

If you're looking at pilot training programs, it's easy to get distracted by the big headlines: the duration, the certificates, the placement promises. Equipment aeloswiss.com matters too, though, because it shapes what students actually practice every day. At AELO Swiss Academy, the training story includes two very different tools: a Diamond DA42 for hands-on flying and a Boeing 737 NG simulator for advanced instrument and multi-crew training. Put together, they create a workflow that feels practical, stepwise, and realistic in how it mixes procedural discipline with real stick-and-rudder fundamentals.

This is also the kind of detail that makes a school's training philosophy tangible. AELO Swiss Academy is a Switzerland-based organization focused on pilot education, founded in 1985. It is described as an EASA-approved Approved Training Organization with code CH.ATO.0311. Training takes place in the Locarno/Gordola area in Ticino, Switzerland, and the academy describes itself as formerly known as Aero Locarno. The public program descriptions also highlight that modern training equipment includes Diamond DA42 aircraft and a Boeing 737 NG simulator used for advanced IFR and APS MCC training.



Below is a grounded look at what those pieces of equipment represent, how they tend to function in a training environment, and what practical trade-offs students and instructors often notice when the program moves between an aircraft and a simulator.

Why the DA42 and the 737 NG simulator belong in the same conversation

A DA42 and a 737 NG simulator do not train the same skills in the same way. One is built around flying as an activity you physically perform, and the other is built around training as an activity you repeat, refine, and measure under controlled conditions.

That sounds obvious, but the reason it matters is because modern training is rarely just “learn the basics, then move on.” It’s usually about building a chain of competency. You start with aircraft handling and procedures, then you increase operational complexity. IFR training, for example, depends on your ability to fly accurately while managing heads-down and heads-up tasks. Multi-crew concepts add another layer: coordination, communication discipline, and standard callouts.

In AELO’s case, the program pages describe using the DA42 and the Boeing 737 NG simulator for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. That pairing implies a deliberate training logic. The DA42 supports the foundational flying

and procedural rhythm. The 737 NG simulator supports scenario-based work where you can rehearse, troubleshoot, and standardize how teams behave in the real IFR world.

The Diamond DA42 aircraft: where flying discipline becomes muscle memory

When a training program leans on a DA42, it's usually because that platform can support repeatable flight-time practice while keeping the student grounded in real aerodynamics and real cockpit management. AELO's published information specifically states it uses Diamond DA42 aircraft as part of its training equipment for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. That tells you the aircraft isn't just there to "get you hours." It's part of the framework that feeds into IFR competence and team coordination training later.

In day-to-day terms, a DA42 training environment typically rewards students who take process seriously. Not because anyone is trying to be strict for the sake of it, but because IFR flying and procedure management are mostly about staying consistent under workload.

Here's what that consistency usually looks like in practice, even without getting into program-specific internal details. In many training setups, students repeatedly practice sequences like briefing the approach or maneuver, setting up configurations, flying the correct track and altitude profiles, and managing speed and configuration changes without turning the cockpit into a panic environment. Over time, the student's scan pattern and task ordering get better. The student stops "chasing" the aircraft and starts guiding it.

Even simple mistakes become easier to diagnose once you can repeat the same kind of flight many times. If your altitude excursions are larger today than last week, instructors can usually point to a specific behavior: delayed control inputs, late cross-checking, rushing the scan, or not stabilizing before transitioning between tasks. The DA42, as an actual airplane you can feel and fly, makes those cause-and-effect links stick.

Trade-off: aircraft training shows everything, including the messy parts

The hard part about using an aircraft as your main training tool is also the main benefit. It's not "all controlled." Weather, air traffic, and operational constraints influence what can be practiced on a given day. If a student's skill improves quickly, that's great, but they still need enough exposure to build confidence that survives imperfect conditions.

A simulator can control the environment and reproduce scenarios, but the airplane teaches you how to handle the real flow of tasks when the world won't behave exactly as planned. That's especially relevant for IFR work, where workload management is not purely a technical question, it's also a mental one.

So the trade-off looks like this: aircraft training tends to be less repeatable from day to day, but it builds an intuitive feel for flying under constraints. The best training programs use that "real mess" to make students stronger, then lean on simulation to refine and standardize.

The Boeing 737 NG simulator: where IFR and multi-crew procedures get standardized

AELO's described equipment includes a Boeing 737 NG simulator used for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. That combination is important. "Advanced IFR" signals instrument work beyond the earliest stages, where precision, anticipation, and procedural consistency start to matter more than basic navigation. "APS MCC" points to multi-crew training that focuses on crew cooperation and standardized execution.

In a 737 NG simulator environment, the training emphasis tends to shift from raw aircraft handling toward procedural accuracy, crew coordination, and scenario management. Students have to do more than fly by instruments. They have to manage cockpit responsibilities as a team.

Even if you're not running the exact same scenario every time, simulation allows instructors to create repeatable lessons: similar failures, similar workload patterns, and similar decision points. That repeatability is what helps students move from "I can do this when everything is perfect" to "I can do this when something changes."

The simulator's real value: repeating the same lesson until it's clean

A simulator doesn't just allow practice, it enables refinement. If a student's callouts are inconsistent, it's easier to correct them after a repeat. If a crew interaction breaks down during a high-workload segment, instructors can pause, review, and re-run with targeted focus.



That matters for IFR work because instrument flying is not only about maintaining altitude and track. It's also about managing checklists, cross-checking instruments, monitoring automation modes, and coordinating the tasks that naturally divide between crew roles.

And it matters for MCC-style training because communication is a performance requirement, not a "nice to have." In multi-crew operations, small communication lapses can create bigger errors. Simulation is where those lapses get exposed safely and then corrected through repetition.

Trade-off: simulation can feel sterile if you treat it like theory

The main risk with simulator training is also common sense: if a student mentally treats the simulator as "just a computer," they can underplay the discipline required to be systematic. The cockpit demands become familiar quickly, and some people stop treating the simulator like a real environment.

A well-run program counters that by demanding the same professionalism you'd use in an aircraft session. The goal is that when students transition back to flying or to operating concepts with more realism, they don't lose the procedural habits that simulation helps develop.

In AELO's case, the simulator is explicitly positioned as part of the training equipment for advanced IFR and APS MCC. That suggests the simulation is not an optional extra, it's integrated into the learning plan.

How the DA42 and 737 NG simulator likely connect within the program flow

Even with limited public detail, you can still see how the equipment pairing would work as a learning pipeline.

A DA42-based phase supports building accurate flying technique and procedural habits you can later apply in complex IFR contexts. The student learns the basics of managing flight parameters, maintaining stable profiles, and keeping a disciplined scan. That foundation is crucial before you can fully benefit from scenario-driven IFR training.

Then the 737 NG simulator takes that foundation and transforms it into crew-based operational competence. Advanced IFR requires the student to manage more than “one set of tasks.” The simulator environment helps teach how to coordinate tasks between roles while following standard procedures.

The “connection” is less about learning the same procedure in two platforms and more about developing transferable behaviors: briefing discipline, control stability, task prioritization, checklist use, and communication structure.

Equipment and training outcomes: what AELO claims, and how to read it responsibly

AELO Swiss Academy makes public claims about high outcomes, including a 96% graduate placement rate within six months and one of the highest pass rates in Europe. Those are self-reported claims on the academy’s website. It’s worth treating them as marketing statements, not as guarantees, but it does tell you something about the organization’s positioning.

When a school emphasizes advanced equipment like a DA42 and a Boeing 737 NG simulator, those tools are usually part of the “how” behind those claims. Training quality isn’t solely equipment, but equipment is often a major contributor. Better equipment can mean more consistent training opportunities, more realistic procedural practice, and faster feedback cycles.

That said, placement rate is a multi-factor outcome. It includes individual aptitude, time management, market conditions, and graduation readiness. Equipment helps shape readiness, but it doesn’t eliminate all external variables.

The Locarno/Gordola setting: why the physical training base affects equipment use

AELO’s training base is in the Locarno/Gordola area in Ticino, Switzerland, and program information includes Aeroporto 21, 6596 Gordola, Switzerland. That matters because any flight training operation depends on the day-to-day reality of where you are.

Even without claiming anything specific about typical weather patterns or flight availability, it’s fair to say that location influences schedule density and how often aircraft sessions can run. The DA42 component of training, being aircraft-based, is naturally more sensitive to operational constraints than simulator time.

A program that uses both DA42 aircraft and a Boeing 737 NG simulator has a practical advantage here. When conditions allow, students build flying competence in the aircraft. When conditions don’t, the simulator can keep procedural learning and scenario practice moving. That kind of balance is often what helps students maintain continuity during training.

What students tend to notice when moving between aircraft and simulator

In real student experience, transitions between equipment are not just logistical, they're cognitive.

In the aircraft, you manage physical sensation and real-world variability. Your inputs have "feel." Your scan and timing are shaped by the pace of flight. Even your sense of workload is different because you are physically flying.

In the simulator, the workload management becomes more "procedural." The aircraft response can be very realistic, but your attention is pulled toward checklists, modes, crew coordination, and scenario decisions. You can replay and correct without the same external limitations you face in an aircraft.

A good training plan uses that difference deliberately. It encourages students to respect each environment for what it's best at:

- aircraft for flying discipline and real-time operational awareness
- simulator for repeatable IFR refinement and crew-standard behavior

A short practical lens for evaluating training equipment use

If you're comparing programs or trying to imagine what training will feel like, you don't need insider details to ask the right questions. You can look for evidence that the equipment is integrated into training objectives rather than simply "available."



Here is a small set of questions that usually reveal whether a DA42 and a 737 NG simulator are truly being used to support advanced IFR and APS MCC training goals:

- Do aircraft sessions emphasize procedural discipline in addition to basic handling?
- Are simulator scenarios structured around advanced IFR and crew coordination outcomes?
- Is there a clear feedback loop that uses simulator observations to improve aircraft performance?
- Do instructors review performance with a focus on communication and checklist execution for crew tasks?
- Does the program describe continuity between aircraft and simulation, not treating them as separate worlds?

If a school's public information connects equipment to learning outcomes the way AELO's does, that's a good sign you're not dealing with equipment as an afterthought.

One more layer: professionalism across both platforms

Whether you're in a DA42 or a Boeing 737 NG simulator, professionalism is the same currency. The rules change, the fidelity changes, and the pace changes, but the underlying attitude has to remain constant.

For IFR work, professionalism means you brief properly, you fly stabilized, you cross-check, and you don't treat checklists as optional. For APS MCC style training, professionalism means you communicate clearly, you acknowledge responsibilities, and you follow crew procedures consistently.

The best instructors can usually tell quickly whether a student is learning "the steps" or learning the habits behind the steps. Equipment helps reveal that difference. Aircraft time exposes sloppy process because the aircraft doesn't forgive vague control inputs. Simulation exposes inconsistent crew behavior because communication failures show up immediately in crew performance.

Final perspective: what this equipment snapshot really tells you

AELO Swiss Academy's public training equipment snapshot is straightforward: Diamond DA42 aircraft and a Boeing 737 NG simulator are part of its modern training equipment, and they are used for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. Beyond the equipment names, the more meaningful detail is the pairing itself. It suggests a program that values both real flying fundamentals and structured, repeatable crew-based procedure work.

Add in the academy's broader identity, founded in 1985 and operating as an EASA-approved Approved Training Organization with code CH.ATO.0311, and the picture becomes coherent. Training takes place in Ticino near Locarno/Gordola, and the program descriptions position the equipment as part of a comprehensive education pathway.

If you're deciding whether a training environment fits you, don't just ask what the aircraft is or what the simulator is. Ask what behaviors the equipment is meant to build in you, and whether the program explicitly connects those behaviors to advanced IFR and multi-crew training goals. AELO's published description does connect the dots at a high level, and that connection is the reason this snapshot is more than a list of equipment. It's a clue about how the training day is designed, and how competence is meant to take shape over time.