



*International Civil Aviation Organization*

**FIFTEENTH MEETING OF THE ASIA/PACIFIC METEOROLOGICAL  
INFORMATION EXCHANGE WORKING GROUP  
(MET/IE WG/15)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 20 – 22 March 2017

**Agenda Item 5:      Quality control, monitoring and management of meteorological  
information exchange**

**ASIA/PAC PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

(Presented by Thailand)

**SUMMARY**

This paper presents the Performance Indicators (PIs) of routine OPMET data from five RODBs: Bangkok, Brisbane, Nadi, Singapore and Tokyo during 1-31 January 2017.

**1.      INTRODUCTION**

1.1            Monitoring activity of routine OPMET data (METAR and TAF) is known as Performance Indicators (PIs). It is an activity in the work plan of the MET/IE WG. The monitoring aims at increasing and improving OPMET availability, timeliness, compliance and regularity at RODBs.

1.2            The monitoring results are presented as Performance Indicators including Availability, Compliance and Regularity index. The PIs are described in detail in Appendix H of the ROBEX Handbook.

**2.      DISCUSSION**

**Calculation Environment and Issues**

2.1            The monitoring is based on the ROBEX Handbook Twelfth Edition - 2004 (Amended - 3 December 2015): Table A, B and C.

2.2            The monitoring was performed during 1-31 January 2017. The PIs were computed using Web-based OPMET PIs analyser. RODB Bangkok, Brisbane, Tokyo and Nadi provided OPMET data by uploading their OPMET files to the web.

2.3            Nonetheless, there were some issues about OPMET data provided by RODBs:

2.3.1 Incomplete set of OPMET data required on computing the threshold (data on December). For example, there were data of 15 days instead of 31. Such threshold consequently affects the calculation of Regularity index.

2.3.2 Lack of completeness or inconsistency of data in aspect of number of aerodromes, for instance, the majority of aerodromes with regard to the monitoring were missing from many data files, but appeared in another. In this case, it can be determined from the huge difference in OPMET file sizes.

2.4 RODB Singapore was unable to provide data in supported file types of the analyser therefore the PIs of RODB Singapore were computed by its system. However, the results were taken into account in this PIs analysis.

### Availability

2.5 The table below summarised the availability of OPMET data for AOP and Non-AOP aerodromes which is relatively high for both METAR and TAF.

	METAR (SA)	TAF (FT)
Expected Aerodromes*	290	269
Available Aerodromes (AOP and Non-AOP)	271	257
Percentage	93.45%	95.54%

\*Exclude aerodromes in MID. (The number of expected aerodromes refers to Table A (SA) and Table B (FT) of the ROBEX Handbook)

2.6 However, there are 19 aerodromes (6.55%) that are **not** available for METAR as shown in the following table.

METAR Bulletin	Aerodrome
SANG31 YBBN	AYMH, AYVN
SAPS32 NFFN	NFTL, NFTV, NLWW, NVSS
SAPS31 NFFN	NSTU
SAPK31 OPKC	OPGD
SAIN33 VECC	VNKT
SATH41 VTBB	VTPB, VTUJ
SAID33 WIII	WABP, WAJJ, WAKK, WALR, WARS, WICT
SAID32 WIII	WIDN, WIMG

2.7 For TAF, there are 12 aerodromes (4.46%) that are **not** available as displayed in the table below.

TAF Bulletin	Aerodrome
<b>FTPS31 NFFN</b>	NCRG, NFTF, NFTV, NIUE, NSFA, NSTU, NVSS, NVVV, PLCH
<b>FTIN32 VABB</b>	VCRI
<b>FTIN31 VABB</b>	VEGT, VEGY

### Compliance

2.8 Due to the issues mentioned above, it is quite difficult to produce the result. In this case, however, the analysis of the compliance index of particular aerodrome will be considered as low compliance when it is lower than 0.5 in at least three RODBs.

2.9 The following aerodromes indicate low compliance for METAR. There are 16 aerodromes (5.52%)

METAR Bulletin	Aerodrome
<b>SAPS31 NFFN</b>	NSTU
<b>SAPS32 NFFN</b>	NFTL, NFTV, NLWW, NVSS, NVVV
<b>SAPK31 OPKC</b>	OPGD
<b>SAIN33 VECC</b>	VQPR
<b>SAID33 WIII</b>	WABP, WAJJ, WAKK, WALR, WARS, WICT
<b>SAID32 WIII</b>	WIDN, WIMG

2.10 Similarly, low compliance TAFs are shown in the table below. There are 16 aerodromes (5.95%)

TAF Bulletin	Aerodrome
<b>FTPS31 NFFN</b>	NCRG, NFFN, NFNA, NFTF, NFTV, NGTA, NIUE, NSFA, NVSS, NVVV, PLCH
<b>FTIN32 VABB</b>	VCBI, VCRI, VOHY
<b>FTIN31 VABB</b>	VEGT, VEGY

### Regularity

2.11 In current scenario of the monitoring, it could not reflect the exact regularity of OPMET exchange because the threshold is calculated from a narrow time frame and therefore, most of irregularity comes from unavailable aerodromes as listed in item 2.6 and 2.7 above.

## **3. ACTION REQUIRED BY THE MEETING**

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this papers; and
- b) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

-----