There is a particular moment in multi-crew training where the air stops feeling abstract and starts feeling procedural. You are not just “flying an approach.” You are managing speed changes, automation modes, scan discipline, and the coordination rhythm that keeps two pilots synchronized under pressure. That is where advanced IFR training and APS MCC training really earn their place, and it is also why simulator training, when done well, can be more valuable than many people expect.

AELO Swiss Academy, based in Switzerland with training in the Locarno/Gordola area in Ticino, has built part of its training proposition around exactly that kind of advanced simulator work. The academy is EASA-approved as an Approved Training Organization (with code CH.ATO.0311 shown on its site), it was established in 1985, and it describes modern training equipment including a Boeing 737 NG simulator for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. It also highlights other programs such as an 18-month ATPL integrated program and a SkyAlps Airlines MPL program. The academy’s precise training syllabus details are not something I can claim beyond what it publicly states, but the training aim is clear: take structured IFR competence and multi-crew practice into a realistic, repeatable environment.

What makes the Boeing 737 NG piece interesting, for students and employers alike, is not brand loyalty. It is the practical promise that a “real transport” simulator can help you internalize standardized workflows, callouts, and role clarity. Even before you reach the more technical topics like departures, interceptions, and approach stabilization, the simulator becomes a place where your mental model of a two-pilot operation solidifies.

Why “advanced IFR” feels different from basic IFR

Basic IFR instruction often focuses on getting you through the mechanics: tracking, vertical guidance, radio work, and understanding what the avionics are doing. Advanced IFR training, at least in the way most professional training environments target it, shifts your attention toward execution quality.

The aircraft may be stable on the display, but the real task is stability in your process. You start asking questions like: Did we brief the approach properly, or did we just “read” the plate? Are we managing speed to protect configuration and targets, or are we chasing numbers after the fact? Do we select modes confidently, or do we react when the airplane moves the wrong way?

In my experience, the most common problem in advanced IFR is not that pilots cannot fly the aircraft. It is that they can fly it in isolation, but they do not yet fly it as part of a system: procedures, automation modes, wind changes, crew coordination, and contingency handling. When training moves to an advanced stage, that gap becomes visible fast.

A simulator that supports repeated IFR scenarios helps because it turns those “almost correct” habits into something you can correct before they become muscle memory. You get to see the same lesson show up in different forms, with slightly different constraints, rather than getting one good attempt and one lucky save.

What APS MCC really means in practice

APS MCC is one of those abbreviations that can sound like an acronym salad until you meet it in the training environment. MCC, multi-crew cooperation, is about how two qualified people divide attention, confirm actions, and manage errors without turning a mistake into a normalization-of-deviation.

APS adds another layer of focus on the procedural side of crew operations. The core value for students is not just “learning to call things out.” It is developing a consistent culture of verification and control sharing. That includes understanding when the pilot flying should stay heads-down on control inputs and when the pilot not flying should become proactive, scanning for the next problem and challenging gently when the plan slips.

In a Boeing 737 NG simulator, the operational environment naturally pushes you toward this kind of discipline. You cannot really coast on basic flying skill if you are managing mode changes, speed and thrust logic, and crew flow in a transport cockpit context. The cockpit becomes a choreography: one pilot’s task links to the other pilot’s confirmations, and both link to what the aircraft is doing right now.

That is why students often describe MCC segments as uncomfortable at first. You are not used to having your decisions met with structured checks. But discomfort is usually the sign that you are being trained out of a solo mindset.

Where a 737 NG simulator fits into the learning curve

AELO Swiss Academy specifically mentions using a Boeing 737 NG simulator for advanced IFR and APS MCC training. When a training provider chooses a simulator with a transport category platform behind it, the practical benefit is that you can train like an operator, not like a private pilot who happens to have instruments.

The simulator does a few things well, if the instruction and scenario design are solid:

First, it compresses time. Instead of waiting until real weather, real air traffic, and real aircraft availability create the perfect learning window, you can enter scenarios that teach the same underlying skill. Second, it allows repetition without accumulating real-world risk. Third, it makes automation behavior something you can learn intentionally, rather than discovering it incidentally.

Still, there is a trade-off. Simulators can make it easy to become confident too fast if the training does not force you to maintain strict scan discipline. A transport cockpit is unforgiving about “automation complacency.” You can be technically correct on the controls and still be wrong on the plan, the timing, or the callout sequence. Good training keeps pulling you back to the basics: what mode are we in, what do we expect next, and who verifies it?

That is a mindset shift, and it is why advanced IFR and APS MCC usually work best together. IFR is not just a set of procedures. It is also a workload driver. MCC is the method for handling that workload with two people instead of one, and the simulator becomes the stage where you practice both.

The kinds of skills you build during advanced IFR in a crew setting

A solo IFR skill can become shaky when you add another pilot's scan, workload, and confirmations. Conversely, a crew coordination habit can look great until you hit a tight procedure moment and realize that your callouts are not actually synchronized with the aircraft's guidance.

In advanced IFR plus APS MCC training, you tend to strengthen several interconnected skills:

- Mode management as a shared language. One pilot selects, the other pilot verifies and monitors, and the crew aligns on what "active" means versus what "armed" means.
- Approach discipline that starts early. The earlier you brief targets, altitudes, speeds, stabilization criteria, and go-around triggers, the less you rely on reactive control.
- Workload shaping. You learn to plan which tasks happen before you get busy, and which tasks are handled after you get stabilized, so you are not both "doing everything" at the same time.
- Communication that is concise and decision-oriented. Not just "call the altitude," but "confirm we are stable for the next segment," and "challenge if targets drift."
- Contingency handling. In transport operations, "something unexpected" is not rare, and crews need a disciplined way to respond without improvising from scratch.

I am describing this as general training logic because the specific scenario list used by any one academy could vary. But the underlying skill set is consistent across professional IFR and multi-crew programs.

A realistic scenario: when crew timing matters more than flying skill

Let me paint a common pattern without inventing any AELO-specific exercise.

Imagine you are set up for an instrument approach with a stable intercept. Everything looks fine for a moment. Then the plan changes slightly, maybe due to a clearance update or a late wind consideration. In a well-trained crew, the pilot monitoring catches the mismatch between the brief and the current clearance, challenges respectfully, and the pilot flying adapts with a clean mode change or speed plan.

In a less disciplined crew, the pilot flying might make the right aircraft inputs but at the wrong time, or based on the wrong assumption. The pilot monitoring might "wait to see," rather than actively cross-checking targets and mode logic. The result is usually not a dramatic crash-level event. It is more subtle: a delayed stabilization, a late correction, an approach that gets flown with stress instead of precision.

This is exactly the kind of lesson simulators can teach effectively. The scenario repeats, the instructor can pause and assess the crew timing, and you get feedback on the coordination flow. Real flights will teach, but they do not always allow you to practice the specific fix in a controlled repeatable loop.

If a training environment also teaches in a transport cockpit context, like a 737 NG simulator, you can connect the lesson to realistic automation behavior. That matters because many "crew timing" failures are really "automation timing" failures.

How to get real value from simulator-based advanced IFR and APS MCC

A simulator can be either a powerful training tool or an expensive distraction. The difference is rarely the hardware alone. It is the way students engage, how instructors coach, and how the crew process is reinforced after each attempt.

Here are a few practical ways I have seen students squeeze the most learning out of an advanced IFR and MCC segment, without turning the training into a box-checking exercise:

1. Treat mode readouts as part of the conversation, not background information.
2. Ask yourself after every segment, “Did we fly the plan, or did we react to the plan?”
3. Practice concise callouts that connect action to target, like “speed stable at X, next check at Y.”
4. Accept that mistakes will happen, then focus on the specific correction you need next time.
5. Use the debrief to build a personal “crew script,” what you say, when you say it, and what you verify.

Notice that this is not about memorizing phrases for the sake of sounding procedural. It is about creating a mental structure that makes it harder to miss the important thing.

The coaching style matters too. Instructors who give feedback only on altitude or runway track can miss the bigger picture. For APS MCC, you want feedback that touches crew coordination, challenge-response timing, and shared understanding of automation.

Where AELO Swiss Academy fits in the broader training pathway

AELO Swiss Academy is not presented as a one-off simulator shop. The academy positions itself around broader pilot education, including an 18-month ATPL integrated program and a SkyAlps Airlines MPL program, and it describes modern training equipment including the Boeing 737 NG simulator for advanced IFR and APS MCC training.

There is a practical advantage for students when advanced IFR and MCC are embedded into an integrated program rather than treated as a detached add-on. You typically build IFR competence progressively, then you apply it in a crew context, while the earlier knowledge is still fresh enough to be used under load. Even with no guarantee details beyond what is publicly claimed, the educational logic is straightforward.

It can also help when a training organization is located in a consistent operational region, and AELO’s training base is described in the Locarno/Gordola area in Ticino, with a program page listing Aeroporto 21, 6596 Gordola, Switzerland. That kind of continuity often matters for logistics, scheduling, and the overall flow from ground training to simulation sessions to consolidation.

The academy also notes it was formerly known as Aero Locarno, referenced on its site and via “powered by AeroLocarno” wording seen on ***aelo*** its former branding. Again, that does not tell you anything technical about the simulator training itself, but it does suggest institutional maturity and an established training presence dating back to its 1985 founding.

The judgment calls advanced IFR demands, even with automation

Advanced IFR in a Boeing 737 NG context is not simply pushing buttons. Automation gives you options, but it does not absolve you of judgment.

Some of the judgment areas that often separate competent from excellent include:

- Choosing whether to rely on guidance modes versus reverting to a more direct flying strategy when the plan becomes unstable
- Recognizing when a “correct mode” is still a “wrong outcome” because speed, path, or configuration targets are not being protected
- Deciding how much to communicate when workload spikes, without drowning the crew in chatter

- Handling go-around decisions cleanly and early, with crew coordination aligned from the start

Instructors typically want you to show that you can think in terms of outcomes, not just buttonology. That is why MCC and IFR work together so naturally. Crew operation is an outcome-driven discipline. You decide together what you are trying to achieve, then you execute and monitor.

Common pitfalls when students transition into advanced IFR plus MCC

Even disciplined students can stumble when they move into advanced IFR and multi-crew cooperation at the same time. The transition often reveals patterns that would otherwise stay hidden.

One pitfall is “solo competence masking.” A student may fly well when alone but struggle to coordinate under crew timing pressure. Another pitfall is “communication drift,” where callouts become long or vague, and the other pilot cannot quickly confirm what matters. A third pitfall is treating automation modes as static settings rather than dynamic guidance that depends on armed and active states.

The simulator helps expose these pitfalls because the instructor can highlight exactly when crew timing slipped, when the pilot monitoring did not challenge, or when the crew did not align expectations before a mode change.

To be blunt, this is also why debrief quality matters more in advanced training than in beginners’ training. A beginner can learn by repetition. An advanced student must learn by diagnosis: why the crew did what it did, and what needs to change next time for the same outcome to occur more reliably.

A debrief that actually improves your next flight

If you take one thing from advanced IFR and APS MCC training, it should be that the simulator debrief is part of the lesson, not a formality. The goal is not to “get through the session.” The goal is to correct the failure mode you demonstrated, then carry the correction forward into the next scenario.

Good debriefs usually focus on:

- What the crew intended versus what the airplane actually did
- Whether the pilot flying and pilot monitoring roles stayed clear
- Whether the brief connected directly to the execution
- Which callouts were missing, late, or unnecessary

Even without knowing the exact method AELO uses internally, that structure is common to effective MCC and IFR training because it targets the levers that change real outcomes.

Who benefits most from Boeing 737 NG simulator exposure

Simulator exposure to a Boeing 737 NG platform can be especially valuable for students who are serious about turning instrument competence into transport cockpit habits. It can also benefit those who need help managing automation mentally, because the cockpit environment forces you to learn the “state” of the aircraft and guidance system rather than just flying by reference points.

In programs like those AELO describes, including an 18-month ATPL integrated program and an MPL pathway, the advanced IFR and APS MCC simulator segment can function like a bridge between technical IFR flying and the real workflow of multi-crew operations.

And if you are choosing training based on equipment, it is worth recognizing that the simulator is only one component. The instructors, the feedback style, the realism of the scenarios, and the way crew roles are practiced and assessed determine whether the hardware becomes a training accelerator or a checklist exercise.

What to watch for before you commit

Because training choices affect time, cost, and career trajectory, it is reasonable to ask direct questions before enrolling. You do not need a dramatic interview. You just want clarity.

Here is a short set of questions that tend to surface the practical truth behind “advanced IFR and APS MCC” claims:

- How does the instructor evaluate crew cooperation, not just aircraft handling?
- Are there structured debriefs that focus on mode awareness and role clarity?
- How do scenarios progress from controlled IFR to higher workload crew coordination?
- What training elements are included within the program, such as advanced IFR and MCC segments?
- How is performance tracked so you can see improvement between sessions?

A training academy in this category will usually be able to explain the learning flow in a way that makes the simulator purpose clear, not just impressive.

The bottom line

Advanced IFR and APS MCC training are not separate worlds. They are the same world, viewed through different lenses. Advanced IFR teaches you to execute procedures with discipline under load. APS MCC teaches you to coordinate that execution with another professional, with shared expectations and timely verification. Put together in a Boeing 737 NG simulator environment, the training can help you build the habits that matter on day one of real multi-crew operations.

AELO Swiss Academy’s stated focus on advanced IFR and APS MCC training using a Boeing 737 NG simulator, combined with its EASA Approved Training Organization status (CH.ATO.0311), its 1985 establishment, and its training base in the Locarno/Gordola area, points to a structured approach rather than a purely ad-hoc training model. If you are aiming for airline-style competence, the key is to look beyond marketing and pay attention to how the training shapes your scan, your crew language, and your ability to recover cleanly when the plan stops matching reality.