



INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANISATION
AFI PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION REGIONAL GROUP (APIRG)
AFI OPMET MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE (AFI OPMET MTF)
THIRD MEETING (AFI OPMET MTF/3)
(Dakar, Senegal, 27 – 28 June 2011)

Agenda Item 3 d): Review of OPMET related FASID Tables

**REVIEW OF THE AFI FASID TABLES MET 1A
AND 2A FROM SADISOPSG/16 MEETING**

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

This paper reviews AFI FASID Tables MET 1A and 2A from SADISOPSG/16 Meeting.

1. Introduction

1.1 The meeting will recall that the AFI OPMET MTF/1 recommended to review the amendments to AFI FASID Tables MET 1A and 2A from SADISOPSG meetings before submitting them to States.

1.2 This paper presents AFI FASID Tables MET 1A and 2A from SADISOPSG/16 Meeting for review by the AFI OPMET MTF/3 Meeting.

2. Discussion

2.1 The SADISOPSG/16 meeting held in Paris from 23 to 25 May 2011 recalled that OPMET information from all the AOP aerodromes was included in Annex 1 to SADIS User Guide (SUG). Annex 1 included OPMET information from both aerodrome operational planning (AOP) (i.e. aerodromes included in the AOP tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. All AOP aerodromes issue METAR and SPECI, as a minimum (with a few exceptions in the EUR Region), while the requirements for TAF were subject to formal regional air navigation (RAN) agreement which was reflected in the Tables MET 1A of all the facilities and services implementation documents (FASID). The Sub-group is informed that, since February 2008, similar to Annex 1, all FASID Tables MET 1A were extracted from the global OPMET database thus ensuring the consistency of information between the FASID Tables MET 1A and Annex 1. This arrangement also implied that Annex 1 now reflected, at all times, the formal requirements displayed in FASID Tables MET 1A. Furthermore, the SADISOPSG had agreed that any proposals for amendments related to OPMET data from AOP aerodromes should be addressed directly to the ICAO Regional Office concerned (SADISOPSG/13 Decision 13/8 refers). This approach eliminated the need for a lengthy procedure and substantially expedited the implementation of new requirements.

2.2 With regard to non-AOP aerodromes, the Sub-group is informed that OPMET information from these aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes. OPMET requirements from these aerodromes could be amended by the group annually, subject to an agreement by the State concerned. It is further recalled that the actual OPMET information that was currently broadcast on SADIS was indicated in Annex 2 (listing the aerodromes included in the bulletins) and Annex 3 (listing the bulletin headers) to the SUG. These annexes were updated bi-annually, with the assistance of the EUR OPMET Data Management Group (DMG).

2.3 The Sub-group is informed that variability of reception of OPMET information from some aerodromes had been cause for adverse comments from users in the past. However, where such comments concerned aerodromes not listed as a requirement in Annex 1, the SADIS Provider State was not obliged to ensure that these aerodromes were available. Non-availability of OPMET information from aerodromes listed in Annex 1 was a different matter and, when notified by users, had been systematically brought to the attention of the States concerned by the appropriate ICAO regional office which had kept on monitoring such deficiencies until their resolution. The SADISOPSG concurred that such a real-time approach had turned out to be efficient and had led, in most cases, to the timely resolution of the deficiencies identified.

2.4 The Sub-group is informed that SADISOPSG Secretariat was requested to seek agreement from the States concerned to provide OPMET information from some 500 non-AOP aerodromes, in response to a request formulated by the International Air Transport Association (IATA). The Secretariat was also requested to report back to the SADISOPSG/16 Meeting the number of aerodromes actually added in Annex 1, as a result of the consultation with States concerned. The results of the study revealed that States agreed to provide OPMET information from only 25 aerodromes while the provision of OPMET information from six aerodromes had been discontinued. The meeting is informed that the changes concerned a very small proportion (about 5 per cent) of approximately 500 non-AOP aerodromes from which OPMET information had been requested in the State letters concerned. The Sub-group is then informed that, based on requests by IATA, long lists of additional requirements for OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes had been included in State letters, year after year, and that as a result, normally only a small number of States had *formally* concurred with such requirements. It was felt that repetitive State letters sent annually to the same States with an identical request could be counterproductive, in particular if the State has already clearly indicated their reluctance to provide OPMET information from the non-AOP aerodromes concerned. Under these circumstances, the Sub-group was informed that the time had come for the Secretariat to keep track on the requests made and to ensure that a State that had refused the provision of OPMET information from their non-AOP aerodromes not be approached before three years had elapsed. In this regard, the Sub-group was informed that the Secretariat will maintain a master list to be placed on the SADISOPSG website related to States' willingness to provide OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes as displayed in **Appendix A** to this paper; and ensure that States that have been consulted on additional requirements for OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes, and have indicated their reluctance to provide such information, not be re-consulted during the three-year period following their refusal.

2.5 The Sub-group is informed that the proposal above attempted to render the requirements in line with OPMET data that was actually made available by States. In this regard, the Sub-group is informed that any proposed deletions could be undertaken by ICAO without the need for consulting the States concerned while any proposed additions would have to be endorsed by them. It was noted that only those aerodromes with location indicators included in the *Location Indicators* (Doc 7910) could be included in Annex 1 to the SUG.

In view of the above, the meeting may agree to formulate the following recommendation.

Recommendation 3/xx: Revision of OPMET Data Requirements

That:

- a) information related to the requirements of OPMET data from non-AOP aerodromes as given in Appendix A, be submitted by ICAO Regional Offices to the concerned States for approval, before amending the AFI FASID MET Table 2A and Annex 1 to the SADIS User Guide (SUG);
- b) the aerodromes as listed in Appendix B to this paper, be deleted from AFI FASID MET Table 2A.

3. Conclusion

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) Note the information in this paper,
- b) Review the Appendixes to this paper and,
- c) decide on the above recommendation proposed for the task Force's consideration.