



International Civil Aviation Organization

**THE THIRD MEETING OF ASIA/PACIFIC METEOROLOGICAL
HAZARDS TASK FORCE (MET/H TF/3)**

Bangkok, Thailand, 13 – 15 March 2013

Agenda Item 1 b): Review of the TOR and follow-up action on the TF/2 meeting and relevant APANPIRG/23 Conclusions

REVIEW OF METWARN/I TF/2 MEETING AND ACTION ITEMS

(Presented by the Secretariat)

SUMMARY

A summary of the METWARN/I TF/2 meeting is provided as well as the agreed action items list for input by the group.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Second Meeting of the Meteorological Advisories and Warnings Task Force (METWARN/I TF/2) was held in Bangkok, Thailand from 19-20 April 2012. A summary of the Meeting was provided to the CNS/MET SG/16 meeting, in Bangkok, Thailand, 23 – 27 July 2012 (CNS/MET SG/16 – WP/16 refers), and is reproduced in **Attachment 1**. The full report of the METWARN/I TF/2 meeting is available at the website: http://www.bangkok.icao.int/cns/meeting.do?method=MeetingDetail&meeting_id=146. The list of agreed action items from METWARN/I TF/2 has been maintained at the Regional Office, Bangkok, reflecting updates provided mainly at meetings, and is provided in **Attachment 2**.

2. ACTION ITEMS LIST REVIEW

2.1 The meeting may review **Attachment 1** to recall the highlights of the previous METWARN/I TF/2 meeting. Updates on action items listed in **Attachment 2** may be provided to the meeting.

3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) Review the information provided in **Attachment 1** and **Attachment 2**; and
- b) Provide updates to the agreed action items list in **Attachment 2**.

ATTACHMENT 1

(Reproduced from CNS/MET SG/16 – WP/16)

METWARN/I TF/2 Summary

1. Introduction

1.1 The second meeting of the Meteorological Advisories and Warnings Implementation Task Force (METWARN/I TF/2) was held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 19-20 April 2012. The meeting was attended by 54 participants from 17 States, IFALPA and ICAO. A conjoint session with the tenth meeting of the OPMET Management Task Force (OPMET/M TF/10) was held on the first day, 19 April 2012, to discuss SIGMET related issues.

2. SIGMET advisory trial

2.1 The meeting recalled that China have issued SIGMET for the Phnom Penh FIR on behalf of Phnom Penh MWO under a bilateral Letter of Agreement between the CAAC and the SSCA of Cambodia (effective 1 June 2009). Cooperation has been strengthened through exchange visits and a future training program is planned in China on SIGMET issuance.

2.2 The SIGMET advisory trial in Asia, hosted by China from April to July 2011, showed some improvement in SIGMET issuance in Lao PDR and DPR Korea; two States which have existing SIGMET deficiencies. Feedback from MWOs and users concerned was encouraging and generally supported the establishment of Regional SIGMET advisory centres. Experience from the SIGMET advisory trial reaffirmed the usefulness of graphical SIGMET information, the importance of meteorological expertise and competencies relevant to the region concerned, the requirement for timely updates to SIGMET information and the necessity for performance monitoring (of SIGMET). Feedback from user groups, such as IATA, and evaluation of the trial in States with deficiencies will be included in presentations at METWSG/4 and/or CNS/MET SG/16 (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/1**).

3. Advisory information

3.1 A topic raised in the IVATF on ways to reduce information overload during volcanic eruptions, due to multiple sources of VA-information, was discussed, including the proposal to remove the requirement for WV SIGMET from ICAO Annex 3. Pros of such an initiative were considered to include elimination of redundant VA information and conflicting VA information and removal of deficiencies where States have not been able to provide WV SIGMET. On the other hand, potentially significant cons were also identified including legal and liability issues, as well as sovereignty issues, which may arise from the removal of WV SIGMET. Furthermore, potential knock-on effects to other types of SIGMET were considered as possibly disadvantageous as well as the prerequisite for widespread international agreement. Alternative solutions could include initiatives to increase the expertise and capabilities of MWOs, noting that MWOs should have access and knowledge of local information, which may be difficult to convey in a timely manner to VAACs (e.g. complex, high volume observational data) and would be required by VAACs to replace the function of MWOs in regards to the issuance of VA information. The group agreed to wait for results of discussions at IVATF/4 in June 2012 before developing any detailed proposals and to report outcomes of discussions to IAVWOPSG/7 in Bangkok, Mar 2013 (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/2**), and findings from IVATF/4 to CNS/MET SG/16 (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/3**).

3.2 Investigation of optimal exchange of meteorological information in the APAC regions is also required; with emphasis on VA information (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/4**), and detailed user requirements in the ASIA/PAC regions (with regards to VA advisories) should be a priority for the MET/ATM TF (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/5**).

3.3 The meeting discussed the broader problem of providing weather hazard advisory information to end users, with a focus on the user requirements, and noted that airlines used VA advisory information (including graphics) as a defacto warning (from perceived centres of excellence) in recent volcanic ash events. The meeting recalled that the WAFC SIGWX product evolved from not too dissimilar a problem (i.e. State-based, text products to centralized graphical products) and required careful consideration of legal, liability and sovereignty issues. Furthermore, the development of the centralized, graphical SIGWX WAFS product had kept pace (more effectively than SIGMET) with the technological developments and advances in meteorology and in the aviation industry.

4. Structure and working arrangements of MET groups

4.1 Options to streamline the structure and working arrangements for the task forces of the meteorological sub-group of APANPIRG were discussed and a proposal to incorporate the current 4 groups into 3 was proposed as follows:

- MET Requirements TF (incorporating MET/ATM TF);
- MET Management TF (incorporating OPMET/M TF);
- MET Implementation TF (incorporating METWARN/I TF and WAFS/I TF)

4.2 Further efficiencies could be gained through increased reliance on virtual meetings (e.g. Email and tele-conference), and holding face-to-face meetings of two or more groups back-to-back within the same week to economize on participants' travel time and expenses. The groups should be task focused and not too general and a detailed proposal will be presented to CNS/MET SG/16 (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/6**).

5. Review of the Work Plan

5.1 Proposed changes to the Work Plan document (i.e. Task Team, Terms of Reference, Work Program, Communication Strategies, Performance Framework Form, Milestones and Work Plan) include: remove Tonga from the Task Team list; remove references to SIGMET Test and SIGMET Guide tasks (moved these to the OPMET/M TF Work Plan); add user requirements from ANSPs, IATA, IFATCA and IFALPA in the work of the group; specify the link to the RACP/TF in the Work Plan; consolidate the individual milestones into one main milestone to report back to CNS/MET SG, annually; expand the scope of Regional Contingency Plans to include tropical cyclone, radioactive cloud and tsunamis; and reviewed target dates for tasks.

6. Review of follow-up action

6.1 Follow-up to METWARN/I TF/1 (Mar 2011) was discussed and mostly completed. With regards to action agreed 1/5, most States participating in SIGMET tests used Z99 sequence number; other States will do so in 2012. Follow-up to APANPIRG/22 (Sep 2011) required further clarification, as discussed in the OPMET/M TF/10 meeting (**OPMET/M TF/10 Action agreed 10/2**).

7. Review of educational material

7.1 Radioactive material: The meeting discussed outcomes from IAVWOPSG/6 in Dakar, Senegal, Sep 2011, which concluded that ad-hoc groups continue with tasks identified to address key issues concerning the importance, complexity and lack of expertise on radioactive clouds (Conclusion 6/29 and Conclusion 6/30).

7.2 Tsunami: The meeting agreed to ask the METWSG to take into consideration the requirements of the ASIA/PAC regions in the development of global requirements for tsunami warning information (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/7**).

8. Review progress on Contingency Plans

8.1 Composition of the ad-hoc group to work on the framework for ASIA/PAC Regional (MET) Contingency Plans was reviewed (only 1 member present) and the meeting agreed to expand the group to include members from Japan and IFALPA. No further progress was reported by the ad-hoc group since the ATM/AIS/SAR/SG/21–WP/05, Jul 2011. The ad-hoc group will be reconvened to continue action against the tasks of the group (**METWARN/I TF/2 Action agreed 2/8**).

8.2 Outcomes from the RACP/TF/1 meeting in Bangkok, 17-19 Apr 2012, were discussed with regards to the RACP/TF role for ATM contingencies and the link to MET (through METWARN/I TF). The link between RACP/TF and METWARN/I TF should be strengthened through exchange of information on progress and requirements of the respective groups.

9. Aerodrome Warnings

9.1 A proposal was considered to source tsunami warning information directly from Regional/National Tsunami Warning Centres and noted the benefits from such a proposal but highlighted the need for standardization of tsunami warning formats and dissemination methods to aviation users.

10. IFALPA discussion on volcanic ash information

10.1 The meeting was informed by IFALPA which represents pilots worldwide that IFALPA considers present volcanic ash advisory framework does not always meet the requirements of users, particularly in big events such as Icelandic volcano eruption occurred in 2010. IFALPA also noted that not enough consistency between VA information provided by States would be problematic, especially when there are multiple SIGMETs across a region for a single event, e.g. Europe, leading to information overload, and additionally both VA SIGMETs and VA advisories are lengthy, difficult to transmit and not user focused. It was suggested that to introduce probabilistic forecast in VA forecast, as in TAFs, would be more useful for the users. The meeting agreed that, under the IAVWOPSG and/or other relevant groups, discussions on the way forward to improve VA information will likely go on for a couple more years before a solution can be found, however action is required to harmonize VA information, which is provided in various overlapping formats, and current supporting guidance documents in relation to VA information are outdated.

ATTACHMENT 2(Derived from METWARN/I TF/2, Appendix B to the Report, and
CNS/MET SG/16 – WP/16)**METWARN/I TF/2 Agreed Actions**Status on **22 February 2013**

(✓ = completed)

No.	Title/Action	Follow-up action (target/completion dates in brackets)
2/1	<p>SIGMET advisory trial.</p> <p>That, an evaluation of the SIGMET advisory trial in Asia (hosted by China) – including feedback from IATA – is presented for further discussion.</p>	<p>China/Secretariat ✓ IP/7 (& SN/8) presented at METWSG/4; IP/17 & WP/50 presented at CNS/MET SG/16 (May-Jul 2012)</p>
2/2	<p>Volcanic Ash Advisory and Warning information.</p> <p>That, the details of discussions in this meeting concerning the pros and cons of removing the requirement for SIGMET for VA be reported to the IAVWOPSG for further consideration.</p>	<p>States/Secretariat In progress WP for IAVWOPSG/7 (February 2013)</p>
2/3	<p>Volcanic Ash Advisory and Warning information.</p> <p>That, the outcomes from the IVATF/4 meeting concerning the proposed removal of the requirement for SIGMET for VA be reported to the CNS/MET SG for further consideration.</p>	<p>IVATF /Secretariat ✓ IP/15 presented at CNS/MET SG/16 (Jul 2012)</p>
2/4	<p>Sub-Regional exchange of volcanic ash information.</p> <p>That, an investigation of the optimal exchange of MET information in relation specifically to VA in the APAC regions be conducted to facilitate the group's further consideration of the proposal to remove the requirement for SIGMET for VA.</p>	<p>States/Secretariat In progress WP for METWARN/I TF/3 (February 2013)</p>
2/5	<p>User requirements for volcanic ash information.</p> <p>That, the MET/ATM TF be asked to establish detailed user requirements in the APAC regions in relation to VA information.</p>	<p>Secretariat ✓ WP/21 presented to CNS/MET SG/16 (Jul 2012)</p>

2/6	<p>Structure and working arrangements of MET groups.</p> <p>That, proposals for streamlining the structure and operation of MET groups (under APANPIRG) be further developed and presented to CNS/MET for consideration.</p>	<p>TF chairs/Secretariat ✓ WP/46 presented to CNS/MET SG/16 (Jul 2012)</p>
2/7	<p>Aerodrome warning on Tsunami.</p> <p>That, the METWSG be asked take into consideration the requirements of the Asia/Pacific regions in its development of global requirements for Tsunami warning information.</p>	<p>Secretariat ✓ METWARN/I TF/2 members (Australia, Japan and Hong Kong, China) participated in METWSG/4, which agreed (4/7) to develop draft amendment proposal to Annex 3 (Appendix 6, 5.1.3) that tsunami warnings are not required in cases where a national public safety plan for tsunami was fully integrated with the "at risk" aerodrome concerned. (May 2012)</p>
2/8	<p>Ad-hoc group on regional contingency plans.</p> <p>That, the ad-hoc group tasked with the framework for APAC Regional (MET) Contingency Plans be refreshed to include Japan and IFALPA (plus updated contact for Australia) and re-commence action against the established tasks of the group.</p>	<p>Secretariat ✓ WP for METWARN/I TF/3 (February 2013)</p>
