

APPI – Pro workshop Report

APPIPOWER SOUTH AMERICA WORKSHOP 20252/9:

Second APPI Instructor Training Workshop at Rio Paramotor and Paramotor – PR

INSTRUCTORS

Ricardo Maciel	Supervisor
Alan Braga	Instructor
Alexandre Barbosa	Instructor

STUDENTS

Nivanil Galvão	49631
André Giacomini	49659
Luiz Anastácio Alves	49856
Marcio De Lima Batista	49636
André Luis De Souza Cruz Barbosa	42361

Date: De 20 a 23 de março de 2025

Location: Escola Rio Paramotor – Praia de Itaipuaçu, Maricá – RJ

Summary

On February 17, 2025, we held a two-hour online meeting to present APPI and clarify the approval requirements to the candidates.

Later, from March 20 to 23, we conducted an in-person event totaling 30 hours of activities. During this period, we evaluated the candidates on several aspects, including:

- Skills as advanced pilots
- Ability to provide theoretical instruction
- Ability to conduct practical instruction on the ground
- Ability to conduct practical in-flight instruction
- Theoretical knowledge, assessed through:
 - A 20-question multiple-choice test covering essential flight disciplines
 - A 10-question written exam on topics taught and discussed during the workshop

In addition to presenting the APPI methodology, we also shared our hands-on experience and the foundational principles of instruction based on the “EDICT” concept. Throughout the activities, we demonstrated the teaching procedures as applied in our own schools, offering the candidates a structured and in-depth training experience.

The evaluation followed previously defined criteria, ensuring a fair and rigorous certification process.

WORKSHOP PROGRESS

March 20, 9:00 a.m.

We began the day’s activities by reintroducing APPI, emphasizing the approval criteria for the candidates’ certification. Following that, we held a personal presentation session where each candidate shared their journey in the sport, and we, the instructors, also introduced ourselves, highlighting our backgrounds as pilots and flight professionals.

We presented the APPI Method and handed each candidate a booklet that would serve as the main reference throughout the workshop, emphasizing that all activities would be guided by this material.

Additionally, we delivered lectures covering topics such as the risks of the sport, the instructor's role in ensuring safety and quality of instruction, and the core principles of APPI instruction based on the EDICT methodology.

To conclude the morning session, we introduced the eight theoretical lessons recommended by APPI and held a draw to assign the lectures that the candidates would present the next day:

Meteorology – Nill
Advanced Meteorology – André G.
Regulations – André Luiz
Aerodynamics – Márcio
Engine Forces on the Wing – Luiz

This completed the first part of the day, ensuring all participants were aligned with the objectives of the workshop.

March 20, 2:00 p.m.

We took the candidates to the field and began the experimental training session, which included:

- Wing and harness presentation

- Line untangling procedures
- Reverse and alpine inflation techniques

During these exercises, we recorded our observations and impressions of each candidate.

Assessment by Alan Braga

Nivanil Galvão	Good presentation of procedures, good demonstration, teaches calmly and assertively.
André Giacomini	Some difficulty in demonstrating the procedures.
Luiz	Correct presentation and demonstration of procedures, slightly verbose when teaching.
Marcio	Reasonable presentation and demonstration of procedures, with some difficulty.
André Luiz	Correct presentation and demonstration of procedures, but slightly verbose.

Assessment Alexandre Barbosa

Nivanil Galvão	Good participation and initiative, demonstrates experience with instructional practice and consistently contributes by sharing solid lesson foundations in explanations.
André Giacomini	Good participation, does not show much experience dealing with students, but pays close attention to the lessons and delivers explanations with care.
Luiz	Good participation and initiative, demonstrates solid technical and theoretical aptitude, but lacks practical fluency in the exercises and has limited experience with students
Marcio	Good classroom participation, but with quite limited technical aptitude. Shows little experience in paramotoring and in dealing with students in general. Demonstrates some difficulty in performing the exercises.
André Luiz	Good participation and initiative, demonstrates practical experience in assisting instruction, though with some difficulty in explaining practical exercises.

March 21, 9:00 a.m.

Candidate Evaluation as Advanced Pilots

We designed a technical course with cones, divided into three stages: takeoff and taxi, low-level precision flight, and engine-off landing.

1. Taxi Circuit

The first challenge assessed ground handling and taxiing accuracy. The pilot was required to:

Inflate the wing using a forward launch and enter the circuit through the entry gate (marked by two cones); Taxi the paraglider following the defined path:

Pass to the right of the first cone;

Pass to the left of the second cone;

Pass to the right of the third cone;

After completing the path, the pilot was to take off, perform a lap, and land again in front of the circuit gate;

Then turn around, lay the wing down, inflate again (this time using reverse inflation), and repeat the taxi route.

2. Low-Level Precision Flight

In the second stage, we assessed precision and control during level flight. Pilots faced a course composed of four extended cones using foam pool noodles, approximately 90 cm high and spaced about 20 meters apart. The goal was to perform a low pass, touching the foam noodles sequentially with their feet.

3. Engine-Off Landing

After touching the last obstacle, the pilot was required to: Climb and shut off the engine over the landing zone; Complete a lap, approach, and land inside an area marked by four cones, approximately 50x50 meters in size.

Error Tolerance and Critical Situation Management

During the evaluation, it was emphasized that errors are natural and acceptable, but the candidate's ability to manage them would also be assessed. For example:

Well-managed error: If a wing malfunction occurred during the course, the pilot was expected to safely abort the maneuver, bring the wing down, and restart the course.

Critical error: Continuing with a deformed wing, taking off unsafely, or damaging equipment would be considered serious and unacceptable.

To ensure a fair environment and reduce pressure, each candidate was allowed three attempts to complete each challenge.

Performance:

Nivanil Galvão	Handled the taxi stage with great skill and calmness. Had difficulty with the low pass, hitting the targets on his third attempt. Executed the engine-off landing with a fast turn; we advised that an advanced pilot should be precise, not aggressive. Despite some lapses, he was approved as an advanced pilot.
André Giacomini	Had difficulty with the taxi stage, failed all three attempts. Also struggled with the low pass. Landing was acceptable. The pilot showed a clear deficiency in advanced piloting skills and was therefore not approved as an advanced pilot.
Luiz	Successfully completed the first inflation and taxi stage. However, during the second round, he did not land in the designated area. After being allowed a repeat attempt, he was unable to take off again. Demonstrated instability as a pilot, alternating between good performances and a series of unexplainable errors, at times making more mistakes than a student in training. Due to this inconsistency, he was not approved as an advanced pilot.
Marcio	Completed all tasks satisfactorily, but showed a clear posture issue (typical of a free-flight pilot). We believe this can be addressed with training, and therefore he was approved as an advanced pilot.
André Luiz	Successfully completed all tasks on the first attempt with excellence. Therefore, he was approved as an advanced pilot.

March 21, 2:00 p.m.

Theoretical Classes Presented by the Candidates

Assessment:

Nivanil Galvão	Good knowledge of the subject, reasonable public speaking skills. Needs to improve organization in the delivery of the topic to enhance the lesson's flow.
André Giacomini	Good public speaking and well-structured presentation. Limited subject knowledge, but shows intelligence and strong potential.
Luiz	Extensive knowledge of the subject, good public speaking, and well-organized class. However, he is quite verbose, often repeating points already covered and using long analogies. As a result, despite the lesson being rich in content, it becomes rather tiring.
Marcio	Good public speaking, but lacks both content organization and subject knowledge to deliver a solid lesson.
André Luiz	Good public speaking, good knowledge of the subject with only a few gaps. Could improve the organization of content delivery, as he tends to shift back and forth between topics and can be slightly verbose.

March 21, 4:00 p.m.

Practical Class – Wing Handling Skills

Assessment:

Nivanil Galvão	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects effectively. Was attentive to details and able to identify the student's mistakes.
André Giacomini	Teaches reasonably well but does not demonstrate with mastery, highlighting his lack of advanced piloting skills. Can correct some issues but does not fully understand the reasons behind certain mistakes.
Luiz	Teaches with a lot of detail but is unable to demonstrate the procedures, which reflects a lack of advanced piloting skills.
Marcio	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects satisfactorily.
André Luiz	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects satisfactorily. Was attentive to details and quickly identified student mistakes.

March 22, 2025 – 9:00 a.m.

We began the day at 9:00 a.m. working on the following procedures:

- Engine safety checklist
- Starting procedure

These procedures were demonstrated to the candidates, who were then asked to repeat the presentation. All candidates performed satisfactorily in this stage.

Next, we went to the field to conduct the hand tow training session, where all participants had the opportunity to act both as the student and as the tow instructor.

At the time, the wind was relatively strong—approximately 20 km/h. The exercise was carried out because all participants were pilots; however, it became clear that placing a student in such conditions would not be advisable. We used the opportunity to highlight several risks. All candidates performed well both as students and as instructors during the towed flight exercise.

March 22, 2025 – 2:00 p.m. – Pre-Solo Flight Briefing

A complete pre-solo flight briefing was delivered by Alexandre to all candidates. Following that, each candidate was invited to repeat the briefing.

.

Assessment by Alan

Nivanil Galvão	Clear and concise briefing, with a well-structured explanation.
André Giacomini	Clear and concise briefing, with a well-structured explanation.
Luiz	Clear and concise briefing, with a well-structured explanation.
Marcio	Good public speaking, but showed difficulty in organizing the information.
André Luiz	Good public speaking, but demonstrated difficulty in organizing the information.

Assessment by Alexandre

Nivanil Galvão	Presented the briefing clearly, illustrating the first flight plan with good examples. Very satisfactory.
André Giacomini	Presented the briefing clearly, with very good communication at each stage. Very satisfactory.
Luiz	Presented the briefing clearly, was objective in presenting the plan, and illustrated the signals well.
Marcio	Presented the plan in a somewhat confusing and insecure manner. With assistance, he developed the plan reasonably well but needs improvement.
André Luiz	Has good public speaking, but gave a confusing presentation without following the step-by-step structure of the plan. With assistance, he was able to present the plan reasonably, but improvement is needed.

Suspended Harness Exercise

Right after the briefing, we began the suspended harness exercises. We demonstrated the exercises and asked the candidates to repeat the presentation. All candidates performed well in this stage.

March 23, 2025 – 8:30 a.m. – Taxiing with Motor and Wing

We started the day with motor and wing taxiing practice, where each candidate had the opportunity to play the role of both student and instructor during the procedure.

Assessment by Alan – Motor and Wing Taxiing Exercise

Nivanil Galvão	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects satisfactorily.
André Giacomini	Teaches satisfactorily, managed to demonstrate the exercise, although not cleanly. Was able to make the necessary corrections.
Luiz	Lacks the ability to demonstrate the exercise.
Marcio	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects satisfactorily.
André Luiz	Teaches, demonstrates, and corrects satisfactorily.

Assessment by Alexandre – Motor and Wing Taxiing Exercise

Nivanil Galvão	Performed the exercise very well, assisting the student with inflation, posture, and wing landing. He also demonstrated how to execute the procedure.
André G.	Performed the exercise well, effectively guiding the student through the taxiing process..
Luiz	Was unable to perform the exercise as a student in training, which led the group to apply teaching techniques on the topic. In this sense, his participation was useful for the exercise, but it also made it even more evident that he is unable to demonstrate basic paramotor procedures. He did, however, provide satisfactory guidance when assisting the student.
Marcio	Performed the exercise well, effectively guiding the student through the taxiing process.
André Luiz	Performed the exercise well, effectively guiding the student through the taxiing process.

March 23, 2025 – 10:00 a.m Solo Flight

Next, we moved on to the solo flight exercise, during which Alexandre played the role of a student, intentionally reproducing several common mistakes, such as:

- Lack of posture correction
- Improper grip on the controls
- Incorrect hand positioning
- Throttle control errors
- Excessive pendulum motion
- Turns with too much brake input
- Low-altitude flight
- Turning in the wrong direction
- Communication failure

All candidates were required to guide the takeoff, navigation, and landing, instructing the student via radio. Later, the landing was conducted with communication solely through visual signals.

Assessment by Alan – Solo Flight Exercise

Nivanil Galvão	Calm and clear instruction, but with some gaps. For example, during takeoff, he forgot to use the agreed-upon cue "full motor" and allowed the student to remain flying close to the ground for an extended distance.
André Giacomini	Calm demeanor, good radio diction, and reasonably acceptable commands.
Luiz	Stressful instruction, with imprecise commands.
Marcio	Calm and precise guidance.
André Luiz	Guidance included some excess information and slight imprecision.

Parecer Alexandre

Nivanil Galvão	Calm instruction and good communication, but with communication gaps and some deficiencies in timing and overall guidance.
André Giacomini	Calm instruction, very good communication and guidance. Some areas to improve, but overall satisfactory performance.
Luiz	Nervous and imprecise guidance, poor timing of instructions. Needs considerable improvement.
Marcio	Calm, precise instruction with excellent communication. Satisfactory performance.
André Luiz	Slightly tense and excessive in delivery. Good communication and borderline performance, needs improvement.

March 23, 2025 – 12:00 p.m. – Theoretical Exam

Two different exams were given to the candidates. One consisted of 20 multiple-choice questions covering basic theoretical topics, and the other included 10 written-response questions on subjects addressed during the workshop.

The candidates had 1 hour and 15 minutes to complete the exam.

Written Exams

	Multiple-Choice Exam Score	Written-Response Exam Score
Nivanil Galvão	70	70
André Giacomini	80	7,5
Luiz	85	80
Marcio	60	0
André Luiz	70	90

FINAL EVALUATION

Nivanil Galvão	Approved as Instructor	Demonstrated advanced piloting skills, aptitude for both theoretical and practical instruction, good procedures, and the ability to teach and demonstrate effectively. There are some gaps to be addressed, but the pilot shows clear potential to improve with the feedback provided during the workshop.
André Giacomini	Not Approved	Showed aptitude in conducting both theoretical and practical lessons, communicates well, is attentive to procedures, and demonstrates calmness and clarity. However, he lacks advanced piloting skills and is currently unable to properly demonstrate procedures to students.
Luiz Alves	Not Approved	Displays strong theoretical knowledge but becomes confused with some procedures and is verbose in certain instructions. In addition, he does not demonstrate advanced piloting skills.
Marcio	Not Approved	Demonstrated advanced piloting skills but with a posture issue that must be corrected (habits from free flight). He has excellent communication and attention to procedures, but lacks preparation in structuring theoretical content as well as sufficient theoretical knowledge. He also failed the theoretical exams.
André Luiz	Approved as Assistant Instructor, with Requirements for Future Instructor Approval	Demonstrated advanced piloting skills, good communication, and attention to procedures. However, he lacks preparation in structuring theoretical content and conducting practical instruction. To complete his instructor training, he must undergo a mentorship period focused on delivering theoretical instruction and flight training via radio to students.

RECORDS

All procedures were recorded on video. The videos, as well as the written exams, will remain available to APPI until the conclusion of the instructor certification process.