

Main takeaways  
Friends/Partners of Aviation Weather  
Summer 2009-07-27

- Want to see more evidence of involvement by the end-users, i.e., the controller, dispatchers, pilots, etc., in the formation and evaluation of future weather requirements
- While the parameters inside the Single Authoritative Source (SAS) may be fairly well understood, who will decide how those fields are populated? NOAA has been designated lead for the effort, but how do others, including industry, participate?
- Endorsement of a NWS proposed industry day during the first half of FY10 (October – March)
- Significant discussion on the need for better aviation weather training across the board for all actors in the system, including meteorologists who support the system. Shawn Clark, a new FAA VP for training was identified by Hank Krakowski as someone to invite to future FPAW events. The discussion recognizes the transition to NextGen will be gradual or evolutionary. Hank also warned against making NextGen concepts “sterile” or “digital only”. NATCA commented on the need to gain better controller trust in weather displays.
- FAA recognition they need to perform better portfolio management of their weather enterprise
- A number of comments which indicate (still) a lack of awareness of what exactly the “cube” is intended to bring to the table:
  - “Faster, better, and cheaper” observations/forecasts to the users
  - More PIREPs, manual and automated, shared by all
  - Finer temporal resolution of automated surface observations
  - “I’m a general pilot and for the life of me I still can’t tell what the cube is”
- Generally positive comments regarding weather integration – one question asked when and if weather integration would be combined with the 4D Cube planning. Answer: Yes
- FAA weather czar comments/questions were not specifically answered
- Industry concerns regarding future aviation weather planning—how/when will they know planning is sufficiently stabilized so that they may plan on whether to use internal funding against opportunity targets?
- IT standards should be identified early
- Data storage/recovery of the cube and the methodologies to do so
- Several comments on the lack of Flight Standards participation in this effort. How to bring them better into the activities?
- SAS at 2013 will have applications against it (FAA)
- If New York is really the problem should we focus on that area for testing/prototyping?
- Implications of the SAS on international agreements/arrangements not clear
- Do the users of the weather system realize we’re asking them to change their business models as well?