LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

METAR TAF Data API for OCC Dashboards: NOAA vs Cache

> LANDING.AERO is a Montreal software studio that builds custom, AI-assisted software for flight operations: operations tools, data integration, workflow automation and dashboards designed around how an airline, charter operator or flight department actually works.

Published by LANDING.AERO · 2026-10-01 · metar taf data api · aviation weather api · metar api · taf api · occ dashboard · noaa aviation weather · weather cache · flight operations · data freshness

Original article: https://www.landing.aero/articles/en/metar-taf-occ-dashboard-noaa-api-cache

In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. AWC Direct API Queries
4. AWC Bulk Cache Files
5. Licensed Managed Delivery
6. Feature Comparison
7. Performance and Benchmarks
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

An operations control center (OCC) dashboard needs a defined **weather data contract** before it needs an endpoint. For each station and product, that contract should specify the identifier, observation or issue time, forecast validity, receipt time, source, retention period, acceptable age, and behavior when data disappear. A terminal aerodrome forecast (TAF) amendment can replace an earlier forecast, while a corrected meteorological aerodrome report (METAR) can retain the original observation time. A screen that sorts only by receipt time can therefore show a newer arrival as if it were a newer observation.

As of **October 2026**, the US Aviation Weather Center (AWC) documents a machine API with up to **30 days** of database access, **100 requests per minute**, and a maximum of **400 entries** on most endpoints. Its current full-dataset cache files publish METAR XML and CSV **once a minute** and TAF XML **every 10 minutes**. These are published service characteristics, not a promise that every report reaches an operator within that interval. The cache is a current snapshot, while the 30-day statement concerns the API database. (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov)

Direct API queries fit a bounded station list, history retrieval, and targeted repair. **Bulk cache ingestion** fits broad current coverage or repeated use by multiple applications, provided the operator can parse, reconcile, and retain complete snapshots. **Managed vendors** may be preferable when a contract must cover redistribution, support, normalized formats, or a defined delivery service. Public vendor pages establish capabilities, but they do not prove that a specific OCC use is licensed or that a route network is complete. CheckWX documents current and historical data; Cirium lists METAR and TAF in commercial plans; AVWX explicitly tells clients to check recency. (www.checkwxapi.com) (developer.cirium.com) (support.avwx.rest)

The acceptance plan should compare actual station and product coverage with the operator's route set, preserve raw and parsed payloads, test amendments and no-data responses, and expose freshness and source state beside every displayed value. The dashboard is **non-authoritative** and does not replace authorized weather briefings or approved procedures. In the United States, Federal Aviation Administration

(FAA) guidance says Part 119 certificate holders use the weather systems in their operations specifications. Canadian and European requirements and guidance must be assessed separately. (www.faa.gov) (tc.canada.ca) (www.easa.europa.eu)

Introduction and Background

The phrase “METAR TAF data API for OCC dashboard” sounds like an endpoint selection. In practice it is a decision about how an operations team will recognize a missing observation, an amended forecast, a failed poll, or an apparently fresh screen backed by old weather. **METAR** is a coded terminal observation; **TAF** is a terminal forecast with an issue time and valid period. The AWC labels both as worldwide products, but that label is not a station-by-station completeness promise. The US National Weather Service (NWS) notes that not every METAR airport has a TAF. (www.weather.gov)

This report compares three ways to feed a **non-authoritative OCC display**: AWC direct queries, AWC bulk cache files, and licensed commercial delivery. It is written for operations and IT teams who must agree on coverage, freshness thresholds, history, failure states, and approved-source boundaries. It is not a pilot briefing guide. The AWC itself says it does not maintain the stations that produce reports, so a successful transport response cannot alone prove that a report was issued or should exist.

The decision is especially important when an airline, charter operator, or flight department crosses jurisdictions. US FAA guidance directs Part 119 certificate holders to the weather information systems in their operations specifications. Transport Canada Standard 725 has its own provisions for Type A flight dispatch centers, and NAV CANADA provides Canadian aviation weather services. European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) guidance describes operator evaluation of supplemental weather information. These are distinct contexts, not interchangeable approvals for a US public API. (www.faa.gov) (tc.canada.ca) (tc.canada.ca) (www.easa.europa.eu)

LANDING.AERO describes its work as integrating existing data sources into operational tools and building custom dashboards. That is a software integration role, not a METAR/TAF feed or an approved weather briefing service. The feed decision and the operator's authorized workflow must still be specified separately. (www.landing.aero) (www.landing.aero)

Define the data contract first

For every station-product pair, record **ICAO identifier**, expected availability, source, raw message, parsed fields, event time, ingestion time, and state. AWC says METAR station identifiers use International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) format. An International Air Transport Association code used in commercial schedules should be mapped explicitly rather than silently reused as a weather station key. (aviationweather.gov) (www.meteomatics.com)

Store all times in Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), with a separate display conversion for each user's locale. This avoids ambiguity when local clocks change. The Internet Engineering Task Force's RFC 3339 recommends UTC for interoperability, and AWC notes the Z suffix in METAR time groups. The dashboard should show both the weather time and “received at” time; neither substitutes for the other. (www.rfc-editor.org)

AWC Direct API Queries

Capabilities

The **AWC Data API** offers METAR and TAF through endpoints under `/api/data`. Its product table lists raw text, JSON, GeoJSON, XML, and International Civil Aviation Organization Meteorological Information Exchange Model (IWXXM) for both products, with CSV additionally listed for METAR. The API database currently provides up to **30 days** of prior data. An OpenAPI specification describes parameters and output models, including TAF query handling by validity or issuance time. That distinction matters when the dashboard is reconstructing what was known at a past dispatch decision point. (aviationweather.gov) (wmo.int)

For a bounded airport list, direct requests are straightforward to reason about. The application can ask for specific stations, preserve the returned raw text, and reconcile parsed fields. A backfill worker can make narrow history requests within the documented window. The implementation should cap each request below the documented **400-entry** ceiling, treat a full result as a reason to split or page a query, and never infer completeness merely from HTTP success. AWC states that most requests need parameters to constrain them.

Adoption pattern

Put the API behind a server-side ingestion service rather than calling it from every browser. AWC says cross-origin resource sharing is not permitted for its API and advises a custom user agent. One central collector also lets the operator coordinate request budgets, deduplicate station requests from several widgets, and store an audit trail. Query by product and station set, normalize only after preserving source bytes, then publish versioned dashboard records. (csrc.nist.gov)

The application should distinguish **valid no data** from a transport failure. AWC documents **HTTP 204** for valid requests with no available data, except GeoJSON. A 204 should create a “no current report returned” state with request time and scope, not an empty report interpreted as clear weather. AWC also documents **429** when limits apply; a client should slow down and honor a `Retry-After` header if one is supplied. The HTTP standard allows `Retry-After` to be a date or delay. (aviationweather.gov) (www.rfc-editor.org) (www.rfc-editor.org)

Strengths and limitations

Direct access is strongest when the route set is limited, historical reconstruction matters, and the operator can own parsing and monitoring. Its principal planning limits are request frequency, row caps, and the need to define behavior when a product is absent. The **100-per-minute** limit applies to API requests, not to a dashboard's render rate. AWC says most METARs update hourly, so polling every few seconds would usually add traffic without creating more observations. Product issuance and network arrival are separate clocks. (www.weather.gov)

AWC Bulk Cache Files

Capabilities

AWC publishes gzip-compressed **current full datasets**. Its documented METAR XML and CSV cache files update **once a minute**; its TAF XML file updates **every 10 minutes**. AWC recommends caches for excessively large or frequent custom queries. A cache ingest is therefore attractive when many stations or applications need the same current snapshot. The ingest can fetch once, unpack, validate, and distribute internally, while preserving a source snapshot identifier for later review. (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov)

The page's **30-day** database window should not be applied to these files. They are described as “all current” reports. An operator needing months of provenance must build its own retained archive or buy a service with a suitable contract. A cache file's documented update frequency is likewise a publication cadence, not a guaranteed maximum age of every underlying report. A METAR may be absent because the station did not report; a TAF may not be issued for that site at all. (www.weather.gov)

Adoption pattern

Treat every download as a **snapshot transaction**. Store the compressed object or a digest, retrieval time, parse result, record count, and source path. Validate that decompression and schema parsing succeeded before publishing the new state. Then compare station-product keys with the previous accepted snapshot. A missing record should pass through a timed “missing from latest snapshot” state before policy decides to hide an older report; the screen should never quietly relabel the older report as current. W3C's provenance model provides a useful conceptual distinction between source entities and derived records. (www.w3.org) (www.w3.org)

Use an explicit reconciliation rule for amendments. AWC says a **TAF AMD** supersedes and cancels the earlier TAF. A corrected METAR, however, can retain its original report time. The database key must therefore include product type, station, issue or observation time, and correction or amendment identity. Arrival order alone cannot decide which message is active. Keep the superseded version available in an audit view, but show the current version clearly.

Strengths and limitations

Bulk files avoid one query per station, but they shift work to downloading, parsing, and completeness checks. A partial or malformed file should be quarantined, with the last accepted snapshot visible as stale. The operator should measure **snapshot age**, **oldest displayed observation age**, and **station coverage** separately. Conditional HTTP requests may reduce transfers if a server supports them, but RFC 9110 only describes the general mechanism; the team must test whether the specific AWC cache endpoint supplies useful validators. (www.rfc-editor.org) (opentelemetry.io)

Licensed Managed Delivery

Capabilities

A managed feed is a procurement and data-rights choice as much as an API choice. **CheckWX** documents current and historical aviation weather data, raw and decoded METAR models, and structured TAF segments. It requires an API key and recommends caching METAR/TAF requests for at least **15 minutes**. These are documented product characteristics, not a universal OCC freshness threshold. Its Version 2 documentation notes decoded structure changes that are not backward compatible with Version 1, a reason to pin and regression-test a schema version. (www.checkwxapi.com) (www.checkwxapi.com) (www.checkwxapi.com) (www.checkwxapi.com) (www.checkwxapi.com)

Cirium FlightStats Weather lists METAR, TAF, and zone forecasts and places the weather API in its Commercial and Contract plans. **AVWX** advertises parsed JSON, XML, or YAML reports; its support documentation warns that a cached report can be multiple days old and recommends client-side recency checks. **Meteomatics** exposes distinct TAF issue and validity fields in one product representation. Those pages show possible integration features, but an operator still needs the applicable license, coverage schedule, support terms, and redistribution rights in writing. (developer.cirium.com) (developer.cirium.com) (info.avwx.rest) (support.avwx.rest) (support.avwx.rest) (www.meteomatics.com)

Adoption pattern

Ask prospective vendors to provide a sample payload for each required station and product, including a missing report, a corrected METAR, an amended TAF, and a backfill request. Request documentation for **observation time**, **issue time**, **validity**, **vendor receipt time**, and **client delivery time**. Distinguish which fields are source facts and which are vendor transformations. A plan should state whether raw messages may be stored for audit, how long history remains accessible, and whether dashboard display and internal redistribution are licensed. The public API page alone cannot answer those contract questions. (www.faa.gov) (www.w3.org)

The operator should also ask how a vendor identifies upstream gaps, publishes status, changes schemas, and supports a fallback path. A vendor can simplify parsing or commercial support, but no public feature list proves lower latency or complete route coverage. Compare measured pilot data and signed terms against the same contract used for direct NOAA ingestion. If a vendor decodes weather, preserve the raw message alongside the decoded fields so discrepancies can be reviewed. (www.checkwxapi.com) (support.avwx.rest)

Strengths and limitations

Managed delivery can be preferable when rights, support, format normalization, or a contractually defined service outweigh the cost of operating an internal collector. It remains necessary to monitor report age at the source level. A vendor's fast HTTP response can deliver an old observation. An archive can assist retrospective audits, but the exact query window, completeness, permitted use, and price require written confirmation. Iowa Environmental Mesonet's separate TAF archive illustrates why history is a distinct product requirement, not an inference from a current feed. (support.avwx.rest) (mesonet.agron.iastate.edu)

Feature Comparison

Table 1 compares the three delivery patterns against the same OCC questions. Documented values are marked as such; “verify” identifies an operator-specific acceptance item.

Question	AWC direct API	AWC bulk cache	Licensed vendor
Current METAR/TAF access	Station-scoped API queries; both products documented as worldwide. (aviationweather.gov)	Full current METAR and TAF datasets.	Varies by contract; CheckWX and Cirium document both products. (www.checkwxapi.com) (developer.cirium.com)
Formats	Raw, JSON, GeoJSON, XML, IWXXM; METAR also CSV.	METAR XML or CSV; TAF XML, all gzip.	CheckWX JSON models, Cirium API, AVWX JSON/XML/YAML; verify chosen plan. (www.checkwxapi.com) (info.avwx.rest)
Publication or request limit	**100 requests/minute**, most endpoints **400 entries**. (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov)	METAR files **1 minute**; TAF XML **10 minutes**. (aviationweather.gov) (aviationweather.gov)	Plan and endpoint specific; CheckWX recommends **15-minute** client caching.
History	Database access up to **30 days**. (aviationweather.gov)	Current snapshot; retain internally for history.	Confirm exact period and rights in agreement.
Key unknown	Actual station completeness and observed arrival lag.	File integrity, absent-record meaning, and sustained download behavior.	Station coverage, license, support, and source-to-client lag.

The table exposes a frequent category error: a **cache publication interval** is not a **report age** or an end-to-end service level. It also shows why a broad dashboard may prefer a cache while a small repair job uses the API. The two AWC paths can coexist, with clear source priority and deduplication. No row implies that worldwide product coverage guarantees the operator's airports. (www.weather.gov)

A practical selection sequence

- **Inventory:** List destinations, alternates, diversion stations, and other watched sites, then map schedule codes to ICAO identifiers.
- **Classify:** Mark METAR expected, TAF expected, and optional sites separately. A missing TAF at a non-TAF station is not a feed defect. (www.weather.gov)
- **Specify:** Set operator-owned age thresholds and behavior for stale, missing, corrected, amended, and invalid data.
- **Sample:** Run candidate feeds over representative routes and shifts; record raw report, timestamps, and provenance.
- **Contract:** Confirm commercial use, retention, redistribution, support, and termination rights before relying on vendor delivery.
- **Approve:** Map the dashboard to the operator's existing approved weather workflow and jurisdiction. (www.faa.gov) (www.easa.europa.eu)

Performance and Benchmarks

No public source reviewed here establishes a universal AWC-to-OCC latency benchmark. The useful comparison is a **capacity calculation** followed by operator measurement. AWC publishes **100 requests per minute** and a **400-entry** cap for most endpoints. The NWS describes routine METAR issuance as hourly, while US scheduled TAFs are generally issued at least four times daily, with amendments possible between schedules. Polling interval should therefore be selected for the workflow and tested against actual arrivals, rather than inferred from the cache interval alone. (aviationweather.gov) (www.weather.gov) (www.weather.gov)

Table 2 is planning arithmetic for a hypothetical station set. It assumes one request per station per product, no batching, and evenly spaced polling. The formula is `stations × products × (60 ÷ interval in seconds)`. It is **not** a measured latency or reliability result.

Synthetic plan	Calculation	Requests/minute	Interpretation
20 stations, METAR and TAF, every 5 minutes	20 × 2 ÷ 5	**8**	Below published AWC ceiling; reserve capacity for retries and history.
100 stations, both products, every 2 minutes	100 × 2 ÷ 2	**100**	Equals published ceiling before retries; unsuitable as a safe operating target.
100 stations, both products, every 1 minute	100 × 2 ÷ 1	**200**	Exceeds published ceiling; batch, reduce frequency, use cache, or mix paths.
One current METAR cache and one TAF cache every 10 minutes	1 ÷ 1 + 1 ÷ 10	**1.1 average**	Download traffic differs from API calls; verify file cadence and size.

The first three rows count API calls. The final row counts hypothetical cache downloads, which are a different workload and should not be presented as a claim about API quota. Batching station identifiers reduces requests but must respect returned-row limits and any endpoint-specific constraint. CheckWX, for example, documents up to **25** comma-separated ICAO codes in a METAR request, showing why a vendor's batch rule cannot be assumed to match AWC's. (www.checkwxapi.com)

Measure the pipeline, not only the endpoint

For each accepted message, calculate **source age** (`now minus observation or issue time`), **transport age** (`receipt minus source time`), **processing lag** (`publish minus receipt`), and **coverage** (`required station-product pairs with current data ÷ required pairs`). Report percentiles and missing counts by product, station group, and source during a pilot, but do not invent a pass threshold from a public page. OpenTelemetry defines timestamped gauges and HTTP request-duration metrics that can represent these measurements. Keep metric labels bounded; a per-airport label may be operationally useful, while arbitrary raw messages should not become metric labels. (opentelemetry.io) (opentelemetry.io)

Separate a retry from a duplicate update. A 429 response indicates pressure on the request budget, not new weather. The collector should back off and retain the previous accepted record with an explicit stale marker. A valid 204 response should be logged as no data for that request scope. Error and no-data rates belong on the

monitoring board beside report age, because a green HTTP success chart alone cannot distinguish them. (www.rfc-editor.org)

Data Analysis and Evidence

The published data permit a few defensible calculations, but not a universal benchmark. AWC's **30-day** database access supports recent repair or replay queries. It does not give the bulk caches 30 days of history. The **one-minute** METAR and **10-minute** TAF cache frequencies describe file updates, while METAR and TAF issuance follows separate reporting schedules. NWS says routine METARs are hourly and scheduled TAFs are issued at least four times daily. A report can therefore be older than its file without the file itself being late. (aviationweather.gov) (www.weather.gov) (www.weather.gov)

For a **100-station**, two-product dashboard polled every **two minutes** without batching, the planning calculation yields **100 requests per minute**. That consumes the full published AWC ceiling before failures, retries, station metadata, or historical backfills. If the same route set is polled every five minutes, the result is **40 requests per minute**, still requiring a margin for other traffic. These are arithmetic scenarios under stated assumptions, not observed service performance. The operator should test actual request shapes against the published **400-row** constraint and verify whether any query silently truncates data. (aviationweather.gov)

Table 3 is a synthetic timestamp and provenance test set. The displayed decision is an expected software behavior for review, not a statement about a real airport or a regulatory minimum.

Synthetic event	Input record	Expected dashboard and audit behavior
Correction arrives later	METAR observation 14:00Z, received 14:08Z; corrected message with same observation time received 14:11Z	Show corrected version and original observation age; retain both raw messages and receipt times.
TAF amendment	TAF issued 12:00Z; AMD issued 13:20Z for overlapping validity	Mark earlier TAF superseded, show AMD issue and valid times, preserve predecessor.
Valid empty query	HTTP 204 at 14:05Z for a watched station	Display “no data returned,” request scope, last known report age, and alert state.
Snapshot gap	Fresh cache file omits a previously present station	Do not silently keep the old report as current; mark missing and retain snapshot identifiers.
Local clock change	User locale repeats a 01:30 display time	Preserve UTC source and receipt times; add local offset in display. (www.rfc-editor.org)

The table tests time ordering, absence, and lineage rather than visual formatting. It can be executed against a staging collector with synthetic payloads and checked against the event log. NIST's log-management guidance and W3C's provenance model support retaining enough information to reconstruct which input generated a displayed state. A test passes only when both the screen and audit record agree. (csrc.nist.gov) (www.w3.org)

Acceptance and monitoring plan

- **Coverage baseline:** For every required route station, verify whether a METAR and TAF actually exist in each candidate feed; record planned exceptions. (www.weather.gov)

- **Schema checks:** Parse raw and structured output, reject invalid timestamps, preserve unknown groups, and flag changed fields. (www.checkwxapi.com)
- **Freshness checks:** Compare source, issue, valid, receipt, and publish times against documented operator thresholds. (www.faa.gov)
- **Reconciliation:** Exercise correction, amendment, duplicate, out-of-order, disappearance, and reappearance cases.
- **SPECI checks:** For each candidate feed, test a special observation between routine METARs. Confirm it appears as SPECI, retains its coded observation time and report type, and updates displayed current conditions before the next routine METAR.
- **Failure checks:** Simulate 204, 429, timeout, malformed gzip, incomplete parse, and primary-source loss; inspect display state and alerts.
- **Audit checks:** Rebuild a prior displayed value from raw message, parser version, transformation record, and snapshot or request identifier. (www.w3.org)
- **Operational review:** Have dispatch and IT owners sign off the dashboard's labels, escalation path, and relationship to approved weather sources. (www.faa.gov) (tc.canada.ca)

Implications and Future Directions

A hybrid architecture is often the most testable design: ingest a bulk current snapshot for broad coverage, use narrow API queries for reconciliation or recent backfill, and retain both raw inputs and the active interpreted record. This is an architecture option, not a claim that AWC guarantees availability or that a fallback API is independent of the same upstream source. Switching between two endpoints on one provider may preserve access during one type of failure while leaving common-source gaps untouched.

The **fallback strategy** should therefore be written as an ordered decision rule. If a cache is late, continue to display the last accepted record as stale, attempt a bounded direct query if within the request budget, and alert on the missing station-product pair. If the direct query returns 204, record no data. If both routes are unavailable, show the age and source of the last record, then follow the operator's approved escalation path. A commercial secondary source can be considered only after coverage, license, and equivalence are tested. (aviationweather.gov)

Schema and format choices will continue to matter as feeds evolve. AWC offers several machine formats, including IWXXM, which the World Meteorological Organization describes as an exchange model for aviation meteorological information. A decoded vendor response may save development time, but it also introduces a transformation to test and version. The data contract should isolate the source adapter from the dashboard schema, so a format change triggers controlled regression tests rather than a silent display change. (wmo.int) (www.checkwxapi.com)

For teams commissioning custom software, integration work and weather supply remain separate purchases or responsibilities. LANDING.AERO publicly describes custom integration and dashboard work; it does not present an off-the-shelf weather feed in those descriptions. An operator should therefore compare providers on data rights and coverage, then assess the integration build on parser tests, observability, auditability, and workflow fit. (www.landing.aero) (www.landing.aero)

Finally, the workflow boundary should be explicit in the interface. A non-authoritative OCC dashboard can highlight reports requiring attention and link staff to the approved process; it cannot by itself alter an operator's weather obligations. US operations specifications, Canadian dispatch standards, and EASA guidance are jurisdiction-specific. The deployment review must identify the operator's approved source of weather and ensure the dashboard does not present supplemental data as a replacement briefing. (www.faa.gov) (tc.canada.ca) (www.easa.europa.eu) (www.navcanada.ca)

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Is the NOAA AWC API suitable for a METAR/TAF OCC dashboard?

Yes, as a **non-authoritative data source** if the operator can verify required station coverage, stay within documented limits, preserve source times and raw messages, and handle missing data explicitly. The published API supports recent history and several formats, but the public documentation is not an operator-specific service commitment. Its maximum of **100 requests per minute** and usual **400-entry** response ceiling should be modeled before deployment. (aviationweather.gov)

Should the team use direct API requests or cache files?

Use direct requests for small, targeted station sets and repair queries; use caches when many stations or internal clients need the current dataset. The cache files have stated update cadences, but an individual report may still be old or absent. A mixed design needs a single reconciliation rule and clear source priority. (www.weather.gov)

How often should METAR and TAF data be refreshed?

There is no universal OCC refresh interval in these sources. AWC publishes **one-minute** METAR cache and **10-minute** TAF cache updates, while NWS describes routine METAR issuance as hourly and scheduled TAF issuance at least four times daily. Define polling from the operator's alerting need, request budget, and measured feed behavior; set a separate threshold for report age. (www.weather.gov) (www.weather.gov)

What should happen when a station returns no data?

Preserve the request scope and time, mark the product as absent, and display the last known report only with its age and stale state. AWC's **204** response means a valid request had no available data, except in GeoJSON behavior. Confirm first whether that station is expected to issue a TAF at all. (www.weather.gov)

When is a managed vendor preferable?

Choose a licensed vendor when the operator requires contracted rights, support, normalized output, or history beyond what it can maintain itself. Test a real route list and amendment cases, then obtain the exact contract terms. CheckWX, Cirium, and AVWX pages illustrate feature options, but none of those public descriptions establishes a particular operator's permitted use or end-to-end freshness. (developer.cirium.com)

Conclusion

The useful choice is not simply **API versus cache**. It is whether the selected path can satisfy a written contract for station coverage, product identity, time semantics, retention, failure states, and audit evidence. AWC's direct API is suitable for bounded queries and recent history; its bulk files are efficient for broad current snapshots. A licensed vendor can add format or commercial services if its specific agreement answers the operator's rights and support questions. The published numbers are planning constraints, not delivery guarantees.

An OCC team should start with the required station-product inventory, then run the synthetic tests and a measured pilot across its own routes. The release criterion is that a stale, absent, corrected, amended, or unparseable report is visible as such, with provenance recoverable from the event log. That design makes the dashboard useful to operations while preserving the boundary around authorized weather briefings and approved procedures.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://aviationweather.gov/data/api/
2. https://www.checkwxapi.com/documentation/introduction
3. https://developer.cirium.com/apis/flightstats-apis/weather
4. https://support.avwx.rest/api/
5. https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/publications/aim_html/chap7_section_1.html
6. https://tc.canada.ca/en/corporate-services/acts-regulations/list-regulations/canadian-aviation-regulations-sor-96-433/standards/standard-725-airline-operations-aeroplanes-canadian-aviation-regulations-cars
7. https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/online-publications/easy-access-rules-air-operations?erules-id=ERULES-1963177438-12292
8. https://www.weather.gov/index.php/bmx/aviationwx
9. https://tc.canada.ca/en/corporate-services/transparency/briefing-documents-transport-canada/2023-dm/transport-canada-structure-portfolio/shared-governance-organizations/nav-canada
10. https://www.landing.aero/
11. https://www.landing.aero/about/
12. https://aviationweather.gov/help/data/
13. https://www.meteomatics.com/en/api/request/advanced-requests/api-request-weather-station-mos-data/
14. https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3339.html
15. https://wmo.int/iwxxm
16. https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/sp/800/92/final
17. https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6585.html
18. https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9110.html
19. https://www.weather.gov/asos/METAR.html
20. https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/

21. https://opentelemetry.io/docs/specs/otel/metrics/data-model/
22. https://www.checkwxapi.com/documentation/taf
23. https://www.checkwxapi.com/documentation/version2
24. https://info.avwx.rest/
25. https://www.meteomatics.com/en/api/vector-tile-server/taf-request-meteomatics/
26. https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/request/taf.php
27. https://www.weather.gov/box/product_descriptions
28. https://www.checkwxapi.com/documentation/metar
29. https://opentelemetry.io/docs/specs/semconv/http/http-metrics/
30. https://www.navcanada.ca/en/flight-planning/flight-planning-and-reporting.aspx

THE PUBLISHER

About LANDING.AERO

LANDING.AERO builds custom software for aviation operations teams at airlines, charter operators and flight departments. It is based in Montreal.

What it builds

Operations tools that reduce manual steps in day-to-day flight operations; integration of existing systems and data sources into one operational picture; workflow automation; real-time operational dashboards; bridges between legacy systems and modern applications; and mobile apps for staff in the field. Each application is designed around the operator's own workflows rather than sold as an off-the-shelf platform.

How it works

Work starts with discovery of the operator's workflows, continues with iterative development alongside the operator's team, and includes integration with the tools already in use and ongoing support.

Its own tools

LANDING.AERO also publishes small tools for aviation professionals, including UTC Alarm, which sets alarms in Zulu time, and NOTAM Notifier, announced for NOTAM change alerts on chosen airports.

Visit

See LANDING.AERO and its projects.

Articles published here explain general practice and cite their primary sources, naming the jurisdiction of any rule they describe. They are not operational, regulatory or legal advice, do not replace an operator's approved procedures or manuals, and requirements change.

Website: https://www.landing.aero

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.