

This document is a translation made by SHK of the original response in Swedish to the safety recommendation. In case of discrepancies between this translation and the Swedish original text, the Swedish text shall prevail in the interpretation of the response.

Statement

1 (4)

Date
25/11/2016Reference no.
LFH 2015-3461Your date
02/09/2016Your reference
L-61/15

Swedish Accident Investigation Authority
P.O. Box 12538
SE-102 29 Stockholm

Accident at Malmö Airport (Sturup) on 27 June 2015 involving the aeroplane SE-GIC of the Piper-PA34-200T, Seneca II model, operated by South Sweden School of Aeronautics AB.

The Swedish Transport Agency hereby submits its responses to the recommendations issued by the Swedish Accident Investigation Authority (Statens haverikommission, SHK) in its final report concerning the above occurrence.

The Swedish Transport Agency is recommended to:

During the certifying process and operational controls of air training organisations to tighten its supervision concerning the identification of training elements that might entail increased flight safety risks. RL 2016:05 R3

The Swedish Transport Agency's response:

The flight training section has created 6 additional control questions to be used in operational controls and when reviewing applications for Approved Training Organisation (ATO) status. The control questions are linked to rule references ORA.GEN.200(a)(3), AMC1 ORA.GEN.200(a)(1);(2);(3);(5), AMC1 ORA.GEN.200(a)(1) and GM2 ORA.GEN.200(a)(1)

The flight training section has given a briefing about the addition of further control questions during operational controls during the information meeting organised by the Swedish Transport Agency on 23 and 24 November 2016

A presentation of the new control questions is appended to this response to the recommendations.

Swedish Transport Agency
Civil Aviation and Maritime Department
601 73 Norrköping
Visiting address
Olal Kyrkogata 35, Norrköping

Tel +46 771-503 503
Fax +46 11-18 52 56

transportstyrelsen.se
luftfart@transportstyrelsen.se

Britt-Marie Kärlin
Unit for marketing, environment and analysis
Section for Statistics and Analysis
britt-marie.karlin@transportstyrelsen.se
+46 10-495 37 72

The Swedish Transport Agency is recommended to:

Review the process of standardization among its authorized examiners in order to achieve a safe and consistent performance regarding emergency exercises during skill tests in aircraft. *RL 2016:05 R4.*

The Swedish Transport Agency will be taking the following actions:

- Publication of NOTEX (information specifically intended for inspectors, see appendix) with detailed information regarding how an inspector is to perform elements involving engine failure in the aircraft. This includes a recommended minimum altitude for simulated engine failure in skill tests and general safety aspects that the inspector should consider.
- The above information will also be published in the inspector handbook when it is next revised.
- During all inspector meetings in 2017, information about how an inspector is to perform elements involving engine failure in aircraft will be provided to the inspectors who conduct skills tests in aircraft.

Decisions pertaining to this matter have been made by Head of Unit Simon Posluk. Flight inspectors Toni Reuterstrand and Daniel Wastesson, and Britt-Marie Kärlin, Accident Coordinator, assisted in the final handling of the matter, the latter acting as rapporteur.

[signed]
Simon Posluk
Head of Unit
Unit for Market, Environment and Analysis

NOTEX 2/2016**Skills test in MEPL aeroplanes**

We have had two accidents within a short period of time during training in MEPL and ME/IR. We therefore wish to clarify the Transport Administration's view of the aircraft and how engine failure on ME and manoeuvres at close to stalling speed shall be handled.

Under point 4.5.2 in the inspector handbook, we have written about risk factors and skill tests in aircraft. We recommend reading this point.

With regard to skill tests in the aircraft, we must be aware that the various phases of the test that we carry out entail a heightened risk that we must take into account. Above all, we should be vigilant when doing something out of the ordinary. What we would like to highlight here is flight with one engine and stall manoeuvres in ME aeroplanes.

Flight with one engine inoperative

Both the test for CPL and class-rating for MEPL include engine failure during take-off. This must be performed at a safe altitude. There is no definition of a safe altitude; this is a matter of judgment. The goal of the exercise must be achieved without excessive risks being taken. We consider 300 feet to be a suitable minimum altitude at which to simulate engine failure, partly because this is an altitude which provides certain margins if something unexpected should occur, but also because at this altitude, thrust has not normally been reduced and we can thus be considered to still be in the take-off phase. Note, however, that this is a **minimum altitude**, which should be determined on a case-by-case basis. If you judge that the minimum altitude necessary in order to perform this part of the test safely should be higher, you must of course follow your judgment.

There are a number of parts in which engine failure is simulated, and the basic principle is that this should take place in a safe manner. Think through the conditions of the flight and choose suitable moments for engine failure, where there are sufficient margins should the trainee make an error. The trainee should also be briefed on the various components of the test so as to be prepared mentally.

Stalling exercises

Ensure that you can always conduct manoeuvres in accordance with the flight handbook. If the handbook states, for examples, that you may not exceed an angle of 60 degrees when banking, you should avoid performing stalling manoeuvres in which you cannot guarantee that this threshold will not be exceeded. You should also think over how you will conduct the exercise; perhaps there is an approach which entails less risk but which still allows adequate assessment of the same thing. There is no reason to push the aeroplane to its limits during a test. Remember that there are no tests which explicitly require the simulation of stalling during ascent in a multi-engine aeroplane. A full stall is only necessary in a CPL test and class-rating test. For CPL tests, there are no additional requirements, which means that in this matter, you are able to choose how you carry out the exercise. In the class-rating test, this must be done in Clean configuration and without ascending or descending.

New control questions for operational checks

In what way does the organisation ensure that the thresholds specified in the flight handbook are not exceeded or fallen short of during flight, especially during exercises involving abnormal situations?

What risks has the flight school established with regard to exercises in abnormal situations?

What measures has the flight school implemented in order to reduce risks during flight training with regard to exercises in abnormal situations?

Under what conditions are exercises involving the shut-off and restarting of engines conducted?

What risks has the flight school established related to the shut-off and restarting of engines?

What measures has the flight school established in order to reduce risks during flight exercises related to the shut-off and restarting of engines?