



**EASA**  
European Aviation Safety Agency

# Q & A

**Your safety is our mission.**

An agency of the European Union





## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
1	<p>Can UPRT and/or full stall training be conducted across devices for airplanes with common type ratings?</p> <p>For example, UPRT in a B757 simulator and for B767, or B747-400 UPRT for B747-8?</p> <p>Can the regulators provide information on the subject and advise TDM's and operators on what will be required?</p>	<p>Mainly it is a question of ATO approval (question regarding training) less than a question of FSTD qualification. However, it is up to the OEM to determine training credits. These are normally defined within the scope of OSD FCD, if applicable.</p> <p>The ATO will normally consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. the OSD evaluation</li><li>B. The manufacturer</li><li>C. Be risk assessed by the operator</li></ul> <p>The device should be qualified for the UPRT</p> <p>Example: Regarding the 757/767 my immediate reaction is that it would be acceptable if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. The operator operates both types in a mix</li></ul> <p>The use of a 757 if you only operate 767 is questionable</p>



## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
2	<p>From this date, any application for initial FSTD qualifications (letter of application) shall be against CS-FSTD(A) issue 2, in accordance with ORA.FSTD.210 (a)(1): "The qualification basis for the issuance of an FSTD qualification certificate shall consist of: (1) the applicable Certification Specifications established by the Agency that are effective on the date of the application for the initial qualification"</p> <p>Can you confirm that current Level C and D FFS do not need to change to Issue 2 after Opinion 6 is issued in order to continue to be approved for UPRT training?</p>	<p>In order to satisfy the FCL requirements, of Opinion 6, Issue 2 is applicable. For updated devices this can be done either through a special evaluation or at the recurrent evaluation (requires application).</p> <p>The wording for the QC is to be standardised but it will cover the Issue 2 main requirements : i) UPRT (includes the FSTD validation envelope, which you have as the "Validated Training Envelope" ii) Clean configuration Stall event (high altitude) iv) Airframe &amp; Engine Icing and effects on stall speeds iii) Full Stall (optional)</p>



## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
3	<p>We operate 2 Level B FFS in our FSTD fleet. Both have been approved for UPRT training under the terms of GM4 ORO.FC.220&amp;230 Operator conversion training and checking &amp; recurrent training and checking which was issued in Annex II to ED Decision 29015/012/R. See below.</p> <p>Can you confirm that these level B simulators will continue to be approved for UPRT training after Opinion 6 is issued and that they will not need to upgrade to CS FSTD Issue 2?</p>	<p>As with above, as long, as your devices are compliant against Issue 2 then they should be OK. It would appear that your devices have had an update?</p> <p>If the elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) UPRT (includes the FSTD validation envelope, which you have as the “Validated Training Envelope”</li><li>ii) Clean configuration Stall event (high altitude)</li><li>iv) Airframe &amp; Engine Icing and effects on stall speeds</li><li>iii) Full Stall (optional)</li></ul> <p>are not incorporated, they will be shown as Restrictions/Limitations on the QC</p> <p>With regard to GM4 this will be retracted and replace by a FAQ on EASA website.</p>





# CS-FSTD(A) Issue 2 "EFFECTIVITY"



## CS-FSTD(A) Issue 2:

Publication (entry into force)  
4th May 2018

Applicability date  
~Jan2020

Use of Issue 2 possible but not mandatory

Issue 2 mandatory

New UPRT amendments to  
AMC/GM  
(Part-FCL, Part-ORA, Part-ORO).  
Publication expected ~ Jan 2019

Applicability date  
Publication + 1 year  
~Jan2020



## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
5	<p>FSTD operator 'X' will be updating its simulators of Airbus and Boeing types to include the IOS tools requirements (FSTD Standards h.2 and h.3) that are defined in the latest CS-FSTD A Issue 2. Those will be required to support the PART FCL training requirement for UPRT.</p> <p>There are 2 statement of compliances (SOC) that require to be added to the MQTG:</p> <p>1- A SOC defining the source data used to construct the FSTD validation envelope. I imagine this SOC will be provided by the TDM.</p> <p>2- A SOC to confirm that each upset and prevention scenario available at the IOS and the associated training manoeuvres have been evaluated by a suitable qualified pilot (Refer to AMC9 FSTD (A).300 (a)(1)). This SOC would be provided by the operator.</p>	<p>1. SOC is from the Operator, but can turn to the TDM with support from OEM – in other words the envelopes have come from either Airbus or Boeing and implemented by the TDMs. However, as usual, the SOC is from the applicant/Operator.</p> <p>2. Yes</p>

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
5	<p>Following Appendix 1 to CS FSTD (A).300 1.General, Section h.3 “Upset scenarios”, when not triggered by a malfunction, is there any preferred method for taking the A/C into an upset? By modifying weather conditions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of malfunctions as a way to trigger an upset? Are they expected to be available from the UPRT pages on IOS as well as from the malfunctions page? Is a malfunction used for starting an upset expected to be always able to drive the A/C into the upset? Even when not checking UPRT?</li> <li>• What should be the preferred method for activating a scenario: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flying (manually/automatically) into the upset, with the trainees being aware at all times of what is happening?</li> <li>• Flying (manually/automatically) into the upset, with the trainees NOT being aware of what is happening until the point of taking control of the A/C?</li> <li>• Or direct reposition into the upset?</li> <li>• Are all of these possibilities accepted?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The training provider should develop the scenario in a way that it is realistic and avoids negative training.</p> <p>The scenario may be also validated by the OEM.</p> <p><i>(Question is more related to training than to Issue 2 requirements)</i></p>





## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
7	<p>We as an Operator of FSTD's are concerned about the violent motion movement involved with UPRT.</p> <p>Deep stalls are resulting in very heavy motion effects which gives concerns for the equipment, not only for the short term but also the long term due to possible structural damage of the simulator frame.</p>	<p>Any feedback from the audience?</p>



## Q & A

	QUESTION	EASA Feedback
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Who will determine if the simulated stall is still a good representative behaviour of the simulator compared to the aircraft?</li><li>• Related to this question: Are there already operators who have experienced these buffets? What is their opinion on reducing the max amplitudes?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See AMC10</li><li>• Question to audience</li></ul>



# EASA

European Aviation Safety Agency

**Thank you for your attention**

**Your safety is our mission.**

An agency of the European Union

