

Report of MOTNEG BMG/11

Held at SLV, Norrköping, Sweden on 4th & 5th September 2001.

Those present: -

Eva Noreus	Sweden
Kaarina Luiro	Finland
Poul Larsen	Denmark
Ole Andersen	Denmark
Patrick Simon	France
Mrs Callejas	Spain
Wil van Dijk	Netherlands
Herman Swinnen	Belgium
Wim Demol	Belgium
Michael Haberler	Austria
Mike Williamson	UK (Acting Rapporteur)

Agenda Item 1 Report of BMG/10

1.1 There were no corrections or amendments required to the report of BMG/10.

1.2 The Action List from BMG/10 was then reviewed: -

1.3 Duplication of Russian Bulletins

Austria presented IP/3 on this subject. Duplicated Russian bulletins were a result of Prague sending Russian bulletins to both Vienna and Offenbach. Vienna is responsible for promulgating the bulletins but it would appear Offenbach is also distributing them externally as well. The UK is to check that duplication is still occurring on SADIS and if so, to write to the German MOTNEG contact Herr Ruiner requesting that Offenbach does not distribute the messages internationally.

1.4 Work Packages associated with WP6BMG/10

Herman Swinnen distributed spreadsheets on 9th August to MOTNEG Centres that defined lists of 'authorised' bulletins, i.e. those contained in the original BMG questionnaire or subsequently in a METNO and unauthorised bulletins. These were to be checked by each Centre but so far only Belgium and Austria have responded. The procedure relating to the review was presented in WP/5 and was demonstrated by Herman on some sample spreadsheets. Remaining states should if possible get information to Herman at the BMG-FP before MOTNEG/7 but a deadline of 30th November 2001 was selected.

1.5 SIGMET Review

Michael Haberler presented the results of the SIGMET Test. Participation in the test was poor during May but there were a number of contributing factors including BMG/10 which meant that members were not in a position to remind operational staff that the test was taking place. Michael noted that Egypt and Morocco were best informed of the test by telefax. Warnings would be sent out 2 weeks and 1 week before the next test. It was noted that Russian SIGMET coverage appeared to be poor. Michael agreed to prepare short Working Papers on this subject for both METG and MOTNEG. Mike Williamson also agreed to supply examples of non-standard US SIGMETs to Michael for the production of a WP on American SIGMETs. Patrick Simon noted that no response had been received from ICAO as yet regarding his request a comprehensive global list of WC and WV bulletins.

1.6 Rationalisation of EUR to non-EUR distribution.

No work had been carried out on this. It was suggested though that the EUIG members present material from their own investigation to the next BMG were a plan of action could be initiated.

1.7 ODAG Report

Wim Demol presented WP/7, the ODAG report. The report concentrated on significant changes to the ODAG documentation. In terms of the EUR Database ICD this included definition of database misuse and abuse. A section of 'Data Availability' monitoring was added as well. Patrick Simon prepared, based on SUG Annex 1, a station list which is ready for inclusion in the ICD.

A paper was also prepared for METG on the subject of SIGMET requests and the use of the date time groups in database replied. The subject of the impact of Amendment 72 on the OPMET databases was also raised. This will impact both the input of data into the databases and the formatting of database replies. Two questions require clarification for MOTNEG in this respect.

- a) What exactly will be the format of each database immediately following 1/11/01 taking into account that input data may come in a variety of formats.
- b) The Databases require a consistent policy for presentation at some agreed time after 1/11/01 particularly with regard to the inclusion of prefixes before each report or forecast.

1.8 Bulletin Requests on OPMET Databanks.

There is a requirement that the composition of the bulletins should be based on the existing communication bulletins (SUG Annex 3), however there is a problem because there is no connection between the required stations (Annex 1) and the actual communication bulletins. The initial version of the common OPMET DB catalogue will therefore contain only a limited list of European bulletins. It should be noted that the DBs store data on report level and that bulletin requests are therefore only shortcuts for a request of a list of reports (i.e. the replies are always recompiled, using the most recent valid reports for all requested stations). This means that the contents of a bulletin retrieved are not necessarily the same as the original source bulletin.

1.9 EUR OPMET Database Availability

Wim Demol presented a paper, WP/8, on the availability of aerodrome data on the EUR OPMET databases. As with other metrics the SADIS User Guide Annex 1 is used as the baseline requirement. The results show that the 3 databases are consistent in achieving around about 80% of the Annex 1 requirement for SA's and FC's and 70% for FT's.

1.10 Report on RQM Monitoring from the ODAG

A paper was presented on the monitoring of RQMs on the OPMET Databases. The purpose of the paper was to monitor the heaviest users of the databases. From the figures provided it appeared that the heaviest users, heavy being defined as in excess of 100 requests per day, were SBBRYZYX, RCTPYZYX and VHHHYMYX. It is evident that some of these queries were automatically generated but as there was no performance problems at the OPMET databases and those addresses appeared to be legitimate OPMET databases it was decided to take no further action at the moment.

1.11 Long Messages

Further clarification of on the requirements for the cataloguing of long messages shall be issued so that member may be able to respond fully on this matter by the next BMG.

1.12 Performance Indices

A paper was presented by the BMP-FP on Performance Indices. Although the P.I.s were designed for SADIS distribution the non-availability of a full set of SADIS data meant that the indices were calculated from a sample of AFTN data monitored at Brussels. P.I.s were demonstrated at Regional and National level. The results were encouraging and the meeting commended the excellent work of Herman Swinnen on this matter. It was suggested that the regional level P.I.s were most appropriate for reports to SADISOPSG and EANP whilst the national level P.I.s should be reserved for problem investigation within the BMG. It was also suggested that applying the P.I.s to the AFTN monitoring at a MOTNEG centre should be useful to demonstrate the effectiveness of the AFTN distribution. It was also suggested that some work be carried out on validating the P.I.s before releasing the results to SADISOPSG.

1.13 Inter-Regional Data Request Procedure

The procedure for Inter-Regional data Requests was presented in WP11. This was a refinement of the previous version. A couple of small modifications were suggested. The paper shall be presented as an IP at METG and a WP at MOTNEG.

Agenda Item 2 MOTNEG Action Plan

2.1 General

Many items in the action plan had already been dealt with under the previous agenda item.

2.2 BMG Data Update Procedure

This document has undergone minor updates specifically with respect to e-mail addresses. The BMG should consider at its next meeting the consolidation of material provided on the ftp sites. Data including ODAG data should be presented in a consistent and user friendly format.

2.3 BMG Data Monitoring Procedure

Minor updates are required. SIGMET test results should be copied to Michael Pichler and the AIRAC calendar should be updated. It was noted that MOTNEG centres should promulgate the results of SIGMET tests to their areas of responsibility within the EUR Region. Michael Haberler suggested that Denmark and Spain should be invited to provide SIGMET monitoring results.

2.4 BMG Data Update Procedure

A new Appendix has been added which documents 'unauthorised bulletins', i.e. those bulletins that

- a) fall within the MOTNEG distribution criteria
 - b) were not included in the original BMG questionnaire or subsequent METNOs.
- SPECIs should be deleted from Appendix 3 where equivalent METAR bulletins exist, as per the decision at BMG/10.

2.5 EUIG

Work on the EUIG has been suspended until current problems raised by the CIDIN Operations Group on CIDIN routing have been fully resolved. Herman Tanner Freismith of Austria is engaged in preparing a solution. Poul Larsen the EUIG Chairman is to be briefed on the subject.

2.6 US SIGMETs

France has requested that it receive US SIGMETs and this is now being actioned by the UK. States that are not currently receiving these SIGMETs but require them and are prepared to receive them in their current format should contact Kevin Loy in the UK to initiate the appropriate routing changes.

2.7 Long Messages

The WP on this subject was not ready in time for the meeting however Kevin Loy will circulate a copy for comment prior to MOTNEG/7. Members were reminded of the action from the last meeting where they were requested to identify any bulletins exceeding the maximum AFTN message length that may be transferred from GTS to AFTN at their centres.

Agenda Item 3 Operational Problems

3.1 Amendment 72 to Annex 3

Mike Williamson presented a paper on the proposed bulletin format changes associated with Amd 72 to Annex 3. The paper included the draft of WP to be presented at METG and a summary of questionnaire responses regarding the effect of the new formats. Amendment 72 to Annex 3 includes, by implication, a modification to bulletin formats that was promulgated in CBS/XII. This information was not widely promulgated and did not come to the attention of most EUR organisations until August 20001, when it was promulgated by the MOTNEG Chairman following correspondence from ICAO Montreal.

The short notice has meant that a significant number of end systems are unprepared for the new formats. This will result in increased manual operations and/or the failure of systems to correctly process data. The questionnaire promulgated by the UK showed that many EUR states had systems that would be unable to cope with the new formats.

The BMG considered how to minimise the disruption to the promulgation and processing of met data after the 1st of November. One problem is quantification of the effects of the change. It is not clear how many states will produce codes compliant with the revised WMO codes. Some EUR states are certainly capable of producing code in the new format. The only confirmed implementation appears to be Japan.

In order to limit disruption as far as possible the group agreed that a suggestion be made at METG that EUR states do not implement the most problematic part of the WMO amendment, i.e. the inclusion of the 'METAR YYGGggZ' line following the Bulletin header of a METAR bulletin. It should be noted that the other changes defined in Amendment 72 are not considered to be particularly problematic. There does appear to have been a problem in many states regarding the promulgation of ICAO state letters to the appropriate operational sections. All BMG members who did not see the Amd 72 state letter should attempt to trace what happened to the document sent to their state and take appropriate action to ensure that the information is fully promulgated in future.

At METG the WP included in BMG/WP12 will propose a change in WMO codes to remove the problematic and redundant elements introduced by the CBS XII modifications. Of the proposals number 2 is preferred as it provides a consistent bulletin format, reduces the amount of redundant information and meets the ATNP requirements. AT METG it will be suggested that EUR states use this format from the 1st of November 2001. It is expected though that even if ICAO and the WMO accept the code changes, they will not be officially implemented until 2003 at the earliest.

On the 1st of November it is expected that a number of bulletins will be received in the new format and that these will cause disruption. The following structure was proposed in order to manage the problem.

1) Monitoring

The Inter-Regional Gateways, London, Toulouse and Vienna, will monitor interregional input in order to identify bulletins with the new code format. EUR bulletins will be monitored at Copenhagen. This will enable a global picture of compliance to be assembled.

2) Problem Reporting

When a problem occurs with an end system related to bulletin format it shall be reported to the state authority who shall then report it to the MOTNEG Centre in whose 'Area of Responsibility' they lie. The MOTNEG Centre will promulgate the problem report to all other MOTNEG Centres.

3) Problem Resolution

a) Data from outside of EUROPE Problems reported will be noted by the relevant Inter-Regional Gateway. At given times these centres will review the outstanding problems as where possible look at the feasibility of solving the problem by recompiling bulletins into a format compliant with METG Proposal 2. It should be noted that there is not an unlimited recompilation capacity so problems may have to be prioritised. Recompilation may have an effect on routing especially with respect to SADIS. There may also be objections to the compilation of data, although a precedent has been set by the ICS System.

b) Data from EUROPE Problems reported will be noted by Copenhagen. At given times Copenhagen will review the outstanding problems as where possible look at the feasibility of solving the problem by recompiling bulletins into a format compliant with METG Proposal 2. As above it should be noted that there is not an unlimited recompilation capacity so problems may have to be prioritised

Recompilation will have to be sustained until

a) End systems have been adapted to deal with the amd 72 bulletin formats or
b) ICAO/WMO regulations are modified in line with the proposal made at METG.
Depending on the extent of the problem, recompilation may take up substantial resources within the Message Switches in Copenhagen, London, Toulouse and Vienna.

Another problem to be considered is that states may implement the amd 72 bulletin format changes at some time after the 1st of November. This will require a standing procedure to react to problems arising from late implementations.

Mike Williamson will produce a draft set of procedures for dealing with the problem in the EUR Region based on the Y2K procedures. This will be reviewed by correspondence and a Working Paper submitted to MOTNEG.

3.2 Incorrect Data Formats

Michael Haberler presented an IP. The paper was intended for presentation as a WP at METG. It was recommended that references to the 'CHECK TEXT NEWENDING ADDED' were removed it is a legitimate appendage to an incorrectly terminated AFTN message. Otherwise the paper contained an interesting selection of incorrectly formatted data.

3.3 BMG Problem Management

A draft paper was produced on problem management within the BMG process. There was insufficient time to consider this paper in the detail it required. It was agreed not to present it at MOTBEG/7howevr members were encouraged to read it with a view to producing a workable document by the next meeting.

3.4 Required SIGMETs for OPMET DBs

Patrick Simon produced a FIR list on which a global list of SIGMETs is to be based. He requested that any information on SIGMETs received be passed to him so that he can populate the global SIGMET list.

Agenda Item 4 Any other business

4.1 Dissolution of MOTNEG

A draft paper on the dissolution of MOTNEG, provided under WP 14, was discussed. The paper was accepted in principle although there was some debate on the following points.

Would BMG members be required to be AFSG members? It should be noted that members of Met Institutions were in general not members of AFSG although they have an important role in both MOTNEG & BMG.

Some members suggested that BMG should report to METG rather than the AFSG. The relationship between the METG and BMG should be recognised and sustained if the group reports to AFSG.

Any changes to the terms of reference of the group shall be agreeable to the members of the BMG.

The membership of the new BMG will be a contentious issue. In particular it would be useful to have an active representation from Eastern Europe. It was noted that the METG have a specific group dedicated to Eastern European states through which issues can be raised to the main meeting. More representation of southern European states should also be encouraged.

Mike Williamson undertook to update the paper that would then be promulgated to all MOTNEG members this week before being presented as an IP to METG the following week.

4.2 Austrian Telex

Michael Haberler presented a short IP on the cessation of telex service in Austria.

Agenda Item 5 Action List

The Action list was prepared after the meeting and is appended to this report.

Agenda Item 6 Date of Next Meeting

Given the potential changes to MOTNEG and the BMG it was decided that the date and venue of the next meeting would be decided at MOTNEG/7. Provisionally the date was expected to be some time during January 2002.

Attachment 1: Action List

Ref.	Action	Responsible	Target date
BMG/11-1	Check SADIS duplication of Russian data and contact Offenbach to request cessation of further international distribution.	M Williamson	MOTNEG/7
BMG/11-2	All MOTNEG centres to review Bulletin Spreadsheets provided by Herman according to the procedure in WP5.	All MOTNEG Centres	30/11/01
BMG/11-3	Prepare WP on Russian SIGMETs for METG and MOTNEG.	M Haberler	10/09/01 15/10/01
BMG/11-4	Provide examples of non-standard US SIGMETs.	M Williamson	10/09/01
BMG/11-5	Prepare WP on US SIGMETs for METG.	M Haberler	10/09/01
BMG/11-6	MOTNEG Centres requiring US SIGMETs and capable of receiving them should contact Kevin Loy as soon as possible via their MOTNEG Centres.	MOTNEG Centres	MOTNEG/7
BMG/11-7	Member should identify any messages being transferred from GTS to AFTN, which exceed the maximum AFTN message length.	MOTNEG Centres	BMG/12
BMG/11-8	Produce WP for Amd 72 Problem Monitoring & Resolution	M Williamson	MOTNEG/7
BMG/11-9	Produce IP for METG & WP for MOTNEG in relation to the Dissolution of MOTNEG.	M Williamson	METG/11 MOTNEG/7