checking applicable to F50 and F900 aircraft requires demonstration of “no flap” approaches. Completion of a demonstration in any F50/F900 variant suffices for any other variant.

#### 1.4 Master Differences Requirements tables

Master Difference Requirements for the Falcon 50/900 aircraft are shown in the table below. Definitions of the various levels for Training/ Checking/ Currency are the ones from the Common Procedures Document (CPD).

Aeroplane Type Rating Falcon 50/900		FROM AEROPLANE				
		900EX	MF900/F900C	MF50	MF50 EFIS/EIED	50EX
TO AEROPLANE	900EX	-	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>	C/C/C		C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>
	MF900/F900C	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>	-	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>		C/C/C
	MF50	C/C/C	C/C/B	-	C/C/C	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>
	MF50 EFIS/EIED			C/C/C	-	
	50EX	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>	C/C/C C/C/B <sup>1)</sup>		-

<sup>1)</sup> C/C/B is applicable if both aircraft have the same FMS.

## **1.5 Operator Differences Requirements Tables**

Reserved

## **1.6 Specifications for Training**

### **1.6.1 Initial Pilot Training Course – Pilot Type Rating Training Course**

The Initial Pilot Type Rating course analysed by the OEB (Attachment 1), fulfils the requirements of JAR-FCL-AMC 1.261 (AMC1 FCL.725(a)). The course does not cover special operations (such as Steep Approach Procedure, Noise Abatement Departure Procedure).

### **1.6.2 Differences Pilot Type Rating Training Course**

Operators flying more than one variant of the Falcon 50/900 series must have differences training programs meeting criteria specified in the MDR.

Note: If one variant is equipped with EFIS/EIED (Engine Indicating Electronic Display) level C Training / Checking / Currency is required (see MDR table in §1.4)

### **1.6.3 Training Areas of Special Emphasis**

Training organizations and operators should insure that all crewmembers are familiar with procedures for recognizing, avoiding and escaping from severe weather situations, including low-altitude wind shear.

FMS training. If level "C" training is specified due to FMS installation, training must be "hands on" instruction with an approved training device, simulator, or the airplane. If an airplane is used for the training process, it must be emphasized that as much training as possible should be accomplished in a static, "powered-up" aircraft to minimize exposure to a "heads down" environment while the aircraft is in operation.

Cockpit displays training. If level "C" training is specified due to EFIS to EFIS or EFIS to Electromechanical cockpit instrumentation, training must be "hands on" instruction emphasizing all normal, abnormal, and reversionary modes.

Proper precautions and procedures regarding hazardous weather/winter operations, such as proper use of wing/tail de-ice, antiskid braking characteristics when stopping on slippery runways, use of procedures described in the wind shear training aid, hazards associated with rejecting take-offs near V1 on slippery runways, and other such topics, are appropriate for emphasis in training programs.

## **1.7 Checking**

Proficiency checks must be conducted in accordance with FCL.740 'Validity and renewal of class and type ratings' and OPS 1.965 'Recurrent training and checking'.

## **1.8 Currency**

Compliance with OPS 1.970 'Recent experience' or FCL.060 'Recent experience' as appropriate is required for recent experience.

## 1.9 OPS recommendations

Due to criticality of fuel computations, crews should be familiar with all aspects of fuel management to include normal and abnormal procedures and the manner in which fuel computations are made.

Although not required, it is highly recommended that each operator or flight training centre develop an effective academic and practical upset simulator program.

## 2. Noise Abatement Departure Procedure

### 2.1 Legal requirements for NADP procedures

EU-OPS stipulates procedures for NADP in OPS 1.235:

An operator shall establish appropriate operating departure and arrival/approach procedures for each aircraft type in accordance with the following:

- a) The operator shall ensure that safety has priority over noise abatement, and
- b) These procedures shall be designed to be simple and safe to operate with no significant increase in crew workload during critical phases of flight, and
- c) For each aeroplane type two departure procedures shall be defined, in accordance with ICAO Doc. 8168 (Procedures for air navigation services, "PANS-OPS"), Volume I:
  - 1) noise abatement departure procedure one (NADP 1), designed to meet the close-in noise abatement objective; and
  - 2) noise abatement departure procedure two (NADP 2), designed to meet the distant noise abatement objective; and
  - 3) in addition, each NADP climb profile can only have one sequence of actions.

### 2.2 General Description of the NADP

The procedure is designed to meet the close-in noise abatement objective (NADP 1).

The procedure involves:

- a) Normal take-off to 400 ft. AGL - including gear retraction
- b) Target speed  $V_2 + 10$  KIAS
- c) Thrust reduction at 400 ft. AGL
- d) At or above 3000 ft. AGL flap retraction.

The procedure requires a specific reduction of thrust on all 3 engines at 400ft AGL to a specific  $N1$  designated " $N1_{reduced}$ ".

$N1_{reduced}$  is computed based on  $N1_{take-off}$  of the centre engine and ground temperature as specified in the AFM Section 5 - Performance.

### 2.3 The evaluation process

An evaluation of the thrust reduction procedure, based on the operational procedure close-in NADP, using a Mystère Falcon 50 full flight simulator was performed 30 March, 2011. The evaluation involved the EASA Falcon OEB Chairman, being supported by Dassault Aviation pilots and engineers.

For the F900EX the evaluation was performed using a Falcon 900EX Primus 2000 full flight simulator. This evaluation involved 2 Falcon JOEB pilots, each being supported by a Dassault Aviation pilot and test engineers.

For each evaluation a total of 12 take-offs with thrust reduction at 400 feet AAL were performed. Abnormal situations, including engine failure and windshear conditions, were introduced to assess a crew's ability to discontinue the noise abatement procedure and adopt the procedure appropriate to the abnormal condition.

Due to similarities between the aeroplane types and the commonalities of the associated NADP procedures, the conclusions of the evaluation made on the Mystère Falcon 50 are also valid for the Falcon 50EX, Mystère Falcon 900 and the Falcon 900C.

No flight testing in the aeroplane was deemed necessary by the EASA OEB.

## **2.4 Training Areas of Special Emphasis**

Prior to operating the Dassault MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C or F900EX on a close-in NADP with a thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL, the Falcon OEB recommends the following Training Areas of Special emphasis:

**2.4.1** The departure briefing should include all aspects of the NADP including as a minimum:

- (for MF50, F50EX, MF900 and F900C): the N1 to be set at 400 feet AGL. This parameter (N1reduced) is computed by Dassault Aviation and is available in the Normal Procedure for close-in NADP (Operating Manual – Procedures),
- (for F900EX): N1 to be set at 400 feet AAL and PATH angle to be set. These two parameters (reduced N1 and PATH angle) are computed by Dassault Aviation and can be found in the Normal Procedure close-in NADP (CODDE 2 - Procedures),
- abnormal/emergency procedures during the NADP

**2.4.2** The crew should become proficient on the task sharing described in the Special Procedure for close-in NADP, in particular regarding the thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL which is to be performed by the PNF under the authority of the PF.

**2.4.3** Before executing the NADP both pilots shall be trained in the procedure as PF and PNF as applicable.

## **2.5 Specification for training**

**2.5.1** Crew must be trained in using the procedure provided in the Operating Manual - Procedures (MF50, F50EX, MF900 and F900C) or CODDE 2 - Procedures (F900EX) (Special Normal Procedure close-in NADP) or in equivalent company SOP's,

**2.5.1.1** Crew should be made aware that the Special Procedure for close-in NADP - and only this one - supersedes normal Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). For the F900EX, training should emphasize the use of the FPA mode (to keep a given ground path during the climb) and the crew task sharing.

### **2.5.2 Pilot Training Prerequisite**

No prerequisite is required before entering the NADP pilot course except current type rating on the aeroplane.

**2.5.2.1** The NADP pilot training course can also be included as an integral part of the aeroplane type rating training course

### **2.5.3 NADP Pilot Training**

**2.5.3.1** The initial training should comprise, as a minimum, three take-offs followed by the NADP, and two take-offs where non-normal situations are introduced during the NADP (engine failure, windshear, gear retraction problems etc.).

**2.5.3.2** The Recurrent NADP training should be performed annually, and should include, as a minimum, one take-off followed by the NADP and one take-off where non-normal situations are introduced during the NADP.

## **2.6 Currency**

**2.6.1** The OEB recommends that pilots are not assigned to operate a close-in NADP with a thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL on a Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX as part of the minimum certified crew either as PF or PNF unless he/she has carried out at least 3 NADPs within the previous 6 months on the aircraft or in the simulator.

**2.6.1.1** Credit for currency can be given for NADPs performed on any Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX aeroplane; however one NADP has to be performed on the applicable Falcon within the previous 12 months.

**2.6.1.2** If currency has been lost, it can be renewed by completing the training described in paragraph 2.5.3.1 of this Report.

**2.6.1.3** The Currency for Close-in NADP with thrust reduction at 400 feet AGL, may be maintained by performing the procedure during any take-off, provided that the defined procedure does not conflict with local operational provisions.

## **2.7 Training Commonality credits**

Training commonalities between the Falcon MF50, F50EX, MF900, F900C and F900EX are considered in §1. Falcon 50/900 "Catch-up" process above.

## **2.8 Applicability to specific airports**

See Attachment 2: London City Airport / Other Airports.

## **3 Steep Approach Landing Procedure**

### **3.1 General Description of the Steep Approach**

**3.1.1** A Steep Approach is used primarily when there are obstacles in the approach path that are too high to allow a normal 3° approach path. An approach path angle of 4,5 degrees or more is considered a steep approach.

**3.1.2** The EASA OEB has determined that the conduct of steep approach landing operations requires no higher piloting skill level than that of normal 3° approaches. However, since steep approach landing operations are often tailored to demanding airports - located in mountainous areas, having short runways - the EASA OEB requires flight training, including briefing (no formal academic training, i.e. no classroom training), for competency in conducting steep approach landing operations.

**3.1.3** The EASA OEB found that MF900, F900C and F900EX are operationally suitable for steep approach landing operations up to the following approach path angles with aircrew trained in accordance with the requirements set in this paragraph, and using associated Operating Manual (MF900 and F900C) or CODDE2 (F900EX) Procedures provided by Dassault Aviation. The Falcon MF50 and F50EX are both certified for steep approach operations up to 6.65°. However, these operations were never subject to an EASA OEB.

Aircraft	Max Approach Path Angle
Mystère Falcon 900	6.0°
Falcon 900C	5.5°
Falcon 900EX	6.0°
MF50, F50EX	6.65°

### 3.2 The Operational Suitability Evaluation process

The Operational Suitability Evaluation by the EASA OEB was performed using both a Mystère Falcon 900 (9 January 2012) and a Falcon 900EX (29 October 2011) full flight simulator.

No flight testing in the aeroplane was deemed necessary by the EASA OEB.

### 3.3 EU-OPS Requirements for Steep Approach Procedures

The following EU-OPS and associated AMC references relate to steep approaches:

- Appendix 1 to OPS1.515(a)3: Steep approach procedures
- EU-OPS1.975: Route and aerodrome competence qualification
- AMC OPS1.975 §5 (TGL44): Route and aerodrome competence qualification (Category C aerodrome)

### 3.4 References

Refer to appropriate Operating Manual Procedures (MF900 and F900C), CODDE 2 Procedures (F900EX) and AFM Annexes.

### 3.5 Specifications for Training

#### 3.5.1 Pilot Training Prerequisite

No prerequisite is required before entering the Steep Approach pilot course except a current type rating on the aeroplane, or full initial type rating training up to, but excluding, the check ride.

**3.5.2** The crew must be trained in using Operating Manual Procedures (MF900 and F900C) or CODDE2 Procedures (F900EX) as provided by Dassault Aviation or in using the equivalent company SOP's.

The Steep Approach pilot training course can be included as an integral part of the aeroplane type rating training course.

### 3.5.3 Steep Approach Pilot Training Programme

#### 3.5.3.1 Flight Training

Flight training (as PF or PNF) may be conducted in a Mystère Falcon 900, Falcon 900C or Falcon 900EX Level C or D Full Flight Simulator or in the aircraft, with a Type Rating Instructor (TRI), and must address the following:

- Briefing prior to the simulator session, or during the flight preparation to include: AFM/ Operating Manual (MF900 and F900C) or CODDE 2 (F900EX) Limitations, Normal / Abnormal Procedures, Performance with special emphasis on increased landing distance.
- Phases of the Steep Approach, to include: Stabilized approach concept as a key success for steep approach landing, appropriate slats / flaps configuration, approach speed, and flare initiation.

#### 3.5.3.2 Initial Training

The initial training should comprise, as a minimum, three Steep Approaches:

- one approach following a 5.5° Approach Path Angle with full stop landing to comply with normal procedures; and
- one approach following a 5.5° Approach Path Angle (MF900 and F900C) or 6.0° Approach Path Angle with engine anti-ice management (F900EX) introducing an abuse in speed, managed by crew using AB1 and AB2 alternatively (pilot has to demonstrate his ability to be stabilized at 1000 ft), until touchdown followed by a go-around; and
- one approach following a 5.5° Approach Path Angle (F900C) or 5.5° or 6.0° Approach Path Angle (MF900 or F900EX) with an engine failure below 400 ft, followed by a full stop landing or a go-around at pilot discretion.

#### 3.5.3.3 Recurrent Training

The Recurrent Steep Approach training should be performed every 6 months, and should include, as a minimum, one Steep Approach and a second Steep Approach where non-normal situations are introduced during the Approach.

#### 3.5.3.4 Training Areas of Special Emphasis

The approach briefing should include all aspects of the Steep Approach, including as a minimum:

- normal and abnormal procedures during the Steep Approach;
- transition from a glide path reference system to a visual glide path indicating system; and
- computation of the field length data when using steep approach criteria.

The crew should become proficient on the task sharing described in the Special Procedure for Steep Approach, in particular regarding go-around. Both pilots shall be trained in the procedure as PF and PNF, as applicable.

### 3.6 Recent Experience / Currency

The OEB determined that there are no specific recent experience or currency requirements for Steep Approach.

### **3.7 Training Credit**

Training credit (Initial and Recurrent) can be given for Steep Approaches training performed on either Mystère Falcon 900, Falcon 900C, Falcon 900EX, Falcon 2000 or Falcon 2000EX (as applicable), provided a briefing covering the steep approach procedures avionics differences is taken.

### **3.8 Period of Validity of Competence**

Before performing Steep Approach Landing Operations, an operator shall ensure that the commander fulfils the same requirements of EU-OPS1.975(b)(c) and (d).

### **3.9 Checking Requirements**

There is no requirement for knowledge checking or flight proficiency testing for Mystère Falcon 900, Falcon 900C and Falcon 900EX steep approach qualification.

Proof of completion of either Mystère Falcon 900, Falcon 900C, Falcon 900EX, Falcon 2000 or Falcon 2000EX steep approach training is sufficient to demonstrate qualification.

## Attachment 1

### Falcon 50 Full Type Rating

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
GI 1 (6:00)	GI 2 (6:00)	GI 3 (6:00)	GI 4 (6:00)	GI 5 (5:00) System review (1:00)
Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	Day 10
GI 6 (6:00)	GI 7 (6:00)	GI 8 (6:00)	GI 9 (6:00)	GI 10 (2:00) Review (1:00) Written Exam (3:00)
Day 11	Day 12	Day 13	Day 14	Day 15
FBS 1 (4:00)	FBS 2 (4:00)	FBS 3 (4:00)	FFS 1 (5:30)	FFS 2 (5:30)
Day 16	Day 17	Day 18	Day 19	Day 20
FFS 3 (5:30)	FFS 4 (5:30)	FFS 5 (5:30)	FFS 6 (5:30)	Flight Training: (4/6 landings *)
Day 21				
Skill Test (6:00)				

**Notes:**

GI Ground Instruction

Times for FBS (Fixed Base Simulator) do not include briefing or debriefing

Times for FFS (Full Flight Simulator) include 1.0 Hour briefing and 0.5 Hour debriefing

\* 4 landings including 1 full stop landing for pilots with more than 500 hours MPA experience in aeroplanes of similar size and performance. In all other cases, 6 landings including 2 full stop landings. Both cases include 1 hour briefing and ½ hour debriefing.

This table reflects the Full Type Rating course analysed by EASA, which was found to be compliant with applicable requirements. Any variations to this course should be evaluated by the Competent Authority or through an OEB evaluation. This serves to ensure that an equivalent level of training and safety are reached, and may lead to variations to the table above.

## Falcon 900 Full Type Rating

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5
GI 1 (6:00)	GI 2 (7:30)	GI 3 (7:30)	GI 4 (8:00)	GI 5 (6:00) System review (1:00)
Day 6	Day 7	Day 8	Day 9	Day 10
GI 6 (8:00)	GI 7 (6:00)	GI 8 (7:00)	GI 9 (3:00) System review (3:00)	System Review (3:00) Written Exam (3:00)
Day 11	Day 12	Day 13	Day 14	Day 15
FBS 1 (4:00)	FBS 2 (4:00)	FBS 3 (4:00)	FFS 1 (5:30)	FFS 2 (5:30)
Day 16	Day 17	Day 18	Day 19	Day 20
FFS 3 (5:30)	FFS 4 (5:30)	FFS 5 (5:30)	FFS 6 (5:30)	Flight Training: (4/6 landings *)
Day 21				
Skill Test (First and Additional Type Rating) (6:00)				

**Notes:**

GI Ground Instruction

Times for FBS (Fixed Base Simulator) do not include briefing or debriefing

Times for FFS (Full Flight Simulator) include 1.0 Hour briefing and 0.5 Hour debriefing

\* 4 landings including 1 full stop landing for pilots with more than 500 hours MPA experience in aeroplanes of similar size and performance. In all other cases, 6 landings including 2 full stop landings. Both cases include 1 hour briefing and ½ hour debriefing.

This table reflects the Full Type Rating course analysed by EASA, which was found to be compliant with applicable requirements. Any variations to this course should be evaluated by the Competent Authority or through an OEB evaluation. This serves to ensure that an equivalent level of training and safety are reached, and may lead to variations to the table above.

## **Attachment 2**

### **London City Airport / Other Airport**

#### **1. Applicability to London City Airport**

This procedure has been assessed by the EASA OEB team for London City Airport.

**Refer to Dassault Operating Manual – Procedures / CODDE2, reference DTM914 (MF50), DTM914EX (F50EX), DTM 9819 (MF900), DTA9819C (F900C), DGT115590 (F900EX).**

#### **2. Other Airports**

The process and the associated close-in NADP procedure have been developed for the London City Airport, and can be validated for other airports, provided:

- The new NADP procedure is accepted by the local Authority, and
- All obstacle clearance requirements are fulfilled.