



**STUDY NOTE**

**MEETING OF THE METEOROLOGY PANEL (METP)  
WORKING GROUP MOG**

**Third Meeting**

**Gatwick, London, United Kingdom, 13 to 15 June 2016**

**Agenda Item 3.2.5 UPDATE TO SADIS USER GUIDE**

**Update to the METAR/SPECI and TAF Requirements for International Distribution,  
including SADIS/WIFS, with the introduction of the eANP Met Tables**

**(Presented by the UK and France)**

**SUMMARY**

The purpose of the paper is to highlight the change in monitoring process for OPMET data including that for the SADIS OPMET gateway due to an introduction by ICAO of the eANP Met Tables and a change in policy around Non AOP aerodrome OPMET requirements. The paper includes a history on providing METAR/SPECI and TAF requirements in SADIS User Guide (SUG) Annex 1 and FASID Table MET 2A. Clarification is requested about required data monitoring processes for the SADIS OPMET gateway particularly for IATA requirements for non-AOP aerodromes that are currently distributed.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

***HISTORY OF PROVISION OF METAR/SPECI/TAF IN RELATION TO AOP AND NON-AOP ON SADIS***

1.1 In order to understand the background to the Aerodrome Operational Planning (AOP) and non-AOP requirements relating to METAR, SPECI and TAF collection/distribution for SADIS, a review of the SADIS Operations Group Final Reports was undertaken.

1.2 The Working Papers/Information Papers on which the Final Reports were based (especially in early years) are not always available, and as a consequence the full context cannot always be known.

1.3 The development of the content of what is known as *SADIS User Guide Annex 1* evolved over many years, and eventually became identical to and synonymous with *FASID Table MET 2A*. Excerpts from previous reports are provided in the **Appendix**.

1.4 From the outset, non-AOP aerodromes have been an important requirement to international aviation, as expressed by IATA. However, only 'AOP' aerodromes are obliged to be distributed internationally by States. Distribution of non-AOP aerodromes is – strictly – the prerogative of the originator State, yet this was managed over the years in a manner that was acceptable to IATA and ICAO, and by extension the airline community and the originators of METAR/SPECI/TAF respectively.

1.5 It is not clear in the very early years who was responsible for managing the 'SUG Annex 1', but it appears to be clear that this responsibility fell to SADISOPSG for the majority the period of interest, and was explicitly stated at SADISOPSG/6 in 2001. The SADISOPSG Secretary (on evidence of the Conclusions) had responsibility for that role.

1.6 It would appear that the original specification of METARs/SPECIs/TAFs to be distributed by the SADIS – and expressed in the *SADIS User Guide Annex 1* [SUG Annex 1] - was as necessary to meet the needs of the ICAO EUR Region and managed by Meteorological Operational Telecommunication Network — Europe Regional Planning Group (MOTNEG), then Bulletin Management Group (BMG), then Data Management Group (DMG). This does not necessarily mean that only EUR aerodromes were included (since EUR airlines obviously operate outside of EUR region) but may imply that the number of aerodromes included outside of EUR was limited. It would appear that originally some 2000 aerodromes were listed.

1.7 IATA appears to seek access to greater numbers of aerodrome METAR/SPECI/TAF by submitting proposals for additional aerodromes to be added to SUG Annex 1 along with a justification for the request. In principle, this always appears to have been accepted by the SADISOPSG, subject to capacity on (as was) SADIS 1G; and always re-stating the position that a State could decline to permit non-AOP aerodromes to be distributed internationally by SADIS. In some instances, this position was phrased in the form '...had no objection to distribution', and at SADISOPSG/4 '... provider States had agreed, explicitly or implicitly. This seems to imply that – at least in the early days – the de-facto transmission was considered to have at least tacit approval. In later years an explicit agreement to add non-AOP aerodromes was required from the relevant State.

1.8 During the evolution of the requirements, changes were made in the way the requirements were tabulated (separate column for non-AOP, provision in a database format etc).

1.9 It has not been possible to identify when the *SUG Annex 1* became identical to *FASID Table MET 2A*, although in the latter years of SADISOPSG this was certainly the case and the two references were synonymous. One interpretation of the extract from SADISOPSG/11 may imply that the 'alignment' of the two references commenced around 2006. It appears that this 'alignment' had become established by at least SADISOPSG/14 (2009).

1.10 From at least SADISOPSG/15 (2010), a process to speed up changes (particularly amendments) to SUG Annex 1 was implemented, with direct contact via the Regional Office concerned.

1.11 The theme that is evident - even from the early days of SADISOPSG – is that the Airlines that are represented by IATA increasingly rely upon operations into and out of [or use as nominated alternates] non-AOP aerodromes. These appear to be essential to support modern international air navigation.

1.12 A secondary theme that emerged for a period of time was related to the alignment of ISCS/WIFS METAR/SPECI/TAF and SADIS METAR/SPECI/TAF – whereas the *actual requirement* was to align both with SUG Annex 1/FASID MET 2A and this was clarified at SADISOPSG/18 (2013).

#### ***RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTENANCE OF SUG ANNEX 1***

1.13 At SADISOPSG/6 (2001), it is emphasised that the maintenance of SADIS User Guide Annex 1 is (or was) the responsibility of the SADISOPSG. Presumably this refers to the responsibility for ensuring that SUG Annex 1 was updated accordingly. This function, in the latter years at least, was undertaken by the Secretary of the SADISOPSG.

#### ***METAR/SPECI AND TAF REQUIREMENTS FOR AOP AND NON-AOP AERODROMES***

1.14 Due to resources constraints, the FASID Table MET 2A hosted on the ICAO website had not been updated since April 2014 which raised significant difficulty with OPMET monitoring against requirements. As updates to IATA OPMET requirements for both state updates to AOP and IATA requests for non-AOP aerodromes were not reflected in this table, the accuracy of monitoring against the most current requirement was continually diminishing. As deficiencies (using the EUR region PHP process) are developed based on monitoring of OPMET data against requirements, the proposed deficiency list had to go through extra scrutiny because of the inaccuracy of FASID Table MET 2A. This simply added more time to the analysis in deriving deficiencies.

1.15 To try to address this situation, a teleconference on 28 January 2016 between ICAO HQ, ICAO Paris, the SADIS OPMET gateway provider, IATA and some EUR Data Management Group (DMG) members discussed OPMET data requirements and ICAO functions (e.g. maintaining databases, monitoring). From the ICAO perspective, OPMET deficiencies could only be considered for AOP aerodromes. It was made clear that ICAO has no authority over States for providing OPMET data for non-AOP aerodromes. IATA indicated that OPMET information for some non-AOP aerodromes is requested by airlines to support flight planning through the use of destination and alternate aerodromes. Considering this point, such a list of non-AOP aerodromes should be maintained by IATA, and whilst availability monitoring of this list could be performed by the DMG, there is still questions of how this data should be exchanged if there is no ICAO requirement to do so.

1.16 To update the current AOP database, each region provided their draft electronic Air Navigation Plan Table MET II-2 containing OPMET requirements for AOP aerodromes, except the NAM Region where this information was not yet available. The consolidated table was provided by Belgocontrol which used the draft tables for all Regions and the legacy FASID Table MET 2A for NAM.

1.17 The Proposal for Amendment (PfA) for each Region will be processed in 2016. The status of PfA for each Region is provided below.

- MID – approved
- APAC – approved
- NAT – approved
- EUR – July 2016
- CAR/SAM – July 2016
- AFI – September 2016
- NAM – being developed – date not known

1.18 Currently, those eANPs approved are located on the respective ICAO Regional Office websites. In time, this information will be posted on the ICAO Portal under group SPACE.

***MAINTENANCE OF DATABASES CONTAINING METAR/SPECI AND TAF REQUIREMENTS FOR AOP AND NON-AOP AERODROMES***

1.19 ICAO HQ and ICAO Regional Officers for MET participated in a teleconference on 14 April 2016 to discuss the maintenance of a global database for AOP requirements and how non-AOP OPMET requirements could be managed.

1.20 With reference to AOP OPMET requirements, the format as desired by DMG was provided to the eANP point of contact at ICAO HQ who is coordinating with IT on providing a global AOP OPMET requirement table periodically (e.g. twice per year) as per the format requirements.

1.21 With reference to non-AOP aerodromes, the attendees of the teleconference were made aware that DMG/17 decided that the WG-MOG should be informed about this new situation – AOP tables maintained by ICAO - and advice will be asked about the maintenance of a database containing non-AOP aerodromes and the possible governance around this e.g. where and how frequent this database is maintained also needs to be addressed.

**2. ACTION BY THE METP-WG/MOG**

2.1 The METP-WG/MOG is invited to:

- a) Follow-up on progress on providing one table of ICAO OPMET requirements for AOP aerodromes at an agreed interval (e.g. every six months)
- b) consider inviting IATA to develop a governance process around non-AOP aerodromes OPMET requirements in coordination, as necessary, with appropriate ICAO groups.

## **Appendix:A**

Extracts from SADISOPSG Final Reports relating to Annex 1 to SADIS User Guide.

Note: The 'SADIS Implementation sub-group' pre-dated SADISOPSG. No information is to hand.

### **From SADISOPSG/1 (1996)**

Coordination with Meteorological Operational Telecommunication Network — Europe Regional Planning Group (MOTNEG<sup>1</sup>)

"...MOTNEG was responsible, *inter alia*, for monitoring the operation of communication systems for the collection of OPMET data required in the EUR Region, and dissemination to all regions [including the EUR Region] of OPMET data collected in the EUR Region."

It is now unknown as to the original content, but may have been restricted to EUR and 'peripheral' States.

### **Requirements governing aerodromes whose OPMET data is to be included on SADIS**

8.3 The group recalled that the METG at its fifth meeting in November 1995 had discussed this matter based upon the results of an inquiry which had been sent out in June 1995 to States in the area to be served by SADIS, and IATA. The results of the inquiry had indicated that OPMET data for almost 2000 aerodromes would be required on the SADIS. On closer examination it transpired that, of these, some 30 per cent were domestic or military, but in any case were not listed in the AOP Table of the relevant regional air navigation plans. In view of this, and other anomalies, a second inquiry was initiated in December 1995 in which all States whose aerodromes were concerned were provided with consolidated OPMET data tables developed from the first inquiry and requested to indicate, *inter alia*, for which aerodromes they were prepared to provide OPMET data for dissemination on the SADIS.

### **From SADISOPSG/2 (1997)**

5.4 IATA requested guidance regarding how airline requirements for OPMET data should be dealt with. The Secretary advised that they should continue to be processed through the ICAO regional planning groups and relevant ICAO Regional Offices. In this regard it was noted that the new FASID amendment process would markedly shorten the time required for the update of the OPMET exchange tables. The SADIS User Guide would reflect these amendments as soon as they had been approved in accordance with the procedure.

### **From SADISOPSG/3 (1998)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Presumably predecessors to Bulletin Management Group, which itself became Data Management Group.

Nothing of note.

### **From SADISOPSG/4 (1999)**

3.4 The group agreed that the BMG tables should be used to replace the current [SUG] Annex 2 in the SADIS User Guide and the proposed [SUG] Annex 3. The question was raised why [SUG] Annex 1 should not also be replaced because its information was included in the first BMG table (new [SUG] Annex 2). The group was advised that [SUG] Annex 1 represented the formal list of aerodromes (and their OPMET data) that provider States had agreed, explicitly or implicitly, could be broadcast on SADIS. It was in the exact format to which they had agreed and had to remain under the direct control of ICAO.

3.6 IATA requested clarification of the procedure to be adopted to obtain amendments to Annex 1 of the SADIS User Guide, primarily the addition of aerodromes or OPMET data. The Secretary explained the procedure in some detail, and the group agreed that the procedure should be recorded in **Appendix G [No extant copy]** to the report to assist all users. The group also agreed that the procedure for proposing amendments to Annex 1 to SADIS User Guide could be of assistance to the MOTNEG and the BMG in revising the EUR OPMET update procedure referred to in Conclusion 4/8. The group agreed to develop the following conclusion:

3.8 ...One point in the procedure which the group considered required some clarification was the exact mechanism referred to as “Requirement accepted” and “Requirement not accepted”. The use of “requirements” was considered very specific in ICAO and where this meant acceptance of a requirement for additional aerodromes or OPMET data, the procedure discussed in 3.6 above and included in Appendix G would apply. When it meant simply “changes” to bulletins, headers etc. such “acceptance” by the BMG would seem to be a straight forward matter. It was agreed that these different types of “requirement” should be distinguished and the terminology would be reviewed by the BMG in light of these discussions.

### **From SADISOPSG/5 (2000)**

3.7 ...It was noted that the MOTNEG/5 meeting had proposed a revised EUR OPMET update procedure which took into account some of the comments made by the SADISOPSG at its fourth meeting. The residual items of concern to the group were the need to explicitly indicate in the flow diagram and the EUR OPMET update procedure, that consultation with States occurred before the BMG proceeded with its processing of the request from a user, and the SADISOPSG was in the consultation loop in cases where any changes affected the SADIS broadcast content.

### **From SADISOPSG/6 (2001)**

3.7 With regard to the amendment procedure to Annex 1, it was emphasized that Annex 1 was the responsibility of the SADISOPSG (in accordance with its terms of reference) and that therefore any amendment of substance would have to be approved by this group. Normally, amendment proposals would be presented at the annual SADISOPSG meetings. Under exceptional circumstances (e.g. urgent new requirements), amendment proposals could be submitted by States or users to the Secretary between the meetings; however, these proposals would have to be sent by correspondence to the members of the SADISOPSG for consultation and approval before Annex 1 could be amended. It was realized that there were also amendments of a purely editorial nature; these were quite frequent and they had been so far introduced by the ICAO Secretariat in close coordination with the SADIS provider State without involving the group. The group agreed that this practice was acceptable for efficiency and should therefore be continued.

3.8 It was agreed that Annex 1 amendments of substance would be forwarded to the BMG by the BMG focal point who regularly attended SADISOPSG meetings. This would be done on an annual basis shortly after each SADISOPSG meeting. All editorial amendments made during the year would be forwarded to the BMG focal point by the SADIS provider State.

### **From SADISOPSG/7 (2002)**

3. Hence it was initially assumed that no additions were required and the current Annex 1 was satisfactory. IATA, however, presented an extensive amendment proposal to Annex 1. The SADIS provider State indicated that such a substantial increase could affect the performance indices. It was understood that the requirement to monitor these new data would be performed off-line. The group reviewed Annex 1 and the proposed amendments thereto proposed by IATA and endorsed them in principle. However, it was realized that the amendment to Annex 1 and the subsequent provision of these data would be subject to the normal consultation with States. On completion of the consultation process, the corresponding table in the EUR FASID would also have to be amended. The group formulated the following conclusion:

### **From SADISOPSG/8 (2003)**

3.1.1 The group recalled that the current requirements for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the SADIS User Guide (SUG). The group was aware of the fact that at the SADISOPSG/7 Meeting, IATA had proposed substantial amendments to Annex 1 and that the proposal had in principle been endorsed by the group (Conclusion 7/6 refers). Subsequently, all the States concerned had been consulted seeking their concurrence of the inclusion of a number of aerodromes which included some “non-AOP” aerodromes (i.e. aerodromes not included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans), with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing OPMET data for the non-international aerodromes. All the changes which were agreeable to States concerned had been incorporated in Annex 1.

3.1.2 It was noted that hitherto Annex 1 did not include OPMET data from all the AOP aerodromes. The group recalled that IATA had indicated that the airlines wished to have access to OPMET data from all international aerodromes. The group agreed in principle that Annex 1 should be amended as shown at Appendix F, Part I to this report to include OPMET data from all the AOP aerodromes. This would simplify the annual review of Annex 1 since the group could concentrate its efforts on OPMET data from non-AOP aerodromes. It was suggested, however, that with the addition of new AOP aerodromes in Annex 1, it would take some time before all the new OPMET messages would be available at the SADIS uplink station and that the performance indices could be, at least initially, adversely affected. Therefore, the group agreed that parallel to the inclusion of all AOP aerodromes in Annex 1 to the SUG, ICAO should contact all the States concerned inviting them to make sure that all the required OPMET data were provided to the SADIS and ISCS uplink stations and emphasizing the importance of adhering to the formats specified in the templates given in ICAO Annex 3.

3.1.4 With regard to the format of Annex 1, it was agreed that the category of the aerodrome (i.e. the distinction between AOP and non-AOP aerodromes) should be indicated in a separate column. The current distinction based on the use of italics was not considered sufficient, since the font type was frequently lost when such data bases were processed by computer. Furthermore, the group confirmed the importance of specifying various types of OPMET data in Annex 3 since this would constitute a clear indication of an aeronautical requirements to States and would facilitate any follow-up action required in the case of missing OPMET data.

3.1.5 Requests for additional OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes had been received by the Secretary from IATA. These amendments were reviewed by the group which endorsed them in principle. They are included at Appendix F, Part II. It was realized that the amendment to Annex 1 related to non-AOP aerodromes would be subject to the normal consultation with States. On completion of the consultation process, the corresponding MET tables in the FASID concerned would also have to be amended.

## **From SADISOPSG/9 (2004)**

4.1.1.1 The group recalled that the current requirements for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the SADIS User Guide (SUG). Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. The group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned was agreeable to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes. All the changes which had been requested by users, and agreeable to States concerned, had been incorporated in Annex 1.

4.1.1.6 Additional amendments to Annex 1 were brought forward by IATA which suggested, inter alia, that non-AOP aerodromes, for which no data was available, should be considered for deletion. The group concurred that, with these deletions, Annex 1 would better reflect the reality. Furthermore, it was



proposed by IATA that all of the non-AOP aerodromes for which data was in fact broadcast on SADIS, but were not currently included therein, should be listed in Annex 1. In this regard, the group recalled that non-AOP could only be included in Annex 1 if the State concerned consented to their inclusion and no such agreement had been obtained for these non-AOP aerodromes. Therefore, the group could not endorse their inclusion.

### **From SADISOPSG/10 (2005)**

4.1.1.1 The group recalled that the current requirements by States and users for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the *SADIS User Guide* (SUG). Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. In response to Conclusion 8/6, OPMET information from *all* the AOP aerodromes was included therein. The group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from non-AOP aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data. All the changes which had been requested by users and agreeable to States concerned had been incorporated in Annex 1.

### **From SADISOPSG/11 (2006)**

5.1.1 The group recalled that the current requirements by States and users for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the *SADIS User Guide* (SUG). Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. In response to Conclusion 8/6, OPMET information from all the AOP aerodromes was included therein. It was expected that all AOP aerodromes issue METAR and SPECI, as a minimum (unless otherwise indicated in the remarks column). The group realized that the requirements for TAF were subject to a formal regional air navigation (RAN) agreement which was reflected in FASID Tables MET 1A of all the regional air navigation plans (ANP)/facilities and services implementation documents (FASID). Annex 1 to the SUG had simply to reflect these formal tables. In this regard, it was noted that there were numerous AOP aerodromes from where no TAF were required.

5.1.2 With regard to non-AOP aerodromes, the group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from these aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes. All the changes, requested by users at the SADISOPSG/10 Meeting (Conclusion 10/10 refers) and during the subsequent 12-month period that were agreeable to States concerned, had been incorporated in Annex 1.

### ***Format of Annex 1 to the SUG***

5.1.5 The group was pleased to note that the work on the implementation of the data-base oriented Annex 1 to the *SUG* by the Secretariat called for by Conclusion 10/8 had been completed and was expected to be implemented shortly after the SADISOPSG/11 Meeting. To draw the full benefit of the data-base oriented format of Annex 1 and to ensure its concurrence with the FASID Tables MET 1A of the regional ANP/FASID, the group agreed that it would be important that the requirements for TAF expressed in FASID Tables MET 1A also be converted into the data-base oriented format by the ICAO Secretariat as soon as practicable. The group formulated the following conclusion:

**Conclusion 11/9 — Development of a data-base oriented global FASID Table MET 1A**

That the Secretariat consider developing a data-base oriented version of a global FASID Table MET 1A, in time for the SADISOPSG/12 Meeting.

### **From SADISOPSG/12 (2007)**

5.1.1 The group recalled that the current requirements by States and users for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the *SADIS User Guide* (*SUG*) which was maintained as a database by the ICAO Secretariat. Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. In response to Conclusion 8/6, OPMET information from all the AOP aerodromes was included therein. It was expected that all AOP aerodromes issue METAR and SPECI, as a minimum (unless otherwise indicated in the remark column). The group realized that the requirements for TAF were subject to a formal regional air navigation (RAN) agreement which was reflected in FASID Tables MET 1A of all the regional air navigation plans (ANP)/facilities and services implementation documents (FASID). Annex 1 to the *SUG* had simply to reflect these formal tables. In this regard, it was noted that there were numerous AOP aerodromes from where no TAF was required. The group was pleased to note that the currency of information related to TAF in Annex 1 was expected to improve in the future with the introduction of the global database encompassing information pertaining to all FASID Tables MET 1A (in response to Conclusion 11/9).

5.1.2 With regard to non-AOP aerodromes, the group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from these aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes.

### **From SADISOPSG/13 (2008)**

Nothing additional.

### **From SADISOPSG/14 (2009)**

### 5.1.1 METAR, SPECI AND TAF

#### **General considerations concerning the requirements and actual content of the SADIS broadcast**

5.1.1.1 The group recalled that the requirements by States and users for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the *SADIS User Guide* (SUG) which was extracted from a global OPMET database maintained by the ICAO Secretariat. Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes. With regard to additional information included in Annex 1, the group recalled that three categories characterizing the hours of issuance of OPMET data had been incorporated, in view of limiting the monitoring of the availability of OPMET data to aerodromes which provided OPMET data on a 24-hour basis. Furthermore, aerodromes for which 30-hour TAF were required had been clearly identified in Annex 1 (Conclusion 13/6 refers).

5.1.1.2 In response to Conclusion 8/6, OPMET information from all the AOP aerodromes was included in Annex 1. All AOP aerodromes issued METAR and SPECI, as a minimum (with few exceptions in the EUR Region), while the requirements for TAF were subject to formal regional air navigation (RAN) agreement which was reflected in the Tables MET 1A of all the facilities and services implementation documents (FASID). The group recalled that, since February 2008, similar to Annex 1, all FASID Tables MET 1A were extracted from the global OPMET database thus ensuring the consistency of information between the FASID Tables MET 1A and Annex 1. This arrangement also implied that Annex 1 now reflected, at all times, the formal requirements displayed in FASID Tables MET 1A. Furthermore, the group had agreed that any proposals for amendments related to OPMET data from AOP aerodromes should be addressed directly to the ICAO Regional Office concerned (Decision 13/8 refers). This approach eliminated the need for a lengthy procedure (i.e. formulation by the SADISOPSG of draft conclusions for endorsement by the PIRGs concerned) and substantially expedited the implementation of new requirements.

5.1.1.3 With regard to non-AOP aerodromes, the group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from these aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes. OPMET requirements from these aerodromes could be amended by the group annually, subject to an agreement by the State concerned.

5.1.1.4 It was further recalled that the actual OPMET information that was currently broadcast on SADIS was indicated in Annex 2 (listing the aerodromes included in the bulletins) and Annex 3 (listing the bulletin headers). These annexes were updated bi-annually, with the assistance of the EUR Bulletin Management Group (BMG).

## **From SADISOPSG/15 (2010)**

### **METAR, SPECI and TAF**

***General considerations concerning the requirements and actual content of the SADIS broadcast***

5.1.1 The group recalled that the requirements by States and users for METAR, SPECI and TAF to be broadcast on the SADIS were given in Annex 1 to the *SADIS User Guide* (SUG) which was extracted from a global OPMET database maintained by the ICAO Secretariat. Annex 1 included OPMET information from both AOP (i.e. aerodromes included in the aerodrome operational planning (AOP) tables of the regional air navigation plans) and non-AOP aerodromes.

5.1.2 In response to Conclusion 8/6, OPMET information from all the AOP aerodromes was included in Annex 1. All AOP aerodromes issued METAR and SPECI, as a minimum (with few exceptions in the EUR Region), while the requirements for TAF were subject to formal regional air navigation (RAN) agreement which was reflected in the Tables MET 1A of all the facilities and services implementation documents (FASID). The group recalled that, since February 2008, similar to Annex 1, all FASID Tables MET 1A were extracted from the global OPMET database thus ensuring the consistency of information between the FASID Tables MET 1A and Annex 1. This arrangement also implied that Annex 1 now reflected, at all times, the formal requirements displayed in FASID Tables MET 1A. Furthermore, the group had agreed that any proposals for amendments related to OPMET data from AOP aerodromes should be addressed directly to the ICAO Regional Office concerned (Decision 13/8 refers). This approach eliminated the need for a lengthy procedure (i.e. formulation by the SADISOPSG of draft conclusions for endorsement by the PIRGs concerned) and substantially expedited the implementation of new requirements.

5.1.3 With regard to non-AOP aerodromes, the group was aware of the fact that OPMET information from these aerodromes could be included in Annex 1 only if the State concerned had no objection to its distribution on the SADIS and with the understanding that States did not have any obligation of providing such data for non-international aerodromes. OPMET requirements from these aerodromes may be amended by the group annually, subject to an agreement by the State concerned.

5.1.4 It was further recalled that the actual OPMET information that was currently broadcast on SADIS was indicated in Annex 2 (listing the aerodromes included in the bulletins) and Annex 3 (listing the bulletin headers). These annexes were updated bi-annually, with the assistance of the EUR Bulletin Management Group (BMG).

**Appendix B****Extract from EUR ANP, VOLUME I****PART II – AERODROMES / AERODROME OPERATIONS (AOP)****2. GENERAL REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

2.1 Regular aerodromes and their alternates required for international commercial air transport operations should be determined through regional agreements, based on the list of international aerodromes designated by States and the needs of the international commercial flights. Consideration should also be given to the needs of international general aviation flights as identified by user requirements. The alternate aerodromes should be planned/selected, to the greatest practicable extent, from the list of existing regular aerodromes used for international aircraft operations. However, where in specific cases the designation of another aerodrome in close proximity to a regular aerodrome would result in appreciable fuel conservation or other operational advantages, this aerodrome may be designated for use as an alternate aerodrome only. Planning of alternate aerodromes should be made on the basis of the following objectives:

a) to ensure that at least one suitable alternate is available for each international aircraft operation; and

b) to ensure that the facilities at the designated alternate aerodrome(s) are appropriate for the alternate aircraft operations.

2.2 The list of regular and alternate aerodromes (including their designations) required in the Region to serve international civil aviation operations (international scheduled air transport, non-scheduled air transport and general aviation operations) is given in **Table AOP I-1**. Each Contracting State should ensure the provision of aerodrome facilities and services at the international aerodromes under its jurisdiction.

**TABLE AOP I-1**  
**INTERNATIONAL AERODROMES REQUIRED IN THE EUR REGION**

**EXPLANATION OF THE TABLE**

City/Aerodrome: Name of the city and aerodrome, preceded by the location indicator.

Designation: Designation of the aerodrome as:

RG – international general aviation, regular use;

RS — international scheduled air transport, regular use;

RNS — international non-scheduled air transport, regular use;

AS — international scheduled air transport, alternate use;

ANS — international non-scheduled air transport, alternate use.

*Note 1 — when an aerodrome is needed for more than one type of use, normally only the use highest on the above list is shown.*

[Example — an aerodrome required for both RS and AS use would only be shown as RS in the list.]

*Note 2 — when the aerodrome is located on an island and no particular city or town is served by the aerodrome, the name of the island is included instead of the name of a city.*