	Ref		Section No.	
IFALPA			**DF/9**	
Deficiency Form				

Dear Colleague: IFALPA is in the process of gathering data for the study of the compliance with ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices. We would appreciate your completion of this form

DATE: _____   **NAME (optional)** _____

FLIGHT NO _____   **FROM** _____   **TO** _____
(Please add ICAO and/or IATA code)

EN-ROUTE NAVIGATION: Unserviceable Navigation Aids

No.	FIR	NAV AID Ident/freq	VOR /DME / NDB	Published by NOTAM	
1				○ Yes	○ No
2				○ Yes	○ No
3				○ Yes	○ No
4				○ Yes	○ No
5				○ Yes	○ No

EN-ROUTE COMMUNICATIONS:

No	GND Stn Call Sign	Waypoint	Freq	Time (HF)	Congestion Low/Med/High	Freq in use for gnd - gnd coms	Readability
1						○ Yes ○ No	
2						○ Yes ○ No	
3						○ Yes ○ No	
4						○ Yes ○ No	
5						○ Yes ○ No	
6						○ Yes ○ No	
7						○ Yes ○ No	
8						○ Yes ○ No	
9						○ Yes ○ No	
10						○ Yes ○ No	

0 – no contact, 1 - unreadable, 2 – readable now & then, 3 – readable but with difficulty, 4- readable, 5 – perfectly readable

APPROACH/AERODROME COMMUNICATION

A	Approach communications		○ Good	○ Acceptable	○ Poor*
B	Aerodrome Communication (including Tower)		○ Good	○ Acceptable	○ Poor*
C	Congestion due frequency sharing (appr-twr/twr-gnd)	○ N/A	○ Good	○ Acceptable	○ Poor*

* Please specify in Any Other Comments box on reverse side

APPROACH AND LANDING – Runway Used _____

A	Type of approach executed:	○ ILS ○ LLZ DME ○ VOR DME ○ VOR ○ NDB ○ Circling/Visual		
B	Was Radar Service provided:	○ Yes	○ No	○ N/A
C	Quality of Radar Service provided:	○ Good	○ Acceptable	○ Poor*
D	Quality of Appr. Nav Aids used:	○ Good	○ Acceptable	○ Poor*
E	Unserviceable aids / services published by **NOTAM?**	○ Yes	○ No*	○ N/A
F*	Please specify which u/s Navaids were not NOTAMed			

LIGHTING

A	Was approach lighting	○ Serv	○ Part Serv	○ U/S	○ N/A (daylight)
B	Was VASI/PAPI sercviceable / reliable	○ Yes	○ No		○ Not installed
C	Were threshold lights: serviceable/partly serv/unserv/not appl	○ Serv	○ Part Serv	○ U/S	○ N/A
D	Were r/w edge lights: servic/partly serv/unserviceable/not appl	○ Serv	○ Part Serv	○ U/S	○ N/A
E	Was taxiway lighting adequate?	○ Yes	○ No		○ N/A (Daylight)
F	Was apron lighting adequate?	○ Yes	○ No		○ N/A (Daylight)
G	In case any of the above were unserviceable or only partly serviceable, was this fact published by **NOTAM?**	○ Yes	○ No		○ N/A

RUNWAY CHARACTERISTICS (R/W [   ])

A	Condition	○ Smooth	○ Rough	○ Damaged
B	Slippery when wet	○ Yes	○ No	○ N/A (Dry)
C	Surface State? **HEAVY** rubber accretion in **TDZ**	○ Yes		○ No
D	Were surface markings clear?	○ Yes		○ No

METEOROLOGICAL INFORMATION

A	Was valid forecast (**TAF**) available at departure airport?		○ Yes	○ No
B	Was weather information readily available upon first contact with destin. **ATC**?		○ Yes	○ No
C	Was weather information recent, if not pse specify		○ Yes	○ No
D	Was weather information accurate, if not pse specify		○ Yes	○ No
E	If ATIS published was it available	○ N/A	○ Yes	○ No
F	If ATIS provided, was it accurate, if not pse specify	○ N/A	○ Yes	○ No

HAZARDS / SECURITY

A	Were airports manoeuvring areas secure of animals/humans?		○ Yes	○ No
B	Was there a significant bird/wildlife hazard?		○ Yes	○ No
C	Do you consider airport security	○ Good	○ Satisfactory	○ Poor

If unable to assess this yourself, on any of the above, please include your agents' opinion:

NOTAMS (Were NOTAMS factually correct and up to date, if not pse specify)

COMMENT ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE USED ON R/T

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

Document: Revision 2, 04 Apr 2011.