<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hello. As per ICAO Webex held this Tuesday ref SNOWTAM2020 (GRF), we were recommended to ask during this Webex. Would like to clarify, if ICAO expects releasing guidance, what shall be included in ATIS message from GRF message, in which order and specifically - shall be transmitted &quot;RCC&quot; (e.g. RCC 5/5/5) or &quot;Breaking Action&quot; (e.g. Breaking Action Good/Good/Good). Thx</td>
<td>Answer from APAC GRF Webinar: This important topic is being addressed by an ad-hoc expert group, with additional information based upon existing SARPS and guidance, to be released in the summer of 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>About automated system of AIREP, is there any airplane equipped with this system now?? How they transfer data into controllers?? And more importantly, as mentioned in Circular 355, how discriminate between automated AIREP and flight crew originated AIREPs?? Are automated AIREPs more reliable than the other one?? Please explain this. Mohammad Mahanpour <a href="mailto:m-mahanpour@cao.ir">m-mahanpour@cao.ir</a> About automated system of AIREP, is there any airplane equipped with this system now?? How they transfer data into controllers?? And more importantly, as mentioned in Circular 355, how discriminate between automated AIREP and flight crew originated AIREPs?? Are automated AIREPs more reliable than the other one?? Please explain this.</td>
<td>This is a topic that needs to be explored with the R&amp;D community. There is likely some work underway by companies such as Airbus, but the status is unknown to the panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hello colleagues. According to the information in SNOWTAM Guidance document, EASA regulated countries should not fill the item S (friction). Is this rule optional or strictly requested? Thank you.</td>
<td>According to EASA regulations: Publication of friction measurements is not allowed, within EASA regulated countries. There is no guidance provided since this will be according to a standard set or agreed by the individual State. Annex 14 Vol I, 2.9.9 and 2.9.10. (This was an option for States which had a ‘historic approved system’ in place. e.g. and allowance for the Canadian runway Friction Index (CRFI) and requires a method on how the reported friction coefficient relates to aeroplane performance. CRFI had “landing tables” as part of the system).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We are going to measure and to publish as well friction coefficients because it is the only proof we can have in case of accident/incident... But there is no ICAO/EASA guidance how to publish coefficients in the item S) of the new RCR... Whould it be like this: &quot;XX/XX/XX SFH&quot; ? Thanks a lot!</td>
<td>According to ICAO regulations: There is one global Runway Condition Report (RCR). The Runway Condition Assessment Matrix is global and is applicable for all conditions to be reported on a global scale. In Cir 355 a version of the RCAM is provided applicable for those States/runways that do not experience frost-snow-ice conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For those countries where snow is non-existence, how would GRF be issue via SNOWTAM?</td>
<td>When a slippery wet runway condition (RWYCC 3 - WET) or a STANDING WATER condition would be reported in any runway third, and the cessation of these conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Will we publish “SNOWTAMs” or “RCRs” in accordance GRF system??</td>
<td>A Runway Condition Report (RCR) will be issued. There are no difference in the information provided between the RCR and the SNOWTAM (AIS). The RCR is also the basis for reporting to ATS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Will you share this presentation on ICAO’s website? Thank you.</td>
<td>Similar to Question 47 Water patches and flooded would normally be reported as STANDING WATER or only WET for water patches. Location should be specified in the plain language remarks. Similar to question 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>what about water patches and flooded</td>
<td>Similar to Question 47 Water patches and flooded would normally be reported as STANDING WATER or only WET for water patches. Location should be specified in the plain language remarks. Similar to question 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is it possible to share a link with presentations? TY</td>
<td>There is one global Runway Condition Report (RCR). The Runway Condition Assessment Matrix is global and is applicable for all conditions to be reported on a global scale. In Cir 355 a version of the RCAM is provided applicable for those States/runways that do not experience frost-snow-ice conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RCR Matrix for each Runway, dose ICAO have world Runways RCR ?</td>
<td>Yes; to a certain degree. The sequence of information is in a structured order and format to be used limited. See PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) 1.1.2.4, 1.1.2.5 and 1.1.2.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The definition of Situational awareness section provides plenty of filling approaches/options. This means that almost every country might eventually have its own filling practice which may lead to confusions. Has ICAO already dealt with this possible problem?</td>
<td>Yes; to a certain degree. The sequence of information is in a structured order and format to be used limited. See PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981) 1.1.2.4, 1.1.2.5 and 1.1.2.6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shall the new SNOWTAM be related to Airport, or to the single Runway on that airport?

A new SNOWTAM relates to the latest Runway Condition report (RCR) for the individual runways provided by the aerodrome.

In GRF the report of the pilot is based on vision. This judgment makes the decision-making process rather subjective. Which can mislead the aerodrome operators and cause a delay in operation. Different experience, different aircraft and different performance may cause the error. For example, a pilot with 30000 hours of experience on 747 may have different experience in comparison with a young pilot of Fokker 50 (or vice versa). Is there any study on this issue or any measurements in GRF to avoid this problematic misunderstanding (due to subjective data transfer) between pilots?

The AIREP is based upon the pilots subjective perception of the braking action experienced compared with the one reported through the RCR information provided. This is not limited to pilots vision. By nature the AIREP will be subjective and dependent upon the pilots experience. There is single specific study referred to. In US there has been a longer tradition of using AIREP.

For clarification, standing water on the runway should NOT be covered by SNOWTAM and ATIS and ATC info thru radio freq is sufficient? Thank you

Standing water (water with depth of 4mm or more) on runway must be SNOWTAMed in addition to ATIS. If water on runway is 3mm or less (wet) not associated with snow, slush, ice or frost, ATIS will be sufficient. However, if wet runway is associated with snow, slush, ice or frost, SNOWTAM must be issued, in addition to ATIS.

Can we use a simplified snowtam format? (by deleting some items. for example items related to snow in hot countries)

A SNOWTAM reflects the Runway Condition Report (RCR) of which information it contain. For generation of RCR there are two versions of the Runway Condition Assessment Matrix (RCAM). The use of these two versions are dependent upon the climatic conditions. e.g. if the State/aerodrome experience frost, snow or ice on the runways.

Hi all, the definition of the rwy in the context of SNOWTAM is about the physical rwy length or the declared landing distance available?

SNOWTAM relates to published declared distances in the AIP or by NOTAM. The importance of the published landing distance by NOTAM can be seen by the location of this information. It is the first information in the Situational awareness section of the Runway Condition Report (RCR) since this is a direct input in the performance calculations to be used by the flight crew.

What about the rumours that 5 nov 2020 cannot be met?

It is recommended that GRF (including SNOWTAM) be implemented on a globally harmonized basis (no filing of difference as much as possible) to ensure the global utilization of safety benefits of its implementation as well as harmonization. Non-harmonized implementation may cause confusion among the users.

With regard to possible postponement of the requirement by ICAO, this discussion is ongoing and, if decided by the ICAO Council, this will be informed to States in due time.

Can we cancel a snowtam? or can we replace a snowtam?

When a new SNOWTAM is issued for an airport, it automatically cancels the previous SNOWTAM (if exist) and replace the old one. NOTAM systems that receive the new SNOWTAM identify it by its abbreviated heading and location indicator and replace the new SNOWTAM in their database. In case a SNOWTAM has not been issued within 8 hours of a previous SNOWTAM, the old SNOWTAM is automatically expired by the system and the airport will be considered normal. If within 8 hours, the phenomena disappears and you need to cancel the SNOWTAM, you just need to issue a new SNOWTAM for the airport with this format (for example): 01150915 09R 6/6/6 NR/NR/NR NR/NR/NR DRY/DRY/DRY

Great presentations. However, maybe stress that the LOWER runway designator is used (so in your EADD example it should be 11L, not 29R).

The presentation was corrected.

Which is the data from SNOWTAM fields that shall be included in ATIS Message in order to keep it compact and easy readable by pilots in cockpit?

Similar to Question 1
21 Please give us more some examples for NOTAM temples of standing water or slippery wet on the runway for instance!

22 So, according to the new definition, rainwater needs to be issued SNOWTAM? And airports in tropical areas that don’t have snow and only rain are also involved. Did I get it right?

23 Is using NR in ATIS acceptable

24 I have heard rumors that implementation of November 5 will be postponed. is ICAO preparing for a new date?

25 If no % report (not mandatory) on item E can we consider the runway without any contaminant as a rule or keep an option that assessment as not be done?

26 What about the RWY condition changes? IF i report frost during dawn do i have to report another snowtam after the condition changes (30 min) . Hoar/white frost could be change soon as far as i know.

27 Is the air traffic controller inform pilots by using codes or open language as good etc.

28 In situational awareness section, Why there is no item designated with letter "Q"

29 Is there any criteria to be a RWY Assessor ?

30 When the currently published future SNOWTAM has reports for 3 runways in one message, then one of the runways is cleaned, the following SNOWTAM should contain only the new RCR for the cleared rwy or should include also the older RCR’s from the unchanged runways?

31 in situational awareness section, why item Q is not there.... any specific reason......

32 There are more than 100 TWYS. How to?

33 how new snowtam replace old snowtam

34 How should slippery wet RWY be assess?
Today NIL means that the surface is dry and clean (good friction) and has been reported so for many years in Sweden, why is now NIL the same as RWYCC 0 in the new GRF format? EASA has this mentioned in the NPA 2018-14.

In the old ICAO SNOWTAM format NIL represent a surface that is CLEAR AND DRY; a surface providing good braking action. However in US the term NIL had been used for describing a pilot report of no (NIL) braking action. On a global scale the term could provide confusion. Furthermore NIL is not a numerical value which is used for describing rwy condition codes (RWYCCs).

We were able to show the short SNOWTAM report at the end of the METAR report too. The METAR report had the following parts: Rwy designator, surface description, total % of the contamination, depth of the deposit, friction coefficient. With the RCAM will change all what is related with the description, but will be any changes in this type of report.

As part of GRF implementation, Annex 3 SARPs have been updated to remove the state of the runway from the remarks section of the METAR/SPECI beginning 5 November 2020 since this information has been replaced with a new SNOWTAM format and will also be provided on ATIS and voice, when necessary, by ATS.

Might have missed it in the presentation, but has you explained the up and downgrade system? Is it OK to use one of the in NPA 2018-14 explained mentioned examples (ex friction) to upgrade or downgrade your RWYCC or do you need more?

Downgrading and upgrading are described in PANS-Aerodromes (Doc 9981), Assessing a runway and assigning a runway condition code. A change in RWYCC requires a complete assessment taking into account all information available.

Hello, we can not find Hungarocontrol (Hungary) on B2C list.

This is a specific question. They should ask EAD directly.

Hello, we can not find Hungarocontrol (Hungary) on B2C list.

This is a specific question. They should ask EAD directly.

If the Standing water in the RWY not associated to Snow or slush or frost. The standing water is due rain or floods do we still issue SNOWTAM.

Standing water: SNOWTAM & ATS

Wet: SNOWTAM & ATS (if it is associated with snow, slush, ice or frost)

This is a specific question. They should ask EAD directly.

Standing water: SNOWTAM & ATS

Wet: SNOWTAM & ATS (if it is associated with snow, slush, ice or frost)

A NOTAM gives more detailed information regarding the STANDING WATER or SLIPPERY WET conditions and provide depth information which can be used for the assessor when providing a Runway Condition report (RCR) which in turn is the basis for issuing a SNOWTAM. The presentations did not give an option to issue NOTAM instead of SNOWTAM for standing water or slippery wet!

Clarification: For standing water (contaminant): AIS and ATS while wet and slippery wet: ATS only"

Standing water: SNOWTAM & ATS

Wet: SNOWTAM & ATS (if it is associated with snow, slush, ice or frost)

This is a specific question. They should ask EAD directly.

Standing water: SNOWTAM & ATS

Wet: SNOWTAM & ATS (if it is associated with snow, slush, ice or frost)

Yes a RCR containg the information STANDING water requires a SNOWTAM to be issued. Standing water must be SNOWTAm ed, no matter of the reason that caused it.

A NOTAM gives more detailed information regarding the STANDING WATER or SLIPPERY WET conditions and provide depth information which can be used for the assessor when providing a Runway Condition report (RCR) which in turn is the basis for issuing a SNOWTAM. The presentations did not give an option to issue NOTAM instead of SNOWTAM for standing water or slippery wet!

Dear Mr Valdimir thank you for this update , may i have please a copy of this presentation since so many updates i have realized, i need to review again ? with thanks form Jamal

A SNOWTAM reflects the information provided in the Runway Condition Report (RCR) provided by the Aerodrome and reflects the Runway Condition Report (RCR) regulated by the State. The AIS serviceprovider for that State needs to be able to disseminate the full RCR is regulated by the State with full data integrity intact.

The webinar recording is available on: https://www.icao.int/Meetings/webinar-series/Pages/SNOWTAM-2020.aspx

The presentation and lots of other GRF resources are available on:
https://www.icao.int/safety/Pages/GRF.aspx

This item is not a question, but a comment. An answer could be as follows): SWIM would be a future system to manage and promulgate ATM-related information including SNOWTAM. Until SWIM is realized, AFTN or AMHS networks will be used to disseminate SNOWTAM information.

from pilot point of view most commonly used parameter are just the braking action and the % of runway covered and also the thickness of the precipitation on the airport. For easy of adoption i presume that SWIM will be the perfect combination to aggregate the data to be provided on board avoiding the complexity of the message

A SNOWTAM reflects the information provided in the Runway Condition Report (RCR) provided by the Aerodrome and reflects the Runway Condition Report (RCR) regulated by the State. The AIS serviceprovider for that State needs to be able to disseminate the full RCR is regulated by the State with full data integrity intact.

The webinar recording is available on: https://www.icao.int/Meetings/webinar-series/Pages/SNOWTAM-2020.aspx

This item is not a question, but a comment. An answer could be as follows): SWIM would be a future system to manage and promulgate ATM-related information including SNOWTAM. Until SWIM is realized, AFTN or AMHS networks will be used to disseminate SNOWTAM information.

EAD’S cross-validations are going to allow upgrading or downgrading the RWYCC?

Yes. Ref ICAO 9981
If STATE has only water only does it required to follow GRF process?

Yes, GRF and Runway Condition Report (RCR) into SNOWTAM apply to all States recalling that standing water (water of depth 4mm or greater) is a RWYCC 2 and this information is needed for operators to calculate their landing distance and determine, with other factors, if it is safe to land.

similar to Question 47

Dear Colleagues, BULATSA (Bulgarian ANSP) is looking for partners (not migrated to EAD) for some testing for exchange of new SNOWTAM Format messages. We are expecting to be ready for some tests at the end of June. For more information, please contact: dragan.draganov@bulatsa.com.

We are coordinating in EUR/NAT Office a test between Bulgaria and Switzerland.

What if the RWY is DAMP, what code shall be used?

A damp runway will be reported as WET.

If SNOWTAM expires automatically after 8hrs, what safety barriers you suggest (excluding human factor) in risk assessment, cause from safety aspect better to inform about RWY contamination which actually is not anymore, than didn’t inform (if SNOWTAM expires then information stops) about contamination which actually are on runway, but due to some human error didn’t extened?

PANS-Aerodrome (Doc 9981) 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. Significant changes shall be reported without delay. Regular inspection and review of runway condition should be part of the procedure of aerodrome operators, in order to ensure that any significant change has been reported through RCR.

What will happen to current AIM systems due to this SNOWTAM format change??

AISs should consult with their AIM/NOTAM system providers (industry) to update their NOTAM system software. It depends on your current NOTAM system, which could be automated as part of AIS automation system, semi-automated or other platforms that you are currently using in your NOF.

What if a contracting state is not ready to implement RGF?

The GRF implementation applicability date is 5 November 2020. If a State cannot implement by that date, a difference to the relevant Annexes has be filed to ICAO. If there is a deferred implementation date based on a Council decision in June, States will be notified.

For the situation awareness, is it possible for an item specific to runway be linked to a runway which is not listed in Aeroplane performance calculation section?

No. Situational awareness section provide additional information to be used for situational awareness related to the information provided in the aeroplane performance calculation section where the runway is identified. A Runway Condition Report (RCR) cannot contain a situational awareness part alone.

Can Aircraft Manufacturers add some Mechanism for adoption of the new SNOWTAM 2020 as related to ATC's?

This is a topic for future R&D activities

Change name SNOWTAM to CONTAM, less confusion for those with no snow. Perhaps?

Information Management Panel (IMP) is studying future improvements needed for NOTAMs (in general).

N/A

Is re for counties without snow, do we need to adopt the new snowtam format or can we revise it and adopt only what is applicable to the country?

There is one global Runway Condition Report (RCR). The Runway Condition Assessment Matrix is global and is applicable for all conditions to be reported on a global scale. In Cir 355 a version of the RCAM is provided applicable for those States/runways that do not experience frost-snow-ice conditions.

Similar to Question 63

Hi sir: Why some information that is belonging to ATIS not Snowtam main reason?"

The main reason was to keep the volume of the SNOWTAM down. The only runway condition that is reported by ATIS and not SNOWTAM is wet runway (not associated with snow, slush, ice or frost). All other circumstances must be issued through both SNOWTAM and ATIS. With regard to the former, as wet runway has the least significant impact on aircraft performance and is more likely to disappear soon (there wouldn’t be sufficient time to process SNOWTAM), it was agreed that ATIS would be sufficient.

For counties without snow, do we need to adopt the new snowtam format or can we revise it and adopt only what is applicable to the country?

There is a NOTAM and SNOWTAM why cant ICAO consider another reporting format RAINTAM for the standing water since many tropical countires facing this problem of reporting RWY surface condition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Is there a rule according to which ATS has to transmit PIREPS to Airport OCC?</td>
<td>Yes. ICAO: PANS-ATM (Doc 4444) 4.12.7 Forwarding of braking action information. EASA: (EU) 2020/469, ATS.OR.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Is there a KPI from time of RCR assessment to issuing of notam &amp; broadcast on ATIS</td>
<td>There is no specific KPI on SNOWTAM or ATIS processing time. It depends on each State’s system and process which may have different paths to exchange the information and process the promulgation, based on defined responsibilities. A general criteria is that the information received by RCR must be promulgated by ATIS/SNOWTAM with no delay. States should define their own timing KPIs for each responsible authority (Aerodromes, AIS, ATS) to ensure that the information is submitted to the next responsible unit without delay (e.g. within the AIS Quality System for AIS or as part of the MATS for ATS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Fruitful presentation. Thank you</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>NOTAM Office will receive the issuance of SNOWTAM from the originator (Airport assessor-operator)?</td>
<td>Airport authority is responsible for the collection of runway surface condition report and its submission to AIS and ATS (through RCR). NOF (AIS) receives RCR from aerodrome operator in order to produce SNOWTAM and disseminate via AFTN/AMHS. N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Thanks to you and all!!!</td>
<td>No. Situational awareness section provide additional information to be used for situational awareness related to the information provided in the aeroplane performance calculation section where the runway is identified. A Runway Condition Report (RCR) cannot contain a situational awareness part alone. Similar to Question 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>For the situation awareness, is it possible for an item specific to runway be linked to a runway <strong>designator</strong> which is not listed in Aeroplane performance calculation section?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>