

ICAO NSP decided NOT to publish any example values for flight inspection periodicity extensions, because this depends on many local factors, such as facility and antenna system type, local climate, quality of the installation and properties of the surrounding terrain, site safeguarding, quality of maintenance, etc. Therefore it is not possible to give guidance which appropriately takes into account all these factors, even if current modern navigation systems with more digital architectures are generally likely to support such extensions. Nominal intervals are given as an order of magnitude, and the deviation from that should remain a reasonable multiple of that nominal interval, i.e., an extension by a factor of 5 for example would seem quite difficult to justify. Most periodicity extensions used by States do not exceed twice the nominal interval. Another reason why no specific values are given is that this then may give problems to those States which have done suitable analysis and have justified longer extension as those which would have been indicated by ICAO, which will always need to remain on the conservative side. States which are not comfortable with doing their own engineering analysis to support periodicity extensions should simply retain the nominal inspection intervals indicated in Doc 8071.