



International Civil Aviation Organization
CAR/SAM Regional Planning and Implementation Group (GREPECAS)
Eleventh Meeting of the GREPECAS Aeronautical Meteorology Subgroup
(AERMETSG/11)
Lima, Perú, 28 al 30 de noviembre de 2011

Agenda Item 4: Exchange of OPMET information

**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF THE POLL CARRIED OUT AMONG
THE CAR/SAM STATES**

(Presented by the Rapporteur of the COM/MET Task Force)

SUMMARY

This working paper presents a preliminary analysis of the answers to the poll carried out among the States of the CAR/SAM Regions, based on a questionnaire prepared by the AERMET/SG COM/MET Task Force and the Secretary of the Subgroup, with the objective of identify the deficiencies that obstruct the normal interchange of OPMET information. However, due to the lack of the telecommunication component in the analysis, it is not possible for the Task Force to obtain final conclusions and to propose corrective actions.

1. Introduction

1.1 During the analysis of the Agenda Item 5 of the Tenth Meeting of the AERMET/SG - Exchange of the OPMET information, it was noted that despite some States have communication systems that include templates for the preparation of METAR/SPECI and SIGMET that do not allow the preparation of messages with errors and as a consequence it avoid their emissions, some of these messages did not reach the recipients; something similar was also reported by Brasilia Data Bank.

1.2 At that time, the Meeting considered once again that the observed deficiencies in the availability of the OPMET information are not only related to meteorological side and its procedures, but also the communication side and/or the automatic systems. The Subgroup considered necessary the establishment of a COM/MET Task Force conformed by specialists from meteorology and communications fields who, in the light of the new developments analyze the problems of the OPMET information exchange. The Meeting approved the following Decision:

DECISION 10/18 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COM/MET TASK FORCE

That the COM/MET Task Force be established with the terms of reference, work programme and composition presented in **Appendix D**.

1.3 In order to obtain the most available information about the volume and traffic of OPMET messages, as well as the ways and communications systems available for this information interchange, the

members of the Task Force and the Secretary of the subgroup prepared a questionnaire that was sent to the States of both Regions.

2. Discussion

2.1 From all States and Territories existing in both Regions, it was received only 14 answers that it means less than the third part of the total. From the States/Territories of the CAR Region, it was received only 3 answers and from the States/Territories of the SAM Region, it was received 11 answers. Despite this low quantity answers received, it can be observed some aspects that maybe common for most of the States.

2.2 It was noted in most of the answers, that are available communications means to send the OPMET information, by using AFTN, AMHS or GTS, and in almost all of the States, the public Internet is available. Although the telecommunication mean could not be in the meteorological room, in most of the states exists a kind of administrative agreement or arrangement that guarantee the communications service. Most of the States uses templates for the preparation and emission of OPMET information.

2.3 To prepare the address list of the OPMET information, most of the States uses the CAR/SAM Air Navigation Plan (ANP) and the personnel know it and have access to the OPMET data Catalog.

2.4 It was also noted, that the majority of States have an actualized backup system that is aware of all the meteorological and/or communication operators. All States participated in the COM/MET coordinated controls of OPMET exchange for the CAR/SAM Regions carried out from 10 to 16 June, 2010 and the majority of them analyzed the results of this interchange. Not all of the States have a procedure to verify if the sent OPMET messages reached the recipients. In their comments, some States mentioned that hey also receive OPMET information by ISCS.

2.5 From this preliminary analysis we could infer that should not exit difficulties for the availability in the States of the OPMET information accordingly with the CAR/SAM FASID Table MET and in the established OPMET Data Banks. On the other hand, when we analyze the results of the annual COM/MET coordinated controls of OPMET, it is observed failures in each State in the reception of the information sent by others States.

2.6 However, it is interesting to point out that, when we ask to any Data Bank to obtain specific OPMET information or to the received information by ISCS - which is practically a Data Bank in each State - generally the information is available there.

3. Conclusions

3.1 Still remain a lot of gaps, and the information presented in this Working Paper shows the lack of the communication component in this analysis to obtain a more complete conclusion that allow us to take the appropriate actions.

3.2 If all seems to be working acceptably in the Meteorological offices of each State because exist communications means, agreements with the telecommunication services, knowledge of the CAR/SAM FASID Table MET, why the interchange of OPMET information still has deficiencies? In the light of the new informatics and communication technologies, do we have to change the way carry out

this interchanges and rationalize the volume of the interchange that actually we are having? Many questions could be raised about this situation.

4. **Proposed actions to the meeting**

4.1 The Meeting is invited to:

- a) consider the information presented in this Working Paper;
- b) analyze any other aspect that consider necessary in relation with this item; and
- c) propose the actions that consider necessary.

- END -