REPORT

Working Group
for the
EUR OPMET BULLETIN MANAGEMENT

Fifth Meeting
(BMG/5)

1 - 4 February 1999

AUSTRO CONTROL , Vienna

1. Introduction

1.1. The meeting took place at AUSTRO CONTROL from 1 - 4 February 1999. .

1.2. Main tasks of the work for the work of the BMG/5 are related to conclusions of the last MOTNEG meeting in November 1998.

1.3. A list of the participants is enclosed in appendix A. By internal reasons the invited members of Italy and Spainc ould not attend the meeting.

1.4. The agenda of the meeting was following :

1.) EUR transmission of
   - i.) Non EUR - OPMET data
   - ii.) WV, WC, FV,FK - bulletins

2.) EUR OPMET Monitoring
   - i) Routine OPMET Data Monitoring Results (10 Dec 98)
   - ii) Non-Routine OPMET Data Monitoring Results (12-21 Dec 98) iii)
   - iii) SIGMET Test Message Transmission (14 Dec 98)
   - iv) Review of OPMET Data Procedures (including SIGMET Test Message Format)3.) EUR OPMET METNO procedure
     (status report, experience ....)

3.) EUR OPMET METNO Procedure
   Status report, experience, review

4.) Documentation on OPMET tables / EUR and non-EUR

5.) Addressing of EUR and Non-EUR OPMET data
   (changes, improvements, shortcomings)

6.) OPMET exchange coordination with other Regions

7.) Operational shortcomings

8.) Any other business

2. EUR transmission of Non EUR - OPMET data and WV, WC, FV,FK - bulletins :

2.1. The reception of Non EUR OPMET data, especially TAfs from the other Regions is slowly improved. The significant problem to comply with Annex 3 requirement is the very poor coordination in MET-communication between the Regions.

2.2. AFI-TAFs are received sometimes in LO and should be changed to the reception at the agreed gateway LF. The contact should be managed by LF. The situation in LF for the realibiltiy of the circuits is different. The performance of the connection to Nairobi and Dakar is acceptable, problems are existing with Brazzaville and Conacry. The qualtity of the GTS connection ED -

Nairobi is poor. The data are mixed and also problems in the content are detected by ED.

2.3. At time all available OPMET data which are received at EG via the direct circuit WS-EG are distributed. The US FTUS** TAF-data will arrive in EUR as not collected , single report in a bulletin and sometimes late.

2.4. The data exchange between LO - MID have no problems. There is nearly no contact to this area.

2.5. No information is available about the situation LE - SAM.

2.6. The reception of CAR data is rarely depending on the structural and financial situation.

2.7. IATA requested that it is invisaged that all data are regulary distributed by SADIS.

2.8. The use of ISCS data which is transmitted via GTS from Bracknell to ED is practicable.

2.9. The situation on the data of Non EUR - WV, WC, FV,FK - bulletins exchange is not improving quickly. The routing of this data is complicated because for the FV and FK bulletins no clear indication is existing. There are also no gudelines in the ANPs defined. Also some of these bulletins are received via GTS in diffenet centres and at the moment these bulletins are routed only by experience . In the EUR Region the transmission to all other MOTNECentres is agreed but no definition of an OPMET/GTS-AFS-Gateway is available. In the transmission of these bulletins duplication is often detected. A surpression with the existing procedures in the centres is not possible. To solve this problem the Group agreed to accept at first a duplication and than filter out by monitoring and give response to the originator. Due the different monitoring tools ED and LF can not monitor at the moment a defined input channel. It depends on the selective use of the monitoring results in each centre to filter out the related traffic. EG provided a monitoring on the AFS.

3. EUR OPMET Monitoring :

3.1. The MOTNEG document >MOTNEG/BULLMAN/02< Issue Date 6.Nov.1998 / Issue 0.2 was introduced by EB for discussion and revision. In the discussion it was found necessary to make some changes in the time table of monitoring for 1999. In the routine data monitoring no changes were made, only the testtransmission was changed from 5 April to 11 March. (!!!! Pls check the dates of non routine data monitoring !!!!!) Also the Attachment 1 - SIGMET testing was changed slightly (Date of testransmission, transmssion procedure). A revision is attaches as appendix .....

3.2. The last routine monitoring was done on the 10 December 1998 and is stored on the BE-server. Also the new OPMET-catalogue (CAT280199) is available. The results of the monitoring of the three centres are presented by Belgium. At the moment only three centres (EB, ED and LF) are participating the routine monitoring. LO did stop the participation during performance problems of the system. EG will join in the first quarter 1999 the monitoring. For an optimum result and success of the task it is necessary that nearly all centres can prepare results of the monitoring. By discussing the diffent tools of the centres it was found necessary that more information for comparison of the results is required. For optimum results of the monitoring a selective use is envisaged. Afterwars routine changes should be coordinated and introduced

before the next monitoring. To improve the success of the monitoring a " monitoring qualifier" can be helpful. This qualifier should help to differ SADIS, EUR and bilateral traffic. An explicit definition of the "bilateral data" is very complicated. IATA underlined that preferable all data should be evereywhere available. The monitor results are attached as Appendix .... .

3.3. The monitoring exercise of Non-Routine OPMET Data was running in the period 12-21 December 1998. It was observed that most of the bulletins are available in ED depending probably from the GTS connections. Most of these bulletins are US,CN and Australian. Results are attached as Appendix ..... .

3.4. The first monitoring of SIGMET test messages was not really successfull. Not all MOTNEG States do not react to the task of the MOTNEG/4 meeting. Therefore a new date was agreed for the 11 March 1999. Austria will coordinate this monitoring and should report to the next BMG meeting. The procedure was slightly modified as discussed for the MOTNEG/BULLMAN/02 - MONITORING document. The group was also requested by Sweden to monitor the SIGMETs on SADIS and on the terrestrial circuits. This monitoring was proceeded from 13 to 15 January 1999. The provided results shows in general no differencies, only on the last day 6 SIGMETs are delayed and one (LIIB SST) was missing.

3.5. The monitoring of December shows up a problem with a very large number of US SIGMETs. It was investigated that the US are following national procedures for automatic systems and do not correspond with ICAO Annex 3 regulations. Also problems are encountered with the reception of the ISCS data, which are transmitted from Bracknell to Offenbach. They should be deleted, because no sufficient use is at time possible.

3.6. The document "MOTNEG/BULLMAN/02 - EUR OPMET Data Monitoring Procedure" should be one of the new set of basic documents for the new European OPMET Exchange Concept (EOE).

3.7. Summarizing the discussion it was mentioned that urgent response should be made for SIGMET-Monitoring, the routine data have the second priority. If necessary the resukts should be sent by an ICAO State letter to all MOTNEG members. It was also stated that the problem of actual inventory information of EUR OPMETdata reduce the output of monitoring. From other Regions no information, or only outdated information is available.

4. EUR OPMET METNO Procedure - Status report, experience, review :

4.1. Belgium as the focal point for the EUR OPMET procedure has partly automated the update procedure. This procedure started at the beginning of 1998 on a trial basis and the experience was reported to SADISOPSG, METG and MOTNEG. The procedure is successful to handle the changes in a regulated way and was concluded by EANPG as an EUR procedure. The available document MOTNEG/BULLMAN/01 - Issue 1.1/2.Nov.1998 "EUR OPMET DATA Update Procedure" in ist draft version was modified in few minor items which are covering editorial errors, updating of addresses and AFTN indicators. The timetable was corrected and will leave out the AIRAC dates of 12 August and 30 December 1999. Also the EUR OPMET Catalogue structure was modified to give more details for the indication of the distribution . It was underlined that the "MOTNE" - bulletins should be signed strictly with ii = 31 - 39.

4.2. One of the METNO bulletins exceed the length of 1500 characters as defined in Annex

10 for the maximum length of AFTN messages. To solve this delivery problem it was agreed to use additional the WMO - BBB indicator (PAA,PAB,.....PZn) for the splitting of bulletins.

4. Documentation on OPMET tables / EUR and non-EUR :

4.1. The OPMET tables will be nearly automatrd produced shortly after each AIRAC date by Belgium. An excellent WP was presented by Belgium which summarized all available files, descriptionnof the used fields and presentation of the tables. The presentation of the tables give a good overview and comparison possiblities between the different programmes MOTNE, PDN, SADIS... .

4.2. It was envisaged that in future one file with different presentations can be used for all purposes - Bulletinmanagment by the BMG, SADIS User Guide and ANP. Subtables e.g. bulletin oriented, report oriented or others can be extracted.

4.3. Changes in the field discription are agreed. This changes clean up differencies between the different Annexes of the SADIS User Guide and allow to describe better the status of an aerodrome. (Chris pls can you provide me with an updated discription in electronic form for the ref. Appendix - Tks !).

4.4. One MOTNEG/4 oconclusion requests from the BMG information of about OPMET data for coordination of METG and SADISOPSG and to inform these groups about the work of the BMG.

4.5. For the official use of the tables a pragmatic approach should be started to develope a formal proposal for ICAO. The presentation should inform about the whole content and the necessary filterings. The simplicity of the handling should be underlined. Seperation can be made by different criterias e.g. scheduled, non-scheduled, EUR, Non-EUR, areas, countries.....

4.6. The non-scheduled bulletins (WS, WC, WV, FV,FK ..) can not simple encountered. Especially the NON-EUR data and data from countries which have not made the inventory available can be only filled in by experience or let out.

4.7. In this context it was discussed, that a new inventory or updating should be started to get all changes.

4.8. The SADIS tables in the SADIS User Guide (Annex 1 and 3) shows great differncies between the requirement, the transmission on SADIS (Table of SUG) and the actual transmission. The SADIS related data should be available in the format as the other BMG information. A draft review will be made by EB abd EG. The SADIS tables will be than also made available on the BMG server of EB.

5. Addressing of EUR and Non-EUR OPMET data - changes, improvements, shortcomings:

5.1. To improve the reception from non-EUR OPMET data in EUR and the dissemination in EUR and to SADIS activitioes were started before MOTNEG/2 . The agreement included the

use of OPMET international gateways and to resolve the problems of the PDN of Non- EUR Data. The BMG agreed for the future planning with a unique EUR address indicator for OPMET Data addressing (EUZZ****). In the meantime this specific EUR indicator was requested at ICAO HQ Montreal by the OPMET gateway centres and close cooperation and coordination was established to the AFSG.

5.2. Information is available that the allocation of the EUR OPMET indicator is in the administrative approval procedure.

5.3. Once the area indicator for the EUR OPMET application is published decision should be made for the exact format of the eight letter addressee indicator to be used by the <NON-EUR OPMET centres and - gateways .Three possible options are discussed and it was agreed taht an unique PDAI will be a good solution.

5.4. This PDAI do not allow a selective transmission but this is not envisaged in the OPMET distribution.All Non-EUR OPMET data are distributed to all MOTNE Centres including SADIS. If one centre is not able to receive all OPMET data it should be rmoved from the PDAI list and selectively served by one of the remaining MOTNE centres as an extension of his area of responsibilty.

5.5. The originator of an AFTN message containing the OPMET bulletin can forward the message in the simples and standard form . Only one addressee indicator has to be used. Afddditional and parallel distribution nedd to be stopped. Otherwile duplication with unneccessary traffic is loaded the system.

5.3. If interregional OPMET data will be received in an AFTN/CIDIN gateway a standard function will replace the PDAI with the addressee indicators of all MOTNE centers including SADIS. The PDN distribution will disappear and therefore duplication and looping will be excluded.

5.4. The dissemination of Non-EUR OPMET data via GTS should be arranged via the respansiible gateway centre to the other MOTNE centres using AFTN/CIDIN. If these data will be received also via an Non-EUR Interregional gateway centre (I/R GWC) only one duplication is the result. By doing the monitor exersise it is possible to cease this transmission if the bulletin is received regulary via AFTN/CIDIN.

5.5. The inventory of the Non-EUR OPMET data should be revised and continuously updated. A possible start would be the monitoring of the existing PDN programm.

5.6. An AFTN/CIDIN routimng structure has to be set up so that non-EUR OPMET data addressed with the EU indicator ends up in one of the I/R OPMET centres. In case of an outage of one of the I/R OPMET centres, the EU message will be routed atomatically via an alternate path to one of the others. The advantage of this is the balanced load and the full redundancy.

5.7. After the correct set-up of the routing these scheme can be implemented gradually region per region.

5.8. The implementation of the EU PDAI consists of :

- Planning and preparation
- Testing
- Transition
- Review

5.9. In this realtion a number of issues and actions will be need to ensure a smooth and controlled implementation :

- formal and published allocation of the EU-indicator by HQ ICAO
- configuration of EUR AFS nodes
- configuration of interregional gateway PDAIs (test and transition phase)
- configuartion of Non-EUR AFS nodes
- compilation of a list of bulletins by region required
-correspondence to non-EUR regions and their confirmation of intentions
- capture of data arriving on the new indicator
- analys data and identify and resolve of any area of conflicts
- configuration of MOTNE centres and SADIS with any new bulletins identified
- time sclaes
- documentation

5.10. The discussed action plan is attached as Appendix .....

5.11. Close cooperaton with the AFSG will be hold from EB and EG. Detailed information on the necessary steps will be prepared for the next meeting by EB abnd EB also.

5.12. In the longterm planning in the concept of the new EOE system only one I/R OPMET gateway should be envisaged. This should be planned in the progress of the development of the SADIS OPMET gateway . In this development it follows that EB as the SADIS Back-Up will also the back up for this data.

6. OPMET exchange coordination with other Regions :

6.1. An EUR reception of US national convective SIGMETs (WSUS4*) was observed. The non- conformance with standard ICAO provisions do not allow an effiecient handling. The bulletins are triggered on a timebasic and also include NIL-SIGMETs. EG will be active to stop this transmission.

6.2. AFI OPMET data will arrive not regulary in EUR. IATA will bring up this problem in the MET section and provide information for the AFI meeting of IATA.

6.3. All available ASIA data received in EG are provided to SADIS and EUR distribution. At the moment the reception of JP-Forecasts with addtional FC data (splitting 24hrs to 18+9hrs validity) is not complete.

6.4. Unfortunately no attendance of Spain was possible, therefore no new information about SAM was available.

7. Operational shortcomings :

7.1. IATA requesetd in the last time few additional data which are not provided by SADIS or

via EDZW for LH. There are differences between the monitoring of ED and LH. It was explained that the BMG monitoring can be only a snapshot for this day and can not give the whole results. For the request of IATA(summarized for Lufthansa, Iberia, Alitalia, Finnair) the available montoring tables should be used at first to determine unregularities.

7.2. The problem of rare Russian data is still existing. Especially data of new locations can not arranged.

7.3. Also some data of new aerodromes are requested from which no entries in Doc. 7910 is available. If information about such location comes up in one or the other centre , the focal point should be informed to distribute this in one of the news-mail.

7.4. For the handling of interregioanal requirements a focal point should be defined in the other Regions for coordination of OPMET data. For the necessary work to satisfy the SADIS requirement an official way via the SADISOPSG and MOTNEG should be established. The way should not delay the introductioon of new requirements or changes. Fundamental steps are triggered via ICAO letter to other Regions.

7.5. It was announced that the EM-area will be splitted up to several country bulletins in Spring 1999. The change will be introduced by the OPMET Update Procedure.

8. Any other business :

8.1. Information about the EUR implementation of CIDIN/OPMET was presented as follows :

- EB, ED and EK have the application full implemented;
- EG will implement the functionalty with operation of the SADIS gateway;
- LO tested in Sept./Oct 1998 and stopped the use due performance problems until summer 1999 when the replacement of the MSS becomes operational.;
- LF is iscussing the planning internally;
- LI internal discussions about the possibility .

For the next MOTNEG Meeting (MOTNEG/5) ICAO Office should ask with a State letter for the statuts for implementing or planning of CIDIN/OPMET.

8.2. EB(METEO) presentended a WP relating to the Database Query language and structure. The Group is not responsible for this matter. It should presented in the WG2 of the EOE.

8.3. For the provision of documents, WPs and IP modern technology should be used for simpler and efficient handling. EB kindly offers capacity on the FTP-server of OMA.BE for the work of the Group. The available informations should be structured depending on the main groups SADIS, METG,MOTNEG and the next level MOTNEG/BMG.... . EB will kindly inform per mail about the possibilties for the future work.

8.4. It was agreed that depending on the workload the next meeting should be held in good rime before MOTNEG/5 to summarize the work for presentation. The meeting is planned for the 6 - 8 September 1999. The hosting organization is at the moment not fixed. Proposals should circulate in June by mail.

-- o O o --