



*"[air navigation control, [...]] is a task involving the exercise of public authority and is not of an economic nature, since that activity constitutes a service in the public interest which is intended to protect both the users of air transport and the populations affected by aircraft flying over them".
(Extract of decision C.364/92 of the European Court of Justice).*

Attending for ATCEUC FB, NH, VD

The meeting was an information meeting for ATCEUC, ETF, IFATCA and IFATSEA, It presented the outcome of the work conducted in the FABs working group up to now.

Attending

Jors Bruggemans, NL Safety manager, safety workgroup

Gouault Ops Group

Kalens Dutz, Munch ACC, Ops Group.

Peter Nats, Eurocontrol MUAC, TECH Wkgroup

Medioni HR Workgroup

Hofstay, NL ATC, Reg Group

Belgocontrol, Civil Military

Chairman Finances WkgGroup

ETF, Rubini, 4 people, among whom one of DFS. ETF arrives 20 minutes late, explaining that they have had a "lunch problem". (!)

Third date for the meeting. Apologies from the chair. Wanted to hold the meeting after the CEOs discussion, but impossible due to calendar constraints. The chair explains that a web site is being constructed, and that all available material will be put on the website. ETF protests that as social partners, the documents should be sent to them, rather than having to look for them. ATCEUC asks for the address of the website. Different methods !

Agenda:

There will be different presentations, one per group group.

ETF request the methodology of workgroups to be discussed. They spend 15 minutes explaining that they would like to participate to everything, and to all the workgroups. The chairman points out that any strategic decision depends on CEOs. Not on those attending the groups. ETF point will be relayed ATCEUC after sometime, asked if we could start with the meeting, due to tight agenda.

Operational WG

Studies all possible enhancements related to the route network. Work separated in short term (quick wins) and longer term.

The long real time simulations will cover only the three areas identified in the feasibility study. The impact of the charging regime will not be included, as the

Secretariat : ATCEUC/CRNA SUD-EST - 1, rue Vincent Auriol - 13617 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 1 (France)

Tel : (33) 442 33 77 66 - Fax : (33) 442 33 78 95 - Email : head@atceuc.org - www.atceuc.org

AATCU (Serbia) - ATC Branch of IMPACT (Ireland) – ATCOR ((Romania) - ATMPP (Italy) BATCU (Bulgaria)

CATCU (Croatia) - GATCA (Greece) – G.d.F (Germany) – GLCCA (Luxembourg) - ITUATC (Serbia)

LIFSZ (Hungary) - MATCA (Malta) – MATCU (F. Y. Rep. of Macedonia) - SKYCONTROL (Switzerland)

SNICTA (Portugal) - SNCTA (France) - SSKL (Slovenia) - TUEM (Eurocontrol) – USCA (Spain) - ZZKRL (Poland)

experts have concentrated on “marginal” enhancements...leaving the routes where they are. The aim is not to reroute major flows of traffic, but rather to redesign the military airspace.

The military participate, but do not commit to anything.

ATCEUC analysis: lack of political guidance on how far the cooperation:integration will be held impedes the progress of the group. As each provider fears possible competition, the route changes that are simulated are “marginal”. The group is more or less stuck, although they do not recognise it. We have also pointed out that the military should commit, although they will only do that if their government tells them to. Once again, need for political input from the state.

Technical Workgroup

Cooperation can go as far as common training and maintenance, and starts with planning, studys...the middle phases being procurement of pieces of equipment.

The group proposed 5 areas of improvements: for the coming 5 years., and concentrated on those for which max benefits could be expected.

For environment, data collection as nothing yet exists, but DFS started developing a system, it is foreseen that the full dev and full implementation could bring highest return on investments.

For CNS, bundling services could bring benefits as well. But the group limited its analysis to existing structures, and to five years. Longer term analysis is being conducted, and will be presented during the next meeting

Our opinion: *this group is one of the most advanced. Its findings, though limited by the absence of long term direction & objectives are interesting, and seem to match those of MOSAIC.*

Safety WG

Will produce a safety indication plan...and will validate the global approach. There will be no proof, but a mere indication of where the propositions might lead, safety wise.

The implementation for future Safety Management System. It is easy at first, as most states comply with EC regulations, and ESSAR 3. However, there are areas where national differences remain. The group has now identified them. It will, in a second phase, present best practices and recommendations.

ATCEUC : that group could establish rules and guidelines as well as an avaluation of the works. All the more so as it will not be in a position to give a formal go/no go.

Single Sector Operation

ATCEUC mentions SSO as a safety issue, and mentioned that it was on the table in some workgroups. First answer from the chief of Munich ACC was that, indeed, The item of SSO is currently on the table. In the future, tools will allow greater safety...leading to smop.

ATCEUC reacts strongly to the fact that SMOP is on the table, 5 years after Ueberlingen, all the more so as the CEOs did mention that this was not on the table....All managers confirm that they have not discussed this, and that despite what was said by the german rep,(director of Munich ACC) it was not the case at all..

Financial WG

Presents the different level of co-operations, with their financial implications. Those levels rank from information sharing to consolidation. A presentation of general directions is also made (see slides) it contains single rate, common investment, ...The group also analysed that there will have to be a mechanism to amend charges to counterbalance the impact of common investments that would not benefit one provider. (*Europe has been looking for such a mechanism for years, to no avail. We wished them luck finding that mechanism...*)

The group will try to present a method of financing that will allow the benefits brought to the FAB to benefit as well to each individual ANSP. A question is raised with regards to centre consolidation at the end of the presentation.

ATCEUC took a strong stand against centre consolidation, pointing out that the added value of creating massive ACC had yet to be established, while on the other hand the massive contingency issues were here immediately. However, ATCEUC made it clear, that its members involved by FABEC and others were not opposed to ANSP consolidation...

Our opinion : With regards to charging regimes, the set up proposed by the group is coherent with ATCEUC positions: one single rate, mechanisms to counterbalance negative effects in case of mutual investments....It is also in line with the European directive on charging regimes.

HR WG

Very short presentation. They have not achieved yet, and have not started anything with regards to SD in the implementation phase; ATCEUC indicated that it had suggestions and inputs with regards to who should participate.

Training cooperation identify possible cooperations in training.

Traning effort evaluate the effort involved with setting the FAB.

HR Plan

Social Dialogue.

Regulatory/ Institutional

Little to be said here; the presentation outlined the current issues that came across.

Civil Military

Brief presentation on the proceedings. The military are willing to get involved...rather than to commit, as in other groups. ATCEUC made it clear that little progress could be expected until governments made it clear whose priorities shall prevail.

Wrap up

The chair had proposed to leave 15 min to address whatever issues we might have, and wrap up.

ETF equests more involvement, in the groups, explained that they were ready to participate in FABEC, as they had in SESAR...(!!!). Unuseful discussion, as the chair had made it clear that it would not be in a position to make any strategic

decision...leaving that to the CEOs. ETF went on for 15 full minutes, insisting on the "political support" they could bring. (Arf !)

ATCEUC proposed to sum up what had been said, and to give the impression of controllers. ATCEUC concluded that the feeling we have from the groups is that the OPS group is limited. Unless states decide on how far we should go, we will be stalled. The same can be said for the TECH group, the finance group...on the other hand, we centralise ATFCM ASM, charging regimes, unit rates;...this all points in the same direction...we go for one, we centralise. And those of our members who are involved in MOSAIC, sorry, the FABEC, are ready to move. How about we tap on the shoulders of our states, asking for a clear way, one way or the other ?

There seemed to be general approval of that wrap-up. The next meeting will take place after we meet the CEOs, in Nov 2007. Expected Jan 2008.

End of the meeting.