

*International Civil Aviation Organization*

ICAO

**WORKING PAPER (WP/06)****ICAO Asia and Pacific (APAC)**Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Meteorology Sub-Group  
(MET SG/28)

Bangkok, Thailand, 8 to 12 July 2024

**Agenda Item 3: Air navigation deficiencies****MET DEFICIENCIES REVIEW OF THE 2023 ANNUAL SIGMET TEST OUTCOMES  
AND OPMET MONITORING ACTIVITIES**

(Presented by Ad Hoc Group on Deficiencies)

**SUMMARY**

This paper outlines the review by the MET Deficiencies ad hoc group of the outcomes of the 2023 ICAO APAC Regional SIGMET Test and OPMET monitoring activities. Further, proposed updates to the deficiency identification methodology are proposed, to include IWXXM information provision performance.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The 25th Meeting of the Meteorology Sub-Group (MET SG/25) formulated the following decision:

**Decision MET SG/25-04: MET Deficiencies ad hoc group TOR**

That, MET/S WG ad hoc group, formed to work with relevant members of the MET/IE WG, utilises the guidance in the APANPIRG Procedural Handbook, Part V: *Uniform methodology for the identification, assessment and reporting of air navigation shortcomings and deficiencies* and other relevant ICAO documentation, to assist the ICAO Secretariat with the following:

- a) Continue to refine the process, based on the APANPIRG Procedural Handbook, for identifying, analysing, removing and proposing MET Deficiencies, utilising the results of annual ICAO SIGMET tests and OPMET Monitoring activities;
- b) Continue to refine the templates to be used for Deficiency Corrective Action Plans (CAP), Progress Reports and Final Reports; and
- c) As required, work with States concerned to develop a CAP, arrange for testing and monitoring and assist with the reporting to ICAO on the resolution of air navigation MET Deficiencies.

1.2 The MET Deficiencies ad hoc group has reviewed the outcomes of the 2023 ICAO APAC Regional SIGMET Test and OPMET monitoring activities, as presented at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Meteorological Information Exchange Working Group (MET/IE WG/22) – see [WP/17 \(Review of WS SIGMET Test 2023\)](#), [WP/18 \(Results of SIGMET Test 2023 – TC and VA\)](#) and [WP/08 \(Asia/Pacific](#)

[Performance Indices](#)). The review was based on existing deficiency identification methodology outlined in the *MET Deficiency Identification Guide*.

## 2. DISCUSSION

### ICAO APAC Regional SIGMET Test 2023 Outcome

2.1 The MET Deficiencies ad hoc group reviewed the 2023 Annual SIGMET test results in accordance with the MET Deficiency Identification Guide. The results of that review are presented in **Attachment A** to this paper. The review was for traditional alphanumeric code (TAC) SIGMET issuance. SIGMET and TCA/VAA issuance in IWXXM form is addressed in paragraph 2.5 below.

2.2 Attachment A includes proposed actions (listed under each analysis table) and are formed from the criteria defined in the *MET Deficiency Identification Guide*. It is noted that MWO Kabul has yet to participate in an Annual SIGMET test. Further, three RODBs have not received any Kabul FIR SIGMETs in the recent period and so it is recommended that the APAC MET Secretariat engage with Afghanistan and determine whether a SIGMET deficiency is warranted.

2.3 Also of interest are the cases where SIGMETs were received by RODB Singapore but not in the Europe region (eg Male WC SIGMET, Brisbane WV SIGMET). It may be useful to consider whether the SIGMET test also includes other regions to determine whether SIGMETs are successfully reaching other ICAO regions. Subsequent investigations can then be undertaken when Annual SIGMET test reviews show test SIGMETs not reaching those regions.

2.4 States are reminded that RODB Bangkok's OPMET Statistics web application, used to produce the OPMET Performance Indices (PIs), is available for States to perform monitoring on request, e.g., to validate corrective actions.

2.5 2023 Annual SIGMET test results indicated that IWXXM form SIGMET and advisory messages were **only** issued as follows:

State	MWO	WS	WC	WV
China	Hong Kong	✓	✓	✓
	Taibei	✓	✓	✓
Fiji	Nadi	✓	✓	✓
Thailand	Bangkok	✓	✓	✓
Singapore	Singapore	✓	✓	✓
Japan	Tokyo	✓	✓	✓
Solomon Islands	Honiara	✓	✓	✓
Australia	Melbourne	✓		
	Brisbane	✓		
Papua New Guinea	Port Moresby	✓		
New Zealand	Wellington	✓		
French Polynesia	Tahiti	✓		

State	Advisory Centre	IWXXM form advisory issued
Japan	TCAC Tokyo	✓
	VAAC Tokyo	✓
Australia	VAAC Darwin	✓
France	VAAC Toulouse	✓

2.6 While deficiencies are not being recommended for the 2023 Annual SIGMET Test outcomes due to IWXXM form information not being available, it is expected that this begin following the 2024 Annual SIGMET Test.

#### 2023 OPMET Monitoring Activity Review

2.7 The Draft Conclusion MET/IE WG/22-01: *Availability and Timeliness of TAC and IWXXM Meteorological Information* proposes that the annual OPMET monitoring should monitor *availability* and *timeliness* of TAF and METAR information, to provide more meaningful results for States to understand and base corrective actions upon.

2.8 Until that information described in paragraph 2.7 is made available, the MET Deficiencies ad hoc group reviewed November 2023 OPMET Monitoring Activity results in accordance with the [MET Deficiency Identification Guide](#), but only considering the *compliance* statistics. The results of that review of TAC OPMET issuance are presented in **Attachment B** to this paper. Future monitoring of IWXXM form of OPMET issuance is addressed below.

#### Proposed updates to the MET Deficiency Identification Guide

2.9 MET/IE WG/22 reviewed [WP/09 Analysis of IWXXM-Specific Statistics Results](#), presenting the monitoring results of IWXXM-specific statistics at RODB Bangkok with an analysis of IWXXM validation. This paper highlighted the occurrences of unsuccessful translation of TAC messages into IWXXM information, reinforcing the need to ensure that IWXXM is not just present, but also useful (ie passes validation and, where relevant, successfully translated).

2.10 Draft Conclusion MET/IE WG/22-01: *Availability and Timeliness of TAC and IWXXM Meteorological Information* proposes the following updates to the *MET Deficiency Identification Guide*:

- Reflect the requirement for IWXXM OPMET information dissemination
- Reflect the requirement for successful translation (where applicable)
- Identify METAR and TAF that have availability and timeliness scores of less than 95% during the monitoring period.

2.11 Further, MET/IE WG/22 proposed (refer [Flimsy/02 Review Performance Indices and Monitoring](#)) that to determine validity of the IWXXM, it should be considered whether IWXXM form messages:

- are available
- successfully pass validation
- contain valid translation data (where relevant) and
- are timely.

2.12 If operational SIGMET, VAA and TCA IWXXM analysis is available in addition to METAR and TAF, then potential deficiencies may also be identified from this data – in particular when translation of TAC into IWXXM form is unsuccessful.

2.13 Given the above proposals, a draft update to the *MET Deficiency Identification Guide* is provided for consideration by the MET SG in **Attachment C**.

<b>Decision MET SG/28-xx: Update to MET Deficiency Identification Guide:</b>	
What: The Meteorology Sub-group approves the updates to the <i>MET Deficiency Identification Guide</i> and <i>MET Deficiency Report Guide</i> , to	Expected impact: <input type="checkbox"/> Political / Global

include TCA/VAA and IWXXM form OPMET information deficiency identification and updated potential deficiency thresholds, as provided in Appendix X to this report and requests the Secretariat to publish the updated Guides on the ICAO APAC website.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inter-regional <input type="checkbox"/> Economic <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ops/Technical
Why: IWXXM form OPMET, SIGMET and TCA/VAA information is a requirement in ICAO Annex 3 and therefore non-compliance should be considered as a potential deficiency.	Follow-up: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Secretariat
When: 12-Jul-24	Status: Draft to be adopted by Subgroup
Who: <input type="checkbox"/> Subgroups <input type="checkbox"/> APAC States <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ICAO APAC RO <input type="checkbox"/> ICAO HQ <input type="checkbox"/> Other: TEXT	

### 3. ACTION BY THE MEETING

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- a) Note the information contained in this paper;
- b) Consider actions to request States and the ICAO Secretariat to follow up on proposed actions identified in Attachments A & B;
- c) Consider whether to better incorporate the IROG functionality into Annual SIGMET test analysis;
- d) Discuss and consider improvements to the proposed updated *MET Deficiency Identification Guide* in Attachment C; and
- e) Agree to the Decision proposed in paragraph 2.12.

-----

**ATTACHMENT A – Review of the ICAO APAC Regional SIGMET Test 2023 Outcomes**

Note, other non-APAC States also had MWOs participating in the tests. Their test results are not part of this review.

**SIGMETs not received by any RODB:**

States in red text currently hold SIGMET deficiencies.

APAC States	MWO	Missing SIGMET Type
Afghanistan	Kabul	WV, WS
DPR Korea	Sunan	WC, WV, WS
Papua New Guinea	Port Moresby	WC (WS, WV issued)
Nauru	Nauru	WC, WV, WS

Note:

- Improvements noted in 2023 results:
  - Papua New Guinea issuing WS SIGMET
  - Papua New Guinea and Cambodia issuing WV SIGMETs
  - Myanmar and Bahrain issuing WC SIGMETs

Proposed action:

- APAC MET Secretariat to engage with Afghanistan and determine whether a SIGMET deficiency is warranted.

**SIGMET/TCA/VAA not received by at least one RODB**

TCACs	Missing RODB(s)
TCAC New Delhi (FKIN21, 0200Z issue)	RJTD
TCAC Darwin	NFFN
TCAC Honolulu	VTBB, NFFN, RJTD
TCAC Miami	VTBB, NFFN, RJTD
VAACs	Missing RODB(s)
VAAC Toulouse	VTBB, NFFN
VAAC Washington	VTBB, NFFN

APAC MWOs with SIGMET missing at one RODB or more
Dhaka (WC)
Taibei (WC, WV)
Mumbai (WC, WV)
Manila (WC, WS)
Colombo (WC, WV)
Ulaanbaatar (WC, WV, WS)
Brisbane (WV)
Phnom Penh (WV)
Chengdu (WV)
Haikou (WV)
Wuhan (WV)
New Delhi (WV, WS)
Karachi (WV)
Port Moresby (WV, WS)
Honolulu (WV)

Melbourne RFC - YMRF (WS) Kolkata (WS) Honiara (WS)
---

Proposed action:

- TCACs and VAACs listed above check their (test and operational) dissemination lists and issue test TCA/VAA respectively, request missing RODB(s) to confirm receipt.
- MWOs listed above check their SIGMET (test and operational) dissemination lists to ensure that all five RODBs are included, then issue a test SIGMET and request missing RODB(s) to confirm receipt.

**TCA/VAA not received by at least one MWO**

TCACs	Missing MWO receipt
TCAC New Delhi	Bangladesh, Colombo, Karachi, Kota Kinabalu, Kuwait, Muscat, Jeddah
TCAC Tokyo	Phnom Penh, Nadi, Taipei (Note: TCA did reach RODB Nadi)
TCAC La Reunion	Brisbane, Melbourne, Male, Mumbai
TCAC Miami	Tahiti, Honolulu, Kansas City
TCAC Honolulu	Tahiti
TCAC Nadi	Melbourne, Honolulu
VAACs	Missing MWO receipt
VAAC Tokyo	Dhaka, Kolkata, Yangon, Irkutsk, Khabarovsk/Novy
VAAC Washington	Nadi
VAAC Toulouse	Chengdu, Urumqi, Xi'an, Ulaanbaatar
VAAC Darwin	Kolkata, Gia Lam (VVHN), Honolulu
VAAC Wellington	Honolulu

Proposed actions:

- TCACs and VAACs listed above check their dissemination lists and issue test TCA/VAA respectively, MWOs to confirm receipt.

**Message delivery issues:**

Issue	MWO	
Early issue time	Nadi (WC)	
Priority indicator	Phnom Penh, Yangon, Honolulu, Jeddah, Kansas City	
Missing YYGGgg group.	Taipei (WC)	
Receipt > 5 min for all RODBs	TCA	TCAC New Delhi test TCA bulletins
	VAA	VAAC Washington test VAA
	WC	Chennai, Mumbai, New Delhi, Solomon Islands, Colombo
	WV	Lahore, Port Moresby
	WS	Male, Port Moresby, Honiara, Colombo

Note – some SIGMETs received *before* SIGMET time of issuance DTG. Ignoring these for now.

MET SG/28  
Attachment A to WP/06

Proposed actions:

- Nadi and Taibei review internal test SIGMET procedures to ensure appropriate DTG used.
- MWOs listed above to note the use of correct priority indicator in upcoming Annual SIGMET test.
- Centres listed above to determine reason for >5min receipt time by RODBs. Once issue is identified and resolved, issue test SIGMET(s) and RODBs to confirm receipt and outcome of corrective action.

**ATTACHMENT B – Review of the 2023 Annual OPMET Monitoring Outcomes**

*Note, only compliance statistics are considered in this review unless zero availability is indicated, then this is also included. Only OPMET statistics for aerodromes included in the ANP Vol II Table MET II-2 are included in the following tables.*

Note – statistics for compliance <0.5 are highlighted, based on the current meteorological deficiency identification guidance. Statistics ≤ 0.5 and < 0.9 are provided for information only, given consideration of the increase to statistics < 0.95 being considered for potential deficiencies.

**METAR for aerodromes – compliance < 0.95 or zero availability**

States in **red text** currently hold reporting deficiencies.

State	Aerodrome	Bulletin	ROC	Max compliance value
Solomon Islands	AGGH	SANG31	YBBN	0.55
<b>Nauru</b>	ANYN	SANG31	YBBN	0.55
Papua New Guinea	AOPY	SANG31	YBBN	0.82
	AYVN	SANG31	YBBN	<b>Zero availability</b>
Tonga	NFTV	SAPS31	NFFN	0.78
	NFTF	SAPS31	NFFN	0.93
Tuvalu	NGFU	SAPS31	NFFN	0.88
Samoa	NSFA	SAPS31	NFFN	0.93
Vanuatu	NVSS	SAPS31	NFFN	0.46
	NVVV	SAPS31	NFFN	0.68
Pakistan	OPNH	SAPK31	OPKC	0.12
	OPPS	SAPK31	OPKC	0.87
	OPLA	SAPK31	OPKC	0.94
<b>Kiribati</b>	PLCH	NFFN	SAPS31	0.49
Japan	RJSS	SAJP31	RJTD	0.94
China	RCKH	SAHK31	VHHH	0.87
	RCSS	SAHK31	VHHH	0.86
Sri Lanka	VCRI	SASB31	VCCC	0.71
	VCCH	SASB31	VCCC	<b>Zero availability</b>
India	VEGT	SAIN33	VECC	0.87
	VEGY	SAIN33	VECC	0.62
	VIAR	SAIN32	VIDP	0.85
	VAAH	SAIN31	VABB	0.94
	VANP	SAIN31	VABB	0.94
	VEPT	SAIN33	VECC	0.9
Bangladesh	VGEG	SABW31	VECC	0.39
Lao PDR	VLVT	SAAE32	VTBB	0.62 [Partial availability in ANP]
Bhutan	VQPR	SAAS31	VECC	0.48 [Partial availability in ANP]
Indonesia	WAJJ	SAID33	WIII	0.78
	WAKK	SAID33	WIII	0.89
	WALL	SAID32	WIII	0.87
	WAMM	SAID32	WIII	0.80
	WAOO	SAID32	WIII	0.86
	WIDN	SAID32	WIII	0.79 [Partial availability in ANP]



MET SG/28  
Attachment B to WP/06

	WIHH	SAID31	WIII	0.79 [Partial availability in ANP]
	WIMM	SAID31	WIII	0.89
	WIPP	SAID31	WIII	0.94
Singapore	WSAP	SAMS31	WMKK	0.50
	WSSL	SAMS31	WMKK	0.50
Australia	YPXM	SAAU32	YBBN	0.83
	YMHB	SAAU31	YBBN	0.93
	YBTL	SAAU36	YBBN	0.94
	YMML	SAAU31	YBBN	0.93
	YPAD	SAAU31	YBBN	0.92
	YPPH	SAAU31	YBBN	0.9

**TAF for aerodromes – compliance < 0.95 or zero availability**

No States currently hold aerodrome forecast deficiencies.

State	Aerodrome	Bulletin	ROC	Max compliance value
Solomon Islands	AGGH	FTNG31	YBBN	0.32
Nauru	ANYN	FTNG31	YBBN	0.38
Papua New Guinea	AOPY	FTNG31	YBBN	0.42
	AYVN	FTNG31	YBBN	<b>Zero availability</b>
Niue	NIUE	FTPS31	NFFN	0.78
India	VANP	FTIN31	VABB	0.78
	VEGT	FTIN33	VABB	0.27
	VEGY	FTIN33	VABB	0.19
	VOCI	FTIN31	VABB	0.93
	VOCL	FTIN31	VABB	0.93
	VOTV	FTIN31	VABB	0.93
Indonesia	WAJJ	FTID33	WIII	0.01
	WAMM	FTID33	WIII	0.01
	WAOO	FTID33	WIII	0.01
	WIPP	FTID32	WIII	0.01
	WAKK	FTID33	WIII	<b>Zero availability</b>
	WATT	FTID33	WIII	<b>Zero availability</b>
	WIBB	FTID32	WIII	<b>Zero availability</b>
	WIDN	FTID32	WIII	<b>Zero availability</b>
	WIOO	FTID32	WIII	<b>Zero availability</b>
Australia	YPTN	FTAU36	YBBN	0.84
	YBTL	FTAU36	YBBN	0.93
Mongolia	ZMUB	FTCI32	ZBBB	0.02
Sri Lanka	VCCH	FTSB31	VABB	<b>Zero availability</b>
Bhutan	VQPR	FTAS31	VECC	<b>Zero availability</b>
Maldives	VRMG	FTMV31	VABB	0.92
	VRMH	FTMV31	VABB	0.92
	VRMM	FTMV31	VABB	0.92

Proposed actions:

- States listed above with scores less than 0.5 (highlighted) for their aerodromes to determine reason low score. Once issue is identified and resolved, coordinate with associated RODB to confirm regular receipt.

## ATTACHMENT C – Draft updates to MET Deficiency Identification Guide

Editorial note – proposed updates are indicated with ~~strikethrough~~ and **highlighted** text.

### Purpose

Analysis of the annual ICAO SIGMET test and annual OPMET Monitoring activities undertaken as part of the work plan of the Meteorological Information Exchange Working Group will identify OPMET exchange issues ~~by the APAC RODBs may highlight potential air navigation deficiencies in the meteorology field.~~ This document aims to guide the identification of potential deficiencies arising from the outcomes of these activities, ~~focusing on first assisting States in undertaking a root cause analysis to determine whether the issue may be resolved quickly (minimum resolution time to be determined on a case by case basis).~~

A deficiency is to be applied only when there is no **simple** resolution planned and undertaken. The ICAO Secretariat may also provide other sources of MET deficiency information, and the principle of root cause analysis will also be used to determine an appropriate response.

Unless specially outlined, these criteria shall be understood to apply to both traditional alphanumeric code (TAC) and IWXXM form messages.

Note – identifying a deficiency can be an opportunity for a State to use as evidence for the need for increased resources and assistance.

### Method

#### Annual ICAO SIGMET test

Following the finalisation of the results of the annual ICAO SIGMET test, the following criteria will indicate when a possible MET deficiency for SIGMET, TCA and VAA issuance should be considered:

- a) ~~Any~~ No RODB ~~does not~~ receives an expected SIGMET, TCA and/or VAA during the test.
  - If four or fewer RODBs receive a SIGMET, TCA and/or VAA, then the MWO shall be requested to update their dissemination list to include all RODBs and a test **SIGMET** message shall be issued to confirm this update.
- b) User systems cannot ingest an expected SIGMET, TCA and/or VAA.
  - A **SIGMET** message may contain format errors. Minor errors, such as priority indicators, should be communicated directly to the issuing centre **MWO** for resolution, followed by a test **SIGMET** message to confirm the correct format/bulletin information.
- c) A SIGMET, TCA and/or VAA is not received by any RODB within 5 minutes of issuance (referring to Annex 3 Appendix 10 section 1.1 “*Messages and bulletins containing operational meteorological information shall achieve transit times of less than 5 minutes, unless otherwise determined to be lower by regional air navigation agreement.*”).
  - States to undertake root cause analysis, with assistance from deficiencies ad hoc group, to determine reason for slow dissemination or receipt (eg internal process requiring email to ATS to disseminate via AFS on behalf of MWO).
- d) IWXXM form test SIGMET, TCA and/or VAA are not successfully validated and/or successfully translated (where relevant).

*Notes*

- ~~1) Deficiencies ad hoc group to recommend whether follow up SIGMET tests should be conducted to ensure SIGMET issues have been resolved~~
- ~~2) While the items above discuss SIGMET issuance, they equally apply to VAA and TCA issuance.~~

APAC RODB Annual OPMET Monitoring

Following finalisation of the results of the APAC RODB Annual OPMET Monitoring, the following criteria will indicate when a possible MET deficiency should be considered, noting that these criteria apply for both TAC and IWXXM form messages:

- a) No ~~Any~~ RODB ~~does not~~ receives a METAR/SPECI or TAF for aerodromes in Table MET-II-2 during the OPMET Monitoring test.
  - If four or fewer RODBs receive a METAR/SPECI or TAF, then the NOC or ROC shall be requested to update their dissemination list to include all RODBs and the RODBs will be requested to confirm receipt once complete.
- b) A Table MET II-2 METAR/SPECI or TAF with an availability/~~regularity/compliance~~ and/or timeliness score of less than 95% ~~50%~~ (referring to the availability and timeliness defined in the ROBEX Handbook, threshold to be reviewed regularly).
  - NOC to provide information to explain the score. If a resolution can be made quickly, RODBs will be requested to confirm the resolution by compiling one month's statistics. If the resolution requires a longer term (i.e. greater than ~~six~~ ~~three~~ months but to be determined on a case-by-case basis), consider deficiency.
- c) A Table MET II-2 METAR/SPECI or TAF in IWXXM form with successful validation and/or translation (where applicable) scores of less than 95%.

Any other potential deficiency source

The ICAO Secretariat may identify other sources of information that could indicate a MET deficiency and, if appropriate, request the ad hoc group on deficiency under MET/S WSG to assist with root cause analysis.

Deficiency Resolution Support

Once a MET deficiency has been applied (and for existing MET deficiencies), the following steps may be followed by the ad hoc group on deficiencies:

1. Engage with State holding a deficiency, to assist in carrying out a root cause analysis of the issue.
2. Develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (template to be developed) with the State to resolve the issue and collect evidence to show resolution. The CAP may include developing tests/exercises to support the deficiency resolution.

3. Assist State in compiling a report to ICAO outlining evidence of resolution deficiency. States may find the MET deficiency report guide (Attachment A to this Guide) useful in drafting a report.

*Note – the ad hoc group on deficiencies will assist the State in the deficiency resolution; however, the State is responsible for the work being carried out and for ensuring the resolution remains in place.*

### **Attachment A to MET Deficiency Identification Guide – Deficiency Reporting Guide**

---

**Agenda Item x: choose from provisional agenda items**

#### **UPDATE ON MET DEFICIENCY AP-MET-xx**

(Presented by <name of State or Organisation>)

#### **SUMMARY**

*<Use this section to summarise the paper e.g. This paper outlines the work done by <State name> on resolving deficiency AP-MET-xx. If this is a progress update to inform of actions taken to date, then use an information paper template. For providing information to support a deficiency resolution, use a working paper template.>*

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 *<Describe the deficiency – e.g. APANPIRG deficiency AP-MET-xx refers to METAR from xxxx aerodrome not being available on a regular basis.>*

#### **2. DISCUSSION**

##### Corrective Action Plan and Implementation

2.1 *<Use this section to describe the actions taken or planned to resolve the deficiency e.g. regular METARs are now provided from the aerodrome or an AWS will be installed later in the year or information on volcanic activity is now provided to various organisations. Give some details on how these corrective actions help resolve the deficiency. The Corrective Action Plan can be provided as an attachment to the paper.>*

##### Evidence of MET deficiency resolution

2.2 *<Use this section to outline evidence of deficiency resolution or progress – e.g. letter from local airlines, ATS, MWO, VAAC, etc and/or results from OPMET monitoring, results of SIGMET test or other evidence as appropriate. Evidence such as letters can be included as an appendix to the paper and be referred to in this section.>*

**3. ACTION BY THE MEETING**

3.1 *<If this is a working paper, you can request the meeting to carry out an action – e.g. agreeing that the deficiency should be resolved and making a recommendation to APANPIRG to remove it from the deficiency list. If this is an information paper, you can request the meeting to note the progress of the deficiency resolution work.>*

*[Example for WP]*

3.1 The meeting is invited to:

- i. Note the information contained in this paper; and
- ii. formulate a Draft Conclusion for the removal of the deficiency AP-MET-xx from the APANPIRG Deficiency Database.

*[Example for IP]*

3.1 The meeting is invited to note the information on the progress of the deficiency resolution work contained in this paper.

-----

*<If adding attachments such as letters or monitoring results, include them here under the main body of the paper.>*