

## THE DEBATE'S CHANGING TONE: SOME RECENT PRONOUNCEMENTS

Bill Voss, the President of the Flight Safety Foundation (FSF), said at the Corporate Aviation Safety Seminar (CASS) in San Antonio in April 2012: "Five years ago we passed the point where automation was there to back up pilots. Clearly, today, the pilot is there to back up the automation." He later explained that this is a realistic assessment of the world today, except we are not training pilots to be backups to automation. He concluded that we need to develop new kinds of training that go far beyond traditional maneuver-based stick and rudder training.

Both Voss and the FSF are respected members of the airline and corporate aviation community, not given to spurious radical thoughts or heresy. But they aren't the only respected members of the community who think this way. That same month, at the World Aviation Training Symposium (WATS) in Orlando, Mike Carriker, Boeing's Chief Pilot for New Airplane Development, said: "In my 25-year flying career, there has been little change in training. Yet aircraft and teaching technologies have evolved exponentially." He went on to urge a transition from rote-style to competency-based training in order to leverage the capabilities of today's advanced airplane systems.

Bill Voss reportedly noted at the CASS seminar: "If pilots have no idea of what the automation should be doing, then they also have no idea of whether everything they observe on the panel represents a normal operation. That's what happened to Air France 447," he said. "This is not just about better stick-and-rudder skills, though. What you die from is not understanding what configuration will keep the aircraft in the air safely. If pilots don't understand that level flight means two-and-a-half degrees of pitch and 93-percent N1, they have no way of manually controlling that aircraft if something breaks."

