

Q: You say the standards are being evaluated throughout 2020, yet they are going into effect 31 March. Which is it? How will this impact currently qualified pilots and instructors? Will there be a transition period, implement at next evaluation etc.?

A: The CAP standards discussed during this presentation become effective on 31 March 20. Although these publications are part of a “proof of concept” that is being conducted over the course of the fiscal year, that does not imply that they will be dissolved at year end. Based on decisions made by leadership the format of this content may change, but there is no expectation that it would be superseded.

Regarding impact to currently qualified pilots, except for refresher training requirements, the syllabi described in the CAPS 71-series do not impact existing qualifications. CAPR 70-1 changes to the CAP Pilot Flight Evaluation process necessarily impact our Check Pilots. In order to retain their CP qualification, Check Pilots must complete training on the new evaluation process and criteria prior to 31 Mar 20. That training (Pilot Flight Evaluation Improvement Program) is available on AXIS. Check Pilots that do not complete the training prior to that date will have to take the refresher training specified in CAPS 71-1 (National Check Pilot Standardization Course (NCPSC), to regain their CP qualification.

Q: You made a comment that G1000 training was brought back due to close calls. Could you please elaborate?

A: Over the past two years, Civil Air Patrol has had multiple instances of pilots encountering what they perceived to be autopilot malfunctions. In several instances, pilots became convinced that they were battling the autopilot for control of the aircraft. Based on flight data recording, we are highly confident that the autopilot disconnected, and the aircraft was in a pilot induced out-of-trim condition. Despite multiple attempts to increase pilot understanding of GFC700 operation using critical read items and training videos, we continue to have recurrences that indicate inadequate understanding of this system.

Q: Did I understand the indoc profile (CAPS 72-4 profile #16) can be used for either a Cadet or New SM who is already certificated? We’ve had a healthy debate about a member who isn’t F5 qualified flying with AF funds.

A: That is correct. Among other things, Profile #16 supports pilots who are being on-boarded. That includes new SM pilots and Cadet Wings pilots. Those individuals are qualified to fly this profile in AFAM status. If the Wing has determined that appropriated funds are available and priorities permit, then this could be funded as an “A” mission. Otherwise, it can be wing or member funded as a “B” mission.

Q: What you’re describing Re: profile 16 flies in the face of changes made to WMIRS to specifically prevent such flights from being releasable! That is, if you are not a current VFR Pilot, WMIRS will not allow the flight to be released *even if* the right seat is occupied by a CAP Instructor.

A: If profile 16 is selected on a proficiency mission, WMIRS will first evaluate the qualifications of the pilot in position one. If the pilot in position one is not qualified, WMIRS will check to see if the pilot listed in position two is a CAP IP. If so, the sortie is releasable.

Q: I always thought an initial F5 could not be funded ...is that correct?

A: Before I answer the question, I need to carefully define the terminology. With respect to the term "initial" – CAPR 60-3 uses this term when referring to a member's "first" Form 5 in CAP, while CAPR 70-1 and OpsQuals use the term when referring to the first Form 5 in an aircraft make/model. Secondly, we must be careful when using the terms "AFAM" and "funded." As we all know, everything is funded by someone (e.g., appropriated funds, corporate funds, wing funds, member funds). And, not all AFAM flying is funded with appropriated funds – hence "B" mission symbols.

For the purposes of this answer, we will limit our discussion to a member's first CAP Pilot Flight Evaluation (re: CAPR 60-3 3-5.a.(2)(h)). In that context, the answer to your question is "CAPR 60-3 does not permit the use of *appropriated* funds for a pilot's first Form 5." However, Cadet Wings pilots are an exception to this rule. Also keep in mind, that this restriction does not mean that a member cannot fly in an AFAM status prior to their first Form 5, as evidenced by the previous discussion regarding profile #16.

Q: Previously our Wing has been dinged by the Air Force for allowing a non-current CAPF5 pilot to fly an AFAM profile. Does #16 profile officially allow a non CAPF5 pilot to fly the AFAM mission under profile 16 with Liaison Region approval?

A: From the context of question, I infer that we are talking a pilot that has an expired Form 5. As a result, this is an issue of an expired qualified and not one of proficiency. Profile #16 was not designed to support proficiency flying for pilots that have allowed their CAP pilot qualification to expire or who have failed a Form 5. Absent a waiver from CAP/DO, pilots with expired Form 5s should not fly in an AFAM status.

Q: What was the thought process for requiring a VFR qualified pilot in left seat for CFI right seat proficiency sortie? Could a MS or MO be allowed to "ride" in the left seat during an IP/CP right seat proficiency flight, just to "see what it feels like?"

A: Profile #17 was developed in response to mishap trends and CP/IP reports that they were having difficulty maintaining their proficiency in the landing pattern from the right seat. In order to avoid attempting to describe proficiency levels based on criteria a pilot wouldn't normally log (days since last right seat takeoff/landing), we took a conservative risk management approach and structured this profile to require a qualified CAP VFR Pilot in the left seat.

Q: Why are the documentation requirements different between the 71-4 and the 71-5? 71-4 and 71-5 allow you to mark and then scan/upload a copy of the profile. 71-4 allows you to document profile items accomplished on the CAPF 104 and not scan/upload but not the 71-5. 71-5 does say you need to make an entry on the CAPF 104 noting that the profile has been uploaded but that's it. Why not just have them the same?

A: CAP-USAF/DO and the LR's audit documentation of AFAM-approved proficiency flying, while CAP/DOV audits documentation of CAP-approved proficiency flying. The intent was to minimize CAP/DOV workload by having a single documentation location; however, we will make the requirement uniform.