

ACCIDENT

Aircraft Type and Registration:	Jodel DR100A Ambassadeur, G-BFBA	
No & Type of Engines:	1 Continental Motors Corp C90-14F piston engine	
Year of Manufacture:	1959 (Serial no: 88)	
Date & Time (UTC):	23 January 2017 at 1600 hrs	
Location:	Dunkeswell Aerodrome, Devon	
Type of Flight:	Private	
Persons on Board:	Crew - 1	Passengers - 1
Injuries:	Crew - None	Passengers - None
Nature of Damage:	Landing gear and propeller	
Commander's Licence:	Light Aircraft Pilot's Licence	
Commander's Age:	68 years	
Commander's Flying Experience:	1,950 hours (of which 155 were on type) Last 90 days - 11 hours Last 28 days - 5 hours	
Information Source:	Aircraft Accident Report Form submitted by the pilot	

Synopsis

During a tailwheel familiarisation flight with an LAA inspector (the 'inspector'), the pilot handling the aircraft (the 'handling pilot') lost control of the aircraft during a touch-and-go landing, which resulted in the aircraft ground looping.

History of the flight

During the seventh touch-and-go landing of a familiarisation flight, the handling pilot lost control as power was applied during the landing/takeoff roll, which resulted in the aircraft ground looping on the paved runway at Dunkeswell. The landing gear collapsed, which allowed the propeller to strike the ground, and the aircraft came to a stop.

The handling pilot, who had no previous experience of tailwheel/dragger aircraft, had recently purchased the aircraft and this was his third flight with an LAA inspector who was experienced on type. The inspector had previously inspected the aircraft and, prior to the handling pilot taking time with an instructor, offered some familiarisation flights to the handling pilot of which the accident flight was the third. The handling pilot sat in the right seat for the first flight (general handling), and in the left seat for the other two during which circuits were flown. Some of these circuits were flown by the handling pilot.

The inspector stated that, prior to these flights, the handling pilot was fully aware that he was not an instructor (such as an LAA Coach), and the handling pilot was under the impression

that the inspector would be PIC. The handling pilot was also aware that he would have an opportunity to handle the aircraft during the flights. However, as PIC but not an instructor, the inspector would have been unable to offer any instruction to the handling pilot during these flights. Consequently, as the handling pilot was not being trained nor PIC (so was effectively a passenger for these flights), he would have been unable to log hours for any of these flights.

EASA LAPL(A) licence and non-EASA (Annex II) aircraft

Both pilots held an EASA LAPL(A) licence; however, the UK's Air Navigation Order (ANO) 2016 Article 150 deems a non-UK flight crew licence valid for non-EASA (Annex II) aircraft (such as the Jodel DR100A) that are registered in the UK.

Differences and familiarisation training

EASA Part-FCL states in *FCL.135.A LAPL(A) - Extension of privileges to another class or variant of aeroplanes* that:

'(b) Before the holder of an LAPL can exercise the privileges of the licence on another variant of aeroplane than the one used for the skill test, the pilot shall undertake differences or familiarisation training. The differences training shall be entered in the pilot's logbook or equivalent document and signed by the instructor.'

Note that variants within the SEP (land) Class of aircraft, such as SEP (land) with tailwheels, are listed in GM1 FCL.700 of EASA Part-FCL (SUBPART H – CLASS AND TYPE RATINGS SECTION 1 – Common requirements).

EASA Part-FCL Guidance Material (GM) defines differences and familiarisation training in GM1 FCL.710 and GM1 FCL.135.A as:

'(a) Differences training requires the acquisition of additional knowledge and training on an appropriate training device or an aircraft.
(b) Familiarisation training requires the acquisition of additional knowledge.'

These regulations do not specify what type of training (differences or familiarisation) is required to extend the privileges of a licence to another variant; however, it is noted that there is no requirement for familiarisation training to be recorded.

The CAA publication CAP 804 specified the need for differences training for tailwheel variants in Part H, Subpart 1 Section 4 Acceptable Means of Compliance and Guidance Material (AMC and GM), Paragraph 4.3.5. This document is now labelled as 'REFERENCE ONLY' and has, in part, been superseded by CAP 1535 - 'The Skyway Code' (published May 2017), which in the Requirements for the PIC section refers to the EASA website for information on the requirements for differences or familiarisation training. It does, however, state that '*Differences training requires practical training on the aircraft, whereas familiarisation can just be gaining additional theoretical knowledge.*' The Winter 2016

edition of the CAA's GA safety publication '*Clued Up*' discusses the importance of differences training for tailwheel (and other) conversions in an article entitled '*What's the difference?*'

Conclusion

The handling pilot had no previous experience of tailwheel/dragger aircraft and the accident occurred whilst carrying out familiarisation training, but this was not with an instructor. This event has highlighted that, when converting to another variant of an aircraft than the one used for the skill test, pilots must undertake appropriate training with an instructor, guidance for which can be found in the Winter 2016 edition of the CAA's GA safety publication '*Clued Up*'.