

Item	Description	Background	Deliberation
1	Outline of the ConOps	Draft ConOps on RHWAC and strategic assessment were discussed at Conjoint. The Conjoint agreed on a phased-approach to the implementation of phenomenon-based regional advisory system, explicitly highlighting the whom and how aspects. Proposed a slight modification to the outline for consideration by the workstream.	
2	Scope of information service		
a)	Should RHWAC be for single or multi-hazard?	Currently the VAACs and TCACs are responsible for one specific hazardous phenomenon only. However, if different RHWAC for each of the remaining hazardous phenomena, there would be many RHWACs. Also the AOR of the RHWAC for different phenomena might be different and might create a lot of confusion to MWOs and downstream users. Also while the forecasting techniques are different, the facilities to support the observation/forecast of the different hazards are very much in common, and so is not quite cost-effective.	

b)	Should sandstorm be included?	Conjoint recommendation specified that the phenomenon-based regional advisory system for select en-route hazardous meteorological conditions should cover as a minimum: thunderstorm, icing, turbulence and mountain wave but did not mention sandstorm which might not be applicable for some regions. However, as the advisory information would replace SIGMET in phase 2, leaving out sandstorm might create a problem.	
c)	Need for advisory in IWXXM format to MWOs in the initial stage?	Part b) of the Conjoint recommendation is to integrate the information produced into the future SWIM environment. However, as IWXXM is still in the development stage, should this be a functional requirement?	
d)	Should objective verification be included?	It is not so easy to verify SIGMETs. However, without objective verification, it is difficult to assess the performance from the different service suppliers.	
e)	Should it be a requirement for RHWAC to share the forecast support tools/products with MWOs in its AOR?	To support CDM and harmonization, sharing of forecast support tools/products is preferred but should this be a requirement?	
3	Advisory Information		
a)	Fixed time forecast?	Currently the VAACs and TCACs provide fixed time	

		forecast. Fixing the issue time allows for doing the harmonization at fixed time and thus facilitates the discussion.	
b)	If fixed time forecast, then no. of times per day?	Currently the VAACs and TCACs provide fixed time forecast 4 times a day. Is this good enough or more frequent forecast say 8 times a day is preferred. This will also have an impact on the length of the validity period (see below).	
c)	Length of the validity period? Need for outlook?	Currently SIGMET has a validity period of a maximum of 4 hours. The validity period should be a good balance between predictability of the phenomena and user requirement.	
d)	For advisory based on forecast, what should be the lead time?	Currently SIGMET messages shall be issued no more than 4 hours before the commencement of the period of validity. If the MWOs are to issue SIGMET based on the advisory information in phase 1, what should be the lead time considering the predictability of the phenomena and user requirement.	
4	Performance requirement		
a)	Relating to 2d), do we specify any minimum quality of the advisory information?		

5	Addition of trial to work plan	<p>At the 1st telecom of the workstream, it was proposed that a trial be conducted to test out the concept and to obtain feedback on the new product. Based on the current work plan, the draft ConOps and Guide should be ready for approval by METP at its 2nd meeting, scheduled to be held in Oct 2016. It is thus proposed that the trial be held in mid-2017 after the documents are ready.</p>	
---	--------------------------------	---	--