

OTAC 139-30 Consultation Comments 30 July 2021 – 30 August 2021

No.	Commentator Date & Source	Document Reference	Comment	Response	Action
1	BCAA, 09/08/2021	OTAC 139-30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definitions: Friction > incomplete sentence in this definition (second sentence.) 2. Definitions: Surface friction characteristics need period at the end. 3. Appendices: suggest to include ACI RCAM wet dry conditions only - Doc 9981 which is applicable to 90% of OTAA's, slush and snow RCAM just to Falklands. 4. Appendices: Suggest placing RCAM Applicability first in the section then the RCAM Assessments 5. Appendices: Flowcharts are very difficult to read requires reformatting (https://d3pg1c2bhy6429.cloudfront.net/5104/jdt3A9B-roAPRHjS4DQwQszSwkBNDy8T_0dNxYhY/story_content/external_files/RCAM%20Process%20-%20States%20exposed%20to%20ice,%20snow%20or%20frost.pdf and https://d3pg1c2bhy6429.cloudfront.net/5104/jdt3A9B-roAPRHjS4DQwQszSwkBNDy8T_0dNxYhY/story_content/external_files/RCAM%20Process%20-%20States%20NOT%20exposed%20to%20ice,%20snow%20or%20frost.pdf) 6. Appendices: Consider include ACI fillable RCR worksheets or links to similar https://d3pg1c2bhy6429.cloudfront.net/5104/jdt3A9B-roAPRHjS4DQwQszSwkBNDy8T_0dNxYhY/story_content/external_files/RCA%20Worksheet%20-%20wet%20condition%20fillable%20PDF.pdf and https://d3pg1c2bhy6429.cloudfront.net/5104/jdt3A9B-roAPRHjS4DQwQszSwkBNDy8T_0dNxYhY/story_content/external_files/RCA%20Worksheet%20-%20winter%20fillable%20PDF.pdf 7. References: by the time the NPA of OTAC 139-30 is finished one assumes 139 will be on issue 9. 	<p>1-2 will be resolved</p> <p>3. as this document is also used by the Falklands the RCAM will remain as it is.</p> <p>4. This will be changed into suggested order</p> <p>5 Flowcharts will be replaced with new one</p> <p>6. Noted, ASSI is not able to use this in official guidance material and also this is not an official ICAO document</p> <p>7. this will be changed to reflect the correct issue of the document</p>	<p>1-2 changed accordingly</p> <p>3. NFA</p> <p>4-5 changed accordingly</p> <p>6. NFA</p> <p>7. changed accordingly</p>

OTAC 139-30 Consultation Comments 30 July 2021 – 30 August 2021

No.	Commentator Date & Source	Document Reference	Comment	Response	Action
2	Bjoern Boe, 20/10/2021	OTAC 139-30	<p>Here is a summary of important issues related to the GRF implementation in areas where there is DRY OR WET CONDITIONS (NO SNOW, ICE, FROST OR SLUSH).</p> <p>The CAA must verify that:</p> <p>Aerodrome operators (and staff):</p> <p>Understand: When is the runway WET? (PANS ADR) How do we report this to ATC? (an RCR to ATS, -PANS ADR)</p> <p>How do we know whether the runway (or parts thereof) are slippery when wet? , How is this assessed (PANS ADR, physical assessment) How shall this be reported? (NOTAM until runway fixed), SNOWTAM when the runway is wet)</p> <p>Are there areas of the runway where we have standing water? (Standing water is usually found in wheel tracks, ponds, along the edges etc, or if the rainfall intensity is greater than the drainage capacity of the surface) How are such areas identified and how is STANDING WATER reported? Look at the runway just after heavy rain and not where there are ponds, wheeltrack with water etc (PANS ADR) NOTAM until fixed, RCR-SNOWTAM when you have standing water Is the aerodrome manual updated to reflect GRF issues?</p> <p>ATS and AIM, How do they receive and transmit the information in the Runway Condition Report? (VOICE, ATI, SNOWTAM) (PANS AIM, Doc 4444) Have they procedures to receive pilot reports and to convey these to the aerodrome staff? Is the MATS updated to cover GRF issues?</p> <p>Aircraft operators; Are they familiar with the new system? (PANS ADR, Doc 10064) Do they perform a landing distance assessment before landing? New Annex 6 requirement. If yes, are they using appropriate performance data? (Doc 10064) If pilots assess actual conditions to be worse than what has been reported, do they report the fact to ATC correctly - and does the ATC feed this back to the aerodrome operator? Is the OPS manual updated to reflect GRF issues?</p> <p>COMMON: Has everybody been trained properly?</p> <p>These are the most important issues to clarify as soon as possible.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for the comments and detail, which are good examples for aerodromes to use when reviewing their operating environment. Unfortunately, we're unable to provide this level of detail, and it remains the responsibility of each Aerodrome to define the level of detail and resources required to meet the requirements.</i></p>	NFA