



ICAO

International Civil Aviation Organization

Seventh Meeting of the Aerodromes Operations and
Planning Sub-Group (AOP/SG/7)

Bangkok, Thailand, 3 to 6 July 2023

Agenda Item 4: Provision of AOP in the Asia/Pacific Region

GRF IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS IN THE PACIFIC

(Presented by Pacific Aviation Safety Office)

SUMMARY

This paper presents an overview of GRF progress in the Pacific Islands including actions taken and challenges. It also encourages sharing of information and operational implementation lessons learnt from other States.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The ICAO SARPs and Procedures for Air Navigation Services (PANS) related to the enhanced Global Reporting Format for assessing and reporting runway surface conditions (GRF) became applicable on 4 November 2021.

1.2 Implementation has been challenging for many States especially those where only water condition exists and there are low levels of traffic movement. This paper discusses Pacific Island States progress and the challenges,

1.3 It is also important States and Aerodrome operators share implementation experiences and learnings from GRF.

2. DISCUSSION

Pacific Island Implementation

2.1 Through the Pacific Aviation Safety Office (PASO) Pacific States have been receiving GRF training and implementation assistance since 2020. This has included both remote and onsite training and education with associated guidance.

2.2 For Pacific States water reporting is the main component of GRF which can include tropical storms where the rainfall is high but water on the runway runs off quickly. Additionally, some States may only have one flight per day applicable to GRF and in some cases one flight per week, so the reporting needs are limited.

2.3 PASO training and education has been tailored to the Pacific States but even so many have not been implemented, often this is due to limited aerodrome staff usual only air traffic service staff. Often the air operators cannot use the GRF coding as they are not operating jet aircraft and would rather have the descriptor, even the runway coverage is not important information for them.

2.4 Often air traffic control are the only aerodrome staff on the airfield and cannot get a GRF inspection done. They often do not have an Automated Terminal Information Service (ATIS) therefore often no digital ATIS.

2.5 An observation is that the GRF process is not well aligned to water only States and those with low volume traffic or aircraft unable to benefit from the GRF coding. The Global implementation has not well accounted for such States and better guidance is needed.

2.6 There is also misinformation on GRF and a push for electronic or vendor systems for assessing and reporting which are not aligned to ICAO initial GRF requirement. States are sometimes led to believe they need expensive equipment.

2.7 ICAO information for these States would be appreciated and guidance on low volume, water only aerodromes with limited staff and systems. Otherwise, implementation will not occur, and these States be non-compliant when the GRF does not fit their aviation operating environment.

2.8 It would be helpful for all States, not only Pacific States, for a sharing of implementation lessons and experiences of other Asia Pacific States.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) note the information contained in this paper; and
- b) urge other small States with aerodromes that are only impacted by water and have low aircraft movement numbers to consider the Standards required and share implementation lessons and experiences; and
- c) discuss operational implementation information as required; and
- d) discuss any relevant matters as appropriate.

—END—