



## INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANISATION

***AFI PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION REGIONAL GROUP (APIRG)***  
***AFI OPMET MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE MEETNG (AFI OPMET MTF/4)***

*(Pretoria, South Africa, 10-11 September 2012)*

### **Agenda Item 2:**

### **RESULTS OF OPMET DATA MONITORING**

(South Africa)

#### **SUMMARY**

The paper provides OPMET data monitoring statistics for the AFI Region covering the period from January to August 2012 and broken down into three quarters. The stats covers only the monitoring activities conducted at the Pretoria RODB.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 In this paper, the results of the monitoring activities under the responsibility of Pretoria RODB are presented. The monitoring covered the period from January to September 2012. The statistics for September were not included.

### **2. DISCUSSION**

2.1 The meeting may recall that following the AFI OPMET MTF/2 which was held in Johannesburg, South Africa from 6-7 September 2010, Recommendation 2/3 was formulated. The recommendation was adopted during the METSG/10 held in Dakar, Senegal from 29 June to 1 July 2011 and subsequently Conclusion 10/4 was formulated. Both the recommendation and conclusion called for scheduled monitoring of AFI OPMET data by both AFI RODBs starting from 1 January 2012.

2.2 In addition, Conclusion 10/4 called for monitoring to be done in accordance with the procedures in Chapter 12 and Appendix F of the AMBEX Handbook (HB). The meeting will note that paragraph 12.3.1.1 requires that the monitoring be focused on three performance indicators (PIs) namely: Compliance, Availability and Regularity indices. The meaning of these indices and how they should be computed and reported is explained in details in Appendix F of the AFI AMBEX HB.

2.3 The monitoring results were presented in both table and chart format for clarity. Three data types METARs, FC and FT TAFs were monitored. Five bulletin headers (EA31, IO31, AF32, AP32 and EA32) for each data type were monitored from the bulletin compiling centers (BCCs), HAAB, FMMI, HECA, FAPR and HKJK respectively. The detailed results of the monitoring activity are included in the Appendix to this paper.

2.4 In summary, the results present a mixed picture as shown by the three indices, compliance, availability and regularity, displayed in both table and chart format. It can be seen that the BCCs FMMI and HECA recorded a high percentage (above 80%) in all the indices computed throughout all quarters. This means that in most cases, the role players (originating aerodromes and BCCs) complied with their responsibilities under the AMBEX Scheme. Also encouraging was the results for HKJK which shows an average of 70% for all the indices monitored.

2.5 However, the same cannot be said with regard to the remainder of the BCCs (HAAB, FAPR and HKJK). The results show that in most cases bulletins for both data types were not received at the Pretoria RODB during the monitoring period. In the first quarter, a low percentage in the compliance and availability indices were recorded for both HAAB and FAPR. The meeting may wish to note that the situation didn't improve as much in the second quarter, although the results for BCC FAPR showed an improvement in all the indices (over 60%).

2.7 The meeting is invited to note that the results for the third quarter excluded data for September. The statistical analysis took into consideration data for July and August. However, it can be seen that picture remains the same with similar trends as in quarter 1 and quarter 2. Once again, a point of concern is on the data from HAAB which shows low percentages in both the compliance and availability indices. During the entire monitoring period (January to August), no METARs were received from the aerodrome (HADR), hence the reason for low availability for this data type.

2.6 The main reasons for none reception of data at Pretoria RODBs could be attributed to the following:

- Lack of understanding of OPMET exchange responsibilities in the part of the originating aerodromes and BCCs. This was also emphasized in WP/17 where a draft conclusion intended to remedy the problem was formulated for the attention of the meeting.
- Originating aerodromes disseminate data directly into the system through other means such as the Global Telecommunication System (GTS) and not as part of the bulletin.
- In some cases, data quality is a major issue and messages are rejected during the validation process.
- MWOs often changes their hours of operation without informing the regional offices as well as the RODBs and BCCs, contributing to low data availability.

### 3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information provided in this working paper.

