



Policy Statement

Validation of Instrument Flight Procedures

1 Overview

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to set out UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) policy on the validation of Conventional and RNAV instrument flight procedures (IFP) designed by the CAA and third-party IFP approved procedure designers (APD).
- 1.2 ICAO PANS-OPS Doc 8168 Volume II, Part I, Section 2, Chapter 4; ICAO Doc 8071 Volume 1 Chapter 8 and Volume II Chapter 5; and ICAO Doc 9906 Volume 1 form the requirement and basis for validation of instrument flight procedures together with any additional requirements as stated in this document.
- 1.3 The Department for Transport has delegated to the CAA the responsibility for ensuring the safe design of instrument flight procedures within the UK and the CAA is therefore required to establish an IFP regulatory framework to ensure compliance with its responsibility.
- 1.4 The process for producing instrument flight procedures encompasses the acquisition of data, and the design and promulgation of procedures. It starts with the compilation and verification of the many inputs and ends with ground and/or flight validation of the finished product and documentation for publication.
- 1.5 Consequently, ground and/or flight validation and, in the case of RNAV IFP, an additional navigation database validation become part of the package of IFP design activities that the CAA will require industry to complete.

2 Scope

- 2.1 This document addresses:
 - The ground validation of instrument flight procedures;
 - The flight validation of instrument flight procedures;
 - The navigation database validation of RNAV instrument flight procedures;
 - The flight validation crew and aircraft requirements; and
 - The meteorological conditions required for conducting flight validations.

3 Glossary of Terms

- 3.1 **Approved Procedure Designer (APD)** - An APD is a flight procedure designer who has met the competency requirements laid down by the CAA for the design of instrument flight procedures for aerodromes or heliports, which are under the jurisdiction of the CAA. (CAA)
- 3.2 **APV/Baro-VNAV** – An instrument approach procedure, which utilizes lateral and vertical guidance but does not meet the requirements established for precision approach and landing operations. (ICAO DOC 8168)
- 3.3 **‘Flyability’ of an IFP** - An assessment that the IFP is flyable by the anticipated range of aircraft types in various weight, speed and centre of gravity configurations, and in various weather conditions (temperature, wind effects and visibility). It is also designed to assess that the required aircraft manoeuvring is consistent with safe operating practices, and that flight crew workload is acceptable. (CAA)
- 3.4 **Independent Approved Procedure Designer (IAPD)** – An APD who has not been involved in the design of the IFP which is being validated, but can be part of the same organisation. (CAA).
- 3.5 **Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP)** - A series of pre-determined manoeuvres by reference to flight instruments with specific protection from obstacles from the initial approach fix, or where applicable, from the beginning of a defined arrival route to a point from which a landing can be completed and thereafter, if landing is not completed, to a position at which holding or en-route obstacle clearance criteria apply. (ICAO DOC 8168)
- 3.6 **Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP)** – A standard instrument departure (SID), or a planned departure route (PDR), a standard instrument arrival (STAR), or an instrument approach procedure (IAP). (CAA)
- 3.7 **Navigation Data Integrity Assurance (NADIA) Methodology**¹ - Procedure design data is distributed by AIS to all three navigation database providers (Jeppesen, Lufthansa Systems Flight Nav Inc (LSY) and EAG Navtech) in advance of the effective date. The data is formatted and incorporated into their respective databases. In parallel, independent comparison of the navigation database output from the three providers is performed, allowing the ANSP to ensure that all participants are in complete agreement as to the interpretation of the IFPs. Should any discrepancies arise, corrective action can be taken before the AIRAC or IFP effective date.
- 3.8 **RNAV T- or Y- Bar Procedure** – An RNAV non-precision approach or APV incorporating a T- or Y- bar arrangement. It is based on a runway aligned final segment preceded by an intermediate segment and up to three initial segments arranged either side of, and along, the final approach track to form a T or a Y. The lateral initial segments are based on course differences of 70° to 90° from the intermediate segment track. (ICAO DOC 8168)
- 3.9 **Sponsor** – An aerodrome licensee or representative from an aerodrome acting on the licensee’s behalf, or an ANSP, who proposes a new design, changes to, or withdrawal of an IFP. (CAA)

¹ See also, presentation of outcome from EUROCONTROL contract on data integrity at: [http://www.ecacnav.com/Document_Library/Presentations/Data base_Coding_Workshop.html](http://www.ecacnav.com/Document_Library/Presentations/Data_base_Coding_Workshop.html)

4 Validation

- 4.1 Validation is the final step in the procedure design process, prior to publication in the State AIP. The purpose of validation is to confirm the accuracy and completeness of all relevant obstacle and navigation data, and to assess the flyability of the IFP.
- 4.2 Validation comprises a ground validation element and may also comprise a flight validation element. In the case of RNAV procedures, a navigation database validation is also required.
- 4.3 The APD will compile an instrument flight procedure validation package for use in the ground / flight validation process. Each validation package shall include the following:
- A plan view of the final approach obstacle evaluation template, drawn on an appropriate topographical map of scale 1:50,000 to safely accommodate use for navigation, elevated terrain analysis, obstacles and obstructions evaluation;
 - Completed documents that identify associated terrain, obstacles and obstructions as applicable to the procedure. The controlling terrain/obstacle should be identified and highlighted on the appropriate chart;
 - Minimum altitudes determined to be applicable from map studies and database information for each segment of the procedure;
 - A narrative description of the instrument approach procedure;
 - Plan and profile pictorial views of the instrument approach procedure;
 - Documented data as applicable for each fix, intersection, and/or holding pattern; and
 - The output from the navaid coverage analysis that was conducted by/for the APD together with any supporting data and design assumptions.
- 4.4 The sponsor is responsible for all elements of the validation and shall document their proposed validation activities in a plan and submit as early as possible for agreement with the CAA DAP Controlled Airspace Section.

5 Ground Validation

- 5.1 The aim of ground validation is to reveal any errors in criteria application and documentation, and assess the flyability of the IFP.
- 5.2 Ground validation comprises the following elements:
- Aerodrome assessment - Verify that the infrastructure required for the provision of an instrument runway as required by CAP 168 Licensing of Aerodromes is in place;
 - Navigational aid coverage – Verify that the navigational aid coverage infrastructure required for the instrument flight procedure as required by CAP 670 ATS safety requirements and ICAO DOC 8071 is in place;
 - Obstacle clearance review – A review conducted by an IAPD for each route segment;
 - Charting review – A review of the chart conducted by an IAPD;

- Coding review – A review of the coding of RNAV IFP conducted by an IAPD; and
 - Flyability assessment - with the use of software tools, e.g. PC-based to full flight simulator, which can be used to evaluate a range of aircraft types in various weight, speed and centre of gravity configurations, and in various weather conditions (temperature, wind effects and visibility), it should be possible to evaluate the flyability of most procedures.
- 5.3 Where a flyability assessment is conducted using a flight simulator the following elements shall be evaluated:
- All segments of the instrument flight procedure shall be assessed;
 - In the case of SIDs and PDRs, all segments of the procedure from the departure end of the runway (DER) to joining the en-route structure or termination point shall be assessed; and
 - In the case of IAPs all segments of the procedure from the Arrival/ Initial Fix through to the Missed Approach shall be assessed.
- 5.4 Where procedures share the same segment of flight (e.g. initial), the shared segment needs only to be validated once.
- 5.5 In the case of RNAV IFP a test database for the full flight simulator produced by an appropriate navigation data provider for use in the flight management system (FMS) shall be used. (See section 7 for navigation database validation).
- 5.6 Where a ground validation cannot fully verify the accuracy and completeness of all obstacle and navigation data considered in the procedure design or the flyability of the IFP, the CAA may decide that the flight validation is required. The CAA in determining whether a flight validation is required shall consider a number of factors. These include, but are not limited to the following:
- Deviation from PANS-OPS criteria;
 - Speed restrictions applied in the design;
 - Any segment length less than PANS-OPS optimum length;
 - A descent gradient used in the design greater than 6.1% for a non-precision approach and 3.5° for a precision approach;
 - Procedures designed for use in a challenging terrain area and/or dense obstacle environment;
 - Use of a Step Down Fix (SDF) in the final approach segment;
 - A track change of greater than 90° at a waypoint has been used within an RNAV procedure;
 - The introduction of new procedures at an aerodrome;
 - A procedure type that is new to the UK; and
 - Special crew procedures and/or operational techniques likely to be necessary to fly the procedures.

6 Flight Validation

- 6.1 Flight validation shall be carried out, in cases when ground validation determines that flight validation is necessary.
- 6.2 The objectives of the flight validation of IFP are:
- Obstacle verification.
- Flight validation should aim to verify the obstacle that is identified as the controlling obstacle for each segment, and to check that no new obstacles have been erected since the design was undertaken, or that no existing obstacles have been charted with grossly incorrect heights along the designated track; and
 - Such validations must be carried out in daylight hours in VMC and are flown at the minimum published altitude. The final approach segment should be flown at an altitude 30m (100ft) below the proposed minimum descent altitude on a non-precision approach and should be flown ½ scale deflection low, evaluated according to the decision altitude on a precision approach.
- Flyability Assessment.
- Flight validation can provide a detailed assessment of crew workload and charting issues. However, due to the limitation of data received from one aircraft under flight validation conditions, relying on ground validation for a flyability assessment may provide a more comprehensive analysis.
- 6.3 Where a flight validation is conducted the following elements shall be evaluated:
- All segments of the instrument flight procedure shall be flown;
 - In the case of SIDs and PDRs, all segments of the procedure from the departure end of the runway (DER) to joining the en-route structure or termination point shall be flown; and
 - In the case of IAPs all segments of the procedure from the Arrival/ Initial Fix through to the end of the Missed Approach shall be flown.
 - Flight validation of the Visual Manoeuvring area shall also be carried out.
- 6.4 Where procedures share the same segment of flight (e.g. initial), the shared segment needs only to be validated once.
- 6.5 In the case of RNAV IFP a test database produced by an appropriate navigation data-coding provider for use in the RNAV system shall be used. (See section 7 for navigation database validation).
- 6.6 However, in the case of RNAV (GNSS) IAPs of a T- or Y- bar design, manual entry of the procedure into the RNAV system in use is acceptable. In this case the validating pilot will need to manually activate the Course Deviation Indicator (CDI) scaling changes during the different phases of the flight. (See section 7 for navigation database validation).
- 6.7 The use of trials can provide comprehensive flight validation in a number of aircraft types under controlled conditions. The data should be assessed to determine how best it applies to the instrument flight procedure under consideration.

6.8 Crew Requirements

- 6.8.1 The minimum crew of the validation aircraft shall be one pilot to validate the IFP and an observer to assist the pilot in the validation process while observing the “out of cockpit” environment. In the case of an aircraft requiring two pilots, one of the pilots may carry out the observer role. It is desirable that the observer has ICAO PANS-OPS Volume II knowledge.
- 6.8.2 Where the procedure to be flight validated is an RNAV (GNSS) IAP of a T- or Y- bar design and is to be manually loaded into the RNAV system, the flight validation pilot shall ensure that the observer is fully competent in the use of the RNAV system to be used for the flight.
- 6.8.3 Flight validation shall be accomplished by a pilot with all of the following current qualifications:
- Commercial Pilot's Licence or Airline Transport Pilot's Licence (A) or (H) as applicable;
 - Instrument Rating; and
 - Flight Instructor Rating with applied instrument instruction privileges or Instrument Rating Instructor Rating.

6.9 Aircraft Requirements

- 6.9.1 The aircraft to be used for flight validation of an IFP shall have the performance capabilities appropriate to the categories for which the IFP has been designed.

6.10 Meteorological Conditions

- 6.10.1 All IFP validation flights shall be conducted during daylight hours in visual meteorological conditions (VMC), which allow the flight to be carried out with a flight visibility of not less than 8KM, and in sight of the surface throughout the flight validation of the procedure.

7 Navigation Database Validation

- 7.1 Navigation database validation is only applicable to RNAV instrument flight procedures. Such procedures are coded using ARINC 424 path terminators to define specific nominal tracks, which are defined by waypoint location, waypoint type, and path terminator and, where appropriate, speed constraint, altitude constraint and course.
- 7.2 The key element of a navigation database validation is to ensure that the coding of the procedure in the RNAV/FMS system does not compromise the flyability of the procedure.
- 7.3 For small projects and/or individual flight procedure designs the following is an acceptable method of conducting a navigation database validation.
- On the successful outcome of the ground and/or flight validation, the IFP would then be published in the AIP. Once a database is available with the IFP included (normally available 7-10 days before the effective date of the procedure), it will require validation in the RNAV system on the ground. The elements to be checked are set out in the database report in Appendix C.

- 7.4 For large projects affecting multiple procedures in an airspace change, where it may not be practicable to use the previous method, the NADIA methodology may be considered as an acceptable means of navigation database validation. It is also recommended that the ANSP liaise with AOC holders to take account of findings from their own navigation database checks prior to the IFP effective date. The suitability of any method employed for navigation database validation should be discussed with the CAA DAP Controlled Airspace Section at an early opportunity, in the context of the overall validation plan.
- 7.5 If the database validation is unable to take place until after the effective date of the IFP, then NOTAM action shall be required to delay the effective date.

8 Reports

- 8.1 Where a ground and/or flight and navigation database validation has been conducted, a report shall be completed by each of the following where applicable:
- Instrument flight procedure APD;
 - Validating pilot;
 - Relevant ATS unit.
- 8.2 The standard report format is shown in Appendices (A), (B), (C), and (D).
- 8.3 Validation reports shall be forwarded to the CAA via the sponsor after the final validation of the IFP has been completed. Completed reports shall be forwarded to:

Head of Controlled Airspace Section
Directorate Airspace Policy
CAA House K6
45-49 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6TE

References

- A. ICAO PANS-OPS Doc 8168 Volume II, Part I, Section 2, Chapter 4
- B. ICAO Doc 8071 Volume 1 Chapter 8 and Volume II Chapter 5
- C. ICAO Doc 9906 Volume 1

APD VALIDATION REPORT					
Airport Name					
Procedure Designer	Name	Approval No		Signature	
Validating Designer	Name	Approval No		Signature	
Requirement Correlation Matrix:					
Requirement No	Description of Requirement	Compliance Status			Comments
		Non-Compliant	Partially Compliant	Fully Compliant	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
Date					

APPENDIX A

MSA	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
TAA	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						

APPENDIX A

VMC	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
VSS	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						

APPENDIX A

Hold	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						

APPENDIX A

	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
	Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						

SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

Procedure Name	
Reference Aids	

Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
Initial Approach					
Intermediate Approach					
Final Approach					
Initial Missed Approach					
Intermediate Missed Approach					
Final Missed Approach					

SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

Procedure Name	
Reference Aids	

Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC Declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
Departure					

SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

Procedure Name	
Reference Aids	

Segment Name	Construction Correct	Obstacle Clearance Proven	Dominant Obstacle Identified	Minimum Altitude & MOC declared	Validating APD Signature/Initial
Arrival					

General Comments

We hereby declare that the procedures(s) as detailed COMPLY / DO NOT COMPLY with the DAP CAS process requirements.

	Name	Signature	Date
DESIGNER			
CHECKER			

SIMULATOR / FLIGHT VALIDATION REPORT				
Airport Name				
IFP Name				
Validating Pilot	Name	Title	Licence No	Signature
Aircraft Used	Aircraft Type		Aircraft Registration	
RNAV Equipment Used				
Database Provider				
Chart Provider				
AIRAC Date of Data				
Airport Authority	Name		Appointment	Signature
Date				

Pre Flight Checks For RNAV IFP	Requirement	Result	Remarks
	Procedure loaded and activated from an official database?	Yes / No	
	Waypoint coordinates agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	Tracks between waypoints agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	Distances between waypoints agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	RAIM checked?	Yes / No	
	Runway threshold coordinates confirmed? (<i>See note 2 below</i>)	Yes / No	

Segment of Flight		Requirement	Result	Remarks
Arrival	Type (*)			
		Descent Rates Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Lead radials give adequate warning of turns?	Yes / No	
		Transition to Next Segment Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Terminal mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

Initial Approach	Type (*)	Requirement	Result	Remarks
		IAF easily identified?	Yes / No	
		Descent Rates Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Lead radials give adequate warning of turns?	Yes / No	
		Transition to Next Segment Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		After turns, roll out close to the next intended track?	Yes / No	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Terminal mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

Intermediate Approach	Type (*)	Requirement	Result	Remarks
		IF easily identified?	Yes / No	
		Intermediate segment length?	Acceptable / Un-Acceptable	
		Descent Rates Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Transition to Next Segment Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		After turns, roll out close to the next intended track?	Yes / No	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Terminal mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

Final Approach	Non-Precision	Requirement	Result	Remarks
		FAF easily identified?	Yes / No	
		Final segment length acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Descent Rates Acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Descent profiles provide a CDA to 50 ft above THR?	Yes / No	
		Are all SDF Altitude restrictions on or below recommended profile?	Yes / No	
		Visual indicators coincide with the constant decent profile?	Yes / No	
		Transition to Next Segment Acceptable?	Acceptable / Un-Acceptable	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Approach mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

Final Approach	Precision	Requirement	Result	Remarks
		Smooth interception onto the Localizer?	Yes / No	
		Is there a smooth transition from the Intermediate segment at the FAP (Glide slope interception)?	Yes / No	
		Glide path angle and localizer stable?	Yes / No	
		Do the Visual indicators co-inside with the constant decent profile?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

APPENDIX B

Missed Approach		Requirement	Result	Remarks
		Mapt easily identified?	Yes / No	
		Track adjustments at Mapt (if any) acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Track interceptions (if any) after turn achievable?	Yes / No	
		Does profile agree with visual indicators?	Yes / No	
		Minima reached at or before Mapt?	Yes / No	
		Published missed approach gradients achievable?	Yes / No	
		Missed approach turns (if any) acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Terminal mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Missed approach termination suitable for either further approach or diversion?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

General		Requirement	Result	Remarks
		All designated QDR/QDM stable	Yes / No	
		Did any unlocks occur?	Yes / No	
		Overall ease of use of the procedure	Acceptable / Un-Acceptable	
		Overall workload?	Low / Medium / High	
		Any obstructions observed that caused concern?	Yes / No	
		General impression of the procedure. (1-9) (V Poor =1, V good = 9)		
VM(C)		VM(C) areas safe for specified aircraft categories?	Yes / No	

APPENDIX B

Departure		Requirement	Result	Remarks
		Track keeping acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Vertical profile/ Climb gradients acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Turns acceptable/flyable?	Yes / No	
		Track interceptions (if any) after turn achievable?	Yes / No	
		Sufficient track guidance available?	Yes / No	
		Speed restrictions (if any) acceptable?	Yes / No	
		Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	
		Sequencing of waypoints correct?	Yes / No	
		CDI scale changes activated at appropriate phase of procedure? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Terminal mode activated at appropriate range? (<i>See note 3 below</i>)	Yes / No	
		Turn anticipation for all waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Stabilisation distances between waypoints satisfactory?	Yes / No	
		Cockpit workload?	Low / Medium / High	

General Comments (Obstacle reporting information if required shall also be stated here):

Simulator/Flight Validation Result	Simulator/ Flight Captain
Acceptable	Name & Licence No
Not Acceptable	Signature
Deferred	Date

(*) - Straight, DME Arc, Hold, Racetrack, Alternative procedure, Procedure turn 45/180 - 80/260, Base Turn. etc

Note.

1. Where a report item is not applicable for the procedure being validated, delete as required.
2. If the Runway threshold coordinates cannot be confirmed the validation should be discontinued.
3. Where a procedure has been manually entered into the RNAV system in use, this process will not occur automatically. In this case the validating pilot will need to activate the CDI scaling changes during the different phases of the flight.

NAVIGATION DATABASE VALIDATION REPORT				
Airport Name				
IFP Name				
Validating Pilot	Name	Title	Licence No	Signature
Aircraft Used	Aircraft Type		Aircraft Registration	
RNAV Equipment Used				
Database Provider				
Chart Provider				
AIRAC Date of Data				
Airport Authority	Name		Appointment	Signature
Date				

	Requirement	Result	Remarks
	Procedure loaded and activated from an official database?	Yes / No	
	Waypoint coordinates agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	Tracks between waypoints agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	Distances between waypoints agree with charted information?	Yes / No	
	Speed Limits correctly coded?	Yes / No	
	Altitude restrictions correctly coded?	Yes / No	

<u>General Comments</u>	
Database Validation Result	Simulator/ Flight Captain
Pass	Name & Licence No
Fail	Signature
	Date

Note. Where a report item is not applicable for the procedure being validated, delete as required.

ATS VALIDATION REPORT				
Airport Name				
Validating ATCO	Name	Appointment		Signature
Airport Authority	Name	Appointment		Signature
Procedure Name	RWY	Acceptable	Un-acceptable	Remarks
Date				