



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR ENERGY AND TRANSPORT
DIRECTORATE F - Air Transport
Air Traffic Management and Airports

Draft ICB/14 Minutes FINAL
27th March 2007

INDUSTRY CONSULTATION BODY
Minutes of the 14th Meeting

Location: European Commission, Borschette Conférence Centre (Room 2C), Rue Froissart 36, B-1040, Brussels
Date and time: **18th January 2007 at 10.00 am**

Participants:

A list of participants is provided at the end of this document. Ms Tammenoms Bakker (Chairwoman of the HLG) and Mr David McMillan (Member of the HLG) were present for Agenda Item 2.

Apologies:

Apologies were received from the following members of the ICB:

Mr Vincent De Vroey	AEA
Mr Chris Benich	AIA
Mr Denis Lambergeon	AVIMET
Ms Fiona McFadden	ECA
Mr Guenter Martis	IATA
Mr Paul Neering	IFATCA
Mr Philip Clinch	SITA
Mr Akhil Sharma	SITA
Mr Luc Tytgat	EC

Introduction by the Chairman

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed Ms Tammenoms Bakker and Mr David McMillan of the High Level Group who were present. The Agenda was accepted.

Agenda Item 1 – Minutes of the previous meeting

Input Paper:

- Minutes from the previous meeting (ICB/13/Minutes).

Mr Luigi Iodice (ASD/Selex) requested the following changes to the Minutes from ICB/13: Page 23 of 29, paragraph 5, line 2 should now read “*Mr Iodice (ASD/SELEX) offered the support of ASD for re-election of the current Chairman and Vice Chairman. Mr Iodice added that he would like either the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the ICB, for the period 2007/2008, to be an ASD member*”.

Ms Fiona McFadden (ECA) requested the following changes to the Minutes from ICB/13 (via email): Page 9 of 29, paragraph 2, line 3 should now read “*Ms McFadden (ECA) requested that ‘Just Culture’ be added to the work programme and raised the point that environmental issues had not been properly addressed within the ICB Work Programme for 2006/2007. She went on to say that ECA and IFATCA supported the inclusion of a statement on the environment into the ICB Work Programme in the context of operational safety*”.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/1 -The minutes of ICB/13 were accepted with two changes as requested by ASD and ECA.

Action Items

- A14/1 - Incorporate changes to ICB/13 minutes and distribute final version.

Agenda Item 2 – Institutional Sub-group: High Level Group

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/4: Report by the Institutional Sub-group on the High Level Group

The Chairman (Mr Fritz Feitl) stated that he hoped that the ICB had read the input paper for this item and his notes on the proceedings of the HLG. He explained that this Agenda Item was designed to facilitate an exchange of views between the Industry and the High Level Group. He then handed the floor over to the Chairwoman of the High Level Group.

Ms Jacqueline Tammenoms Bakker (Chairwoman of the High Level Group) began by thanking the ICB for the opportunity to address its members. She went on to point out that three other representatives from the High Level group (HLG) were present at the meeting. These were Fritz Feitl, David McMillan and Jeff Poole.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) went on to provide background on the HLG, stating that it had its origins in the September Aviation Regulation Conference where a number of themes were developed. These included the need for simplification of the regulatory structure, clearer definition for the roles and responsibilities and the need for more explicitly shared governance principles. Following this conference Commissioner Barrot established the HLG in November and asked for it to supply a clear regulatory vision and a practical roadmap to 2020. Ms Tammenoms Bakker went on to say that Commissioner Barrot was concerned with possible bottlenecks within the current process that may prevent the implementation of the

SES. Ms Tammenoms Bakker added that Commissioner Barrot has given the HLG a free-mandate to assess the situation.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) continued by listing the members of the HLG:

- Ms Jacqueline Tammenoms Bakker (Director General Air Transport – NL and Chair of the HLG)
- Mr Thilo Schmidt (Chairman of management board – EASA)
- Mr David McMillan (Director General Civil Aviation – UK)
- Mr Raymond Cron (Director General Civil Aviation Administration – Switzerland)
- Mr Michel Wachenheim (President of European Civil Aviation Conference – ECAC)
- Mr Victor Aguado (Director General – EUROCONTROL)
- Mr Fritz Feitl (Chairman Industry Consultation Body)
- Mr Alexander Ter Kuile (Secretary General – CANSO)
- Mr Olivier Jankovec (Director General Airports Council International – ACI)
- Mr Jeff Poole (Director International Air Transport Association – IATA)

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) went on to outline the current progress of the HLG. She stated that the group had met in December and was working towards producing a progress report in April 2007 with a final report to the Commission in June 2007. Ms Tammenoms Bakker added that there were a number of themes and working principles emerging that needed to be addressed. Initially this would mean looking at the current situation and identifying any gaps. Ms Tammenoms Bakker stated that the HLG wanted to adopt a system-wide perspective and add real value, building on what was already in place, through meaningful solutions which originated from discussion. For example, members had already identified a link between airport capacity and ATM system capacity. It was a case of realising where the Industry wanted to go and facilitating the solution, which did not necessarily include a revolutionary new design. Ms Tammenoms Bakker stated that there was a need for clear performance objectives in terms of practical issues and moving forward to 2020. Ms Tammenoms Bakker added that this included addressing such matters as the relationship between EUROCONTROL and EASA with respect to ATM safety, Civil-Military co-operation and the global dimension, i.e. European regulation versus global regulation.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) concluded that she didn't expect stakeholders to agree on all issues and that a single point-of-view might not be obtainable with respect to provocative issues. Ms Tammenoms Bakker hoped that the report would be able to outline the consensus achieved and to define where more work was necessary. Ms Tammenoms Bakker went on to say that she understood there were a limited number of people in the HLG and that she hoped the ICB would understand that there would have to be a balance between input and the time available. Ms Tammenoms Bakker felt that it was important to hear the views of stakeholders and that she hoped to organise a process whereby the Industry could provide input on topics through presentations and hearings. Ms Tammenoms Bakker added that David McMillan and her would attend appropriate meetings (e.g. AEA & CANSO) to discuss relevant processes and issues to engage with stakeholders' representatives and help deliver what Industry wanted in terms of the SES. Ms Tammenoms Bakker finished by

stating that the Commission had provided a real opportunity for stakeholders to have significant input into the SES process.

The Chairman responded by saying that consensus building in a difficult environment was nothing new to the ICB and that it had established a reputation for reaching consensus on difficult matters. He went on to summarise the position of the Industry in light of what had just been said by the HLG Chairwoman. He stated that:

- Industry supported the SES objectives and the target of de-fragmentation;
- Industry believed increased Civil-Military co-operation was essential;
- An efficient future ATM system would have a positive impact on the environment;
- New regulatory framework needed to remove parallel activities and reduce the number of regulatory bodies; and
- Operational solutions for ATM need clear political support to be successful.

The Chairman then opened the floor to the members of the ICB.

Ms Marie Desseaux (CANSO) began by thanking the representatives of the HLG for attending the meeting. Ms Desseaux went on to say that from the point of view of the ANSPs it was important that a clear definition of roles existed for all the players. Ms Desseaux stated that the role of the regulator was different from that of the Industry – the regulator sets out the framework to which Industry has to respond in the most efficient manner. Ms Desseaux went on to say that the SES has allowed for the separation of the ANSPs from public authorities but that there is still change necessary within EUROCONTROL, a view held by CANSO for a number of years. Ms Desseaux stated that the new ANSP Board was allowing Industry to take a more active role within the EUROCONTROL process. But she stated she hoped the HLG would recommend taking a further step and support the delegation of control to Industry of the service provision activities in EUROCONTROL (but not the regulatory functions). This would help to reach the end goal where Industry administers ATM. Ms Desseaux added that the existing and practical roadmap, developed under the leadership of David McMillan, could go further and lead to the delegation of power from Member States to the Industry. Ms Desseaux finished by saying that in order to steer EUROCONTROL activities that are relevant to Industry there must be a harmonised development and implementation process for which Industry needs more control over timings and deliverables.

Mr John Hanlon (ELFAA) enquired as to whether focus will be given to the structure of ATM in Europe. He stated that there was a desire to move towards greater efficiency and cost effectiveness and that this needed to be outlined as a goal to ensure the opportunity is being seized, especially given the opportunity that the HLG has to make recommendations to the Commission.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) responded to Mr Hanlon's question by stating that the HLG wanted to define what the system could deliver and that she welcomed stakeholder input to guide the HLG on performance aspects.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) stated that one objective was more capacity in a more efficient manner. Ms Tammenoms Bakker stated that it was necessary to identify the

bottlenecks which may be regulatory or may be institutional, but which needed definition so that a solution could be identified.

Mr David McMillan (HLG) added that in terms of cost efficiency, one task is to look at objectives for delivering the SES, e.g. halving unit cost and whether this is an ambitious enough target. He went on to comment on CANSO's point concerning EUROCONTROL and stated that the Industry, via the ANSP Board, has more of an opportunity to influence change than ever before and that the opportunity should be fully taken advantage of. He added that he was glad CANSO had advocated that Industry has a greater role in EUROCONTROL's service provision activities.

Ms Sylviane Lust (IACA), in support of Mr Hanlon's comments, stated it was important to eliminate the inadequacies of the current system and that IACA wanted to see the overall cost of the ATM system reduced and efficiency introduced. Ms Lust saw this as the role of the HLG and went on to say that she would be disappointed if this resulted in another report on the outcome of another conference. Ms Lust stated that she had high hopes for the HLG and that the issues were clearly defined. Additionally she enquired as to how results were going to be achieved and by when.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) responded by thanking Ms Lust for her challenge and went on to state that the HLG required Industry to identify the bottlenecks, both from the regulatory perspective and from the view at the 'coal face'. Ms Tammenoms Bakker concluded that the ICB can play a vital role in informing the HLG.

Mr Andries Verburgt (CANSO) stated that the HLG should discuss the simplification of the regulatory framework (e.g. opportunities for reducing cost etc). He stated that one of the blocking factors in terms of FAB development is the harmonisation of regulation. Concerning liability issues he added that this should be considered in two parts – the ANSP role and the regulatory role.

Mr Bernard Martens (CANSO) stated that the vision of CANSO is that all the ANSPs should co-operate more (e.g. joint ventures and cross-border initiatives). Such co-operation is often blocked by national regulation. For example many ANSPs are not able to autonomously decide on investments, particularly abroad.

The Chairman added that in the area of FABs the Industry has a clear picture of the obstacles (e.g. liability). However, while the Industry could define the obstacles and practical solutions, it was for the decision makers to implement these solutions.

Mr Olaf Dlugi (Chairman of the SESAR ExCom) began by stating that SESAR already goes further by suggesting alternatives for the future. For example, FABs could lead to mergers between ANSPs. If ANSPs were to merge then the respective regulatory organisations should merge as well, to ensure financial gains of the new system weren't lost through duplication. Alternatively, it would be possible to look at unbundling equipment provision from service provision. In this instance, a service provider may, for example, cover 3 or 4 countries whilst equipment oversight would be dealt with at the national level. Mr Dlugi stated there was a real possibility of achieving FABs, but it would be necessary to agree in advance that any political stumbling blocks would be removed. He concluded that very little has actually been achieved in the development of FABs.

Mr Markus Durstewitz (ASD/Airbus) commented, in relation to the CANSO point, that it was necessary for co-operation between all Industry groups to provide a single design authority to cover service provision and equipment. He added that there should be a complimentary relationship between SESAR and the HLG to provide a final concept by June.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) responded that it was important to define what was meant by a single design authority. For example, what such an entity would want to achieve and what the benefits would be.

Mr McMillan (HLG) added that he felt the single design authority was an interesting concept but enquired as to what the penalties would be in terms of local flexibility.

The Chairman stated that harmonisation of single states through a European or global system would be very complex and this would need to be considered.

Mr Joe Magee (ETF) stated that he was disappointed that there was no Professional Staff Association representation in the HLG and that there had not, as yet, been an invitation to contribute. Professional Staff Associations supported the Chairman's statement that the ICB approved of increasing efficiency, but this could not be combined with cost cutting. He stated that if EASA is to take on the regulation of safety then there needs to be a clearly defined view of where the resources will come from (i.e. not all national staff will move to EASA. Additionally, the separation of the ANSPs and regulatory bodies had led to staffing difficulties). He added that it would be necessary to consider 'Just Culture' in terms of safety and look at legal issues with respect to liability along with cross border issues and Civil-Military activities.

The Chairman replied that at the last HLG meeting it was decided that there would be the opportunity for controllers, pilots, general aviation and the manufacturing Industry to speak who do not have direct representation on the HLG. The Chairman stated that it would be his responsibility to ensure that the concerns of ICB members without HLG representation were listened to.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) thanked the Chairman for his statement and added that at the last HLG there had been a discussion on how to involve social groups (for example, how to look at the issue of Just Culture with respect to safety).

Mr Gerry O'Connell (IATA) stated that it was right for the HLG to highlight ATM design function in Europe and that IATA would be delighted to support in the highlighting of roles for the various stakeholders involved. In relation to CANSO's point that IATA was happy for ANSPs to be given permission to work outside their national boundaries, IATA would support this in order to allow the vision of 2020 to be achieved by overcoming national rulings and replacing them with European regulation. He commented that for this to happen, an institutional framework needed to be produced by the HLG.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) responded by saying that there was experience available upon which to build and solve problems and that it was the HLG's ambition to identify the way forward. Initiatives with respect to Member States are also on the agenda.

Ms Desseaux (CANSO) returned to the single design authority issue and enquired as to whether this referred to a single system for Europe, whether it agreed to an architecture on

common components and how it might work in practice. Ms Desseaux stated that a single system would not provide flexibility and would not be cost effective. CANSO would like to see more work undertaken on the single design authority, as it was only an idea up until this point in time.

The Chairman responded by saying that Industry has consistently said it would like to take on more responsibility, and for the regulators to facilitate rather than regulate. But it is better to achieve 95% of the result now, rather than 100% some time in the future. The requirement of a single design authority or function has been discussed within SESAR. He went on to say that it was not just a case of system design and that to implement SESAR there will be the need for a co-ordinating body and for the Industry to provide solutions and proposals.

Mr Bo Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) added that in terms of building a bridge between the service provision and the regulators, a large void still existed which could be filled by the single design authority. EUROCONTROL believes the single design authority should define the overall architecture and make the system interoperable. Industry would be responsible for addressing the requirements of the higher level architectural design. With respect to FABs, Mr Redeborn stated that there was a solution from an airspace design point of view. However, FABs are prevented from being put into practice by social issues, institutional constraints and sovereignty matters. It is unclear as to how to move these topics forward as many states require government approval to do so. Mr Redeborn stated that it was the Commission and the Member States but not EUROCONTROL who are the regulators.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) stated that through his contact with the EUROCONTROL Military (CMIC) he had learnt that solutions to tackle the issue of sovereignty were achievable; however, politicians are simply unaware of possible solutions. For example, the French military have a standing agreement with Germany and Switzerland to allow French aircraft to follow unidentified aircraft over borders.

Mr Rob Peters (CMIC) stated that, while he agreed there was a problem, he felt the ICB was not in a position to resolve the issue of sovereignty and co-operation. In terms of the FAB initiative it was not the military that was principally blocking the co-ordination. He went on to say that it was the role of the HLG to define issues and adopt principles to solve problems. Governments are not concerned with who is involved as long as all sides are involved and co-operate. He added that if the military were involved in the regulatory process then they were not going to block progress and were ready to co-operate. He finished by stating that the military was only one instrument used to safeguard sovereignty.

The Vice-Chairman (Mr Eric Kroese) welcomed the existence of the HLG. He stated that the challenge from an ANSP perspective is that there will be fewer ACCs and ANSPs in the future. However, there is a clear lack of vision from the EC on the 'end-state'. With regard to co-operation between ANSPs, this can be difficult when each has different institutional agreements. Furthermore, an incentive for one ANSP to look to co-operate may not apply to another.

Ms Desseaux (CANSO) stated that when we collaborate regarding safety and when there is air traffic, then there must be safety risk management. There is a need for safety risks to be engaged in a professional, efficient and harmonised manner. This will mean integration into the HLG discussion on single design authority.

Mr Martin Robinson (AOPA) welcomed the opportunity for General Aviation (GA) to make their case at the HLG. He stated AOPA was disappointed there was no permanent GA representation on the HLG as the airspace users debate tends to be polarised around airline operations. He reminded the ICB that non-airline aircraft make up the majority and he asked the HLG to take this into consideration.

The Chairman responded by stating there was no intention to isolate stakeholders and that it was not a question of the number of aircraft but the number of passengers (i.e. addressing the need of the consumer). The Industry should try to provide solutions that don't differentiate and which serve to provide an ATM system for everyone. The intention should be to provide enough capacity for all stakeholders.

Ms Tammenoms Bakker (HLG) responded to the point on GA by stating that the volume of traffic in relation to GA will increase and this needs to be taken on board by the HLG. Ms Tammenoms Bakker then urged the ICB to contribute their recommendations via the Chairman. Ms Tammenoms Bakker continued by stating that there were a number of points that she would be taking away from the meeting. These included the absolute emphasis on performance (including capacity and efficiency), the roles of Member States in facilitating system improvements and the single design authority (especially putting its role into perspective). Ms Tammenoms Bakker also commented that Ms Desseaux's points on safety and the relevant comments on Just Culture were important. Ms Tammenoms Bakker concluded by saying that she hoped that the HLG had given confidence to the ICB that successful consultation would take place.

The Chairman thanked the delegates from the HLG for attending the meeting and for their contribution.

Following this statement Ms Tammenoms Bakker and Mr McMillan then left the meeting for another engagement.

The Chairman stated that: Supply Industry; General Aviation; Controllers; and Pilots needed to nominate a representative to attend HLG hearings. In their absence, ATCEUC had requested that the Professional Staff Association representative was not discussed.

Mr Jean-Pierre Barthélemy (ASD) stated that he was disappointed that there was no permanent representative from the manufacturers on the HLG. He then went on to introduce the chosen representative for the manufacturer stakeholder group as **Mr Bertrand de L'Epinois**, who is a Director of Thales, President of the Air Traffic Alliance and who is also involved in SESAR.

Mr Bertrand de L'Epinois stated that he was pleased to be present at the ICB and representing ASD on the HLG. He then went on to outline his previous experience.

The Chairman welcomed **Mr Bertrand de L'Epinois** to the ICB and HLG.

Mr Jeff Poole (IATA/HLG) commented, with respect to HLG hearings, the HLG wants input on very specific issues to facilitate buy-in and does not wish to be lobbied by individual groups. Those who were asked to speak would be informed ahead of time so that a proper representation of stakeholder views could be achieved.

Mr Pedro Vincente Azua (EBAA) stated that EBAA were happy for Mr Martin Robinson (AOPA) to represent their interests at the HLG.

Mr Rudolf Schuegraf (European Air Sports) supported the nomination of Mr Robinson on behalf of European Air Sports, but stated he would like shared representation for GA at the HLG.

The Chairman stated that there would be one representative per stakeholder group. Hearings will be convened so that specific questions originating from the HLG may be addressed and stakeholder groups would have to work together in order to co-ordinate their views and produce a single speaker.

Mr Robinson (AOPA) accepted the nomination on behalf of the GA community. He requested that likely questions be transmitted in advance so that a common GA position may be formulated.

Mr Hanlon (ELFAA) expressed concern as to whether hearing specific questions at the HLG and not users' problems is a major flaw in the consultation process.

The Chairman responded by accepting Mr Hanlon's point of view but stated that all stakeholders have the opportunity to provide opinion through the ICB Chairman. He added that there was a complex process that needed to be dealt with in a short time period and that the HLG could not consult with every single stakeholder group.

Mr Magee (ETF) stated that there were professional staff other than pilots and controllers who should have the opportunity to attend HLG hearings and that the HLG could cause more damage than good if all stakeholders were not to be heard. It was his belief that the EC's approach was to satisfy the requirements of the airlines. He commented that professional staff were never official members of the first HLG but were allowed to attend and contribute directly.

Mr Schuegraf (European Air Sports) stated that he was happy for Mr Robinson to represent European Air Sports at the HLG.

Mr Poole (IATA/HLG) stated that it was a challenge for all the groups involved to focus on difficult issues. If the points made by each stakeholder group are sharp then the chance of success is higher. To this end he said that a 'check list' for what was really required should be provided by each stakeholder group.

The Chairman stated that the Industry, with 4 out of 10 permanent members (including the Chair) on the HLG, had been given the chance to develop how the HLG will progress and get its message across on the key issues. He went on to say that nominations for controller and pilot representatives were required as soon as possible.

The Chairman asked that the ICB accept the Institutional Sub-group report on the HLG. He stated that the Institutional Sub-group would meet the day before each HLG meeting to agree ICB positions. All ICB members were free to attend these meetings.

Mr Magee (ETF) stated that he did not agree with the Chairman only representing the agreed views of the ICB. In his opinion, the ICB will never agree on issues associated with

professional staff. In such a scenario how would the views of the Professional Staff Associations be heard by the HLG.

The Chairman responded that it was essential to represent the consensus of the ICB.

Mr Magee (ETF) commented that some workers have major disagreements with the airlines (who get ‘two bites of the cherry’ i.e. through their own representation on the HLG and through the ICB Chairman). He enquired how the Chairman could represent professional staff if a consensus could not be reached. He went on to state that it was the Chairman’s responsibility to represent the members who have no HLG representation.

The Chairman responded by saying that a possible solution could be that he presented minority positions where no full ICB consensus exists. These would not be presented as an agreed ICB position but rather as an individual stakeholder’s position.

Mr Poole (IATA/HLG) commented, with reference to Ms Tammenoms Bakker’s comments, that it was not envisaged that the HLG would reach a total consensus and that it would be necessary to report both sides of the argument.

The Chairman stated that if the ICB agreed, then amendments could be made to the Institutional Sub-group report on the HLG to reflect that the Chairman may communicate minority positions without the consensus of the ICB. However, where agreement did not exist, the Chairman would like to see possible courses of action explored.

Mr Andries Verburgt (CANSO) requested that the first bullet of section 5 in the Institutional Sub-group (HLG) report be split into two points – *this was agreed*.

Mr Magee (ETF) commented on a liability issue concerning different social rules and not protecting jobs. He requested that impacts of cross-border sectors and differing national law be extended slightly by including the term ‘social rules’ within the FAB bullet in section 5 of the Institutional Sub-group (HLG) report – *this was agreed*.

The Chairman asked Helios to address these comments and adapt the paper accordingly. The agenda item was closed.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/2 - Input requested by Chair of HLG will be discussed and ICB positions agreed in Institutional Sub-group. Subjects are:
 - Define bottlenecks that block greater efficiency in present ATM system;
 - Definition of single design authority proposed by Industry; and
 - Hurdles to de-fragmentation measures such as realisation of FABs, FUA and co-operation/mergers between ANSPs.
- D14/3 - Speakers for hearings at HLG meetings were agreed:
 - Bertrand de L’Epinos for manufacturing Industry;
 - Martin Robinson for General Aviation; and
 - Controllers and pilots: will be nominated after agreement between Professional Staff Associations.

- D14/4 - All speakers committed to coordinate within their stakeholder group.
- D14/5 - Report of Institutional Sub-group was accepted with the change that ICB Chairman will report on minority positions of those stakeholder groups that are not represented in the HLG.

Action Items

- A14/2 - At meeting 25th January 2007 Institutional sub-group shall discuss and agree input to the HLG.
- A14/3 - Professional Staff Associations to provide nominations of speakers for HLG hearings.
- A14/4 - Report of Institutional Sub-group: make changes agreed at ICB/14 and distribute final version of report.

Agenda Item 3 – Interoperability Sub-group

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/2: Report by the ICB Interoperability Sub-group

The Chairman brought the attention of the ICB to the report from the Interoperability Sub-group and asked if there were any questions.

Mr Gerry O’Connell (IATA) stated that he was pleased that the airspace users were now supporting the sub-group. He enquired as to whether the ICB was seriously proposing the production of CSs for legacy systems (e.g. NDBs).

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) began by thanking those who participated in the last sub-group. He went on to ask that the emphasis be changed on the reporting and consultation mechanisms. He commented that that he would like to make it clear that ESO has a different reporting and consultation mechanism to EUROCONTROL. In relation to CSs for legacy systems, this is the result of the activities from the application of the R&TTE directive to Ground ATM equipment. Consequently there is a long list of candidate CSs featuring a number of legacy systems. The default position of the Interoperability Sub-group is to be reluctant with the development of CSs for legacy systems, but if required by the R&TTE activities work could start on the legacy system CSs. As a coincidence the Interoperability Sub-group had produced a list of prioritised CSs that he hoped the ICB would endorse and forward to the Commission.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that he supported the input from IATA. He went on to say that there was no justification for developing CSs for systems that would not improve the performance of the network. It was important to focus on areas that added value to the system.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that he agreed with what had been said by Mr Redeborn but that it was impossible to ignore the need to investigate the R&TTE Directive with respect to legacy systems.

Mr Sven Halle (EC) stated that the Interoperability Sub-group does not want to work on legacy systems and that this was reflected within the list of prioritised CSs.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that the prioritised CS list, which clearly separates the CSs that were linked to the R&TTE Directorate, should be passed to the Commission. He concluded by saying that consideration should only be given to the short list of CSs.

Mr Halle (EC) stated that if the ICB agreed on the prioritisation then a set of mandates would be produced for the next set of CSs: ATS Message Handling System (AMHS); Approach with Vertical Guidance (APV); and Ground-Based Augmentation Systems (CAT I only).

The Chairman asked the ICB if this was the manner in which they wanted to proceed. No objection was raised and the list of prioritised CSs was approved for forwarding to the Commission.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/6 - Report and list of topics and priorities have been approved and will be communicated to Commission.

Action Items

- A14/5 - Draft formal letter to the Commission outlining prioritised CSs proposed by the Interoperability Sub-group.

Agenda Item 4 – Institutional Sub-group: SESAR

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/3: Report by the ICB Institutional Sub-group on SESAR

Debrief by the Commission

Mr Marco De Sciscio (EC) gave a brief report on the status of the SESAR JU regulation. He began by stating that the regulation had not been adopted in December 2006 because there had been a problem with the translation of papers. He envisaged that the regulation would be adopted without any further discussions in Council by the 12th February 2007. This would allow launching the necessary actions for setting up the JU structure.

The Chairman highlighted that the Commission required the Industry to nominate members for the SESAR JU Administrative Board and on the assumption that the JU regulation was approved as there was less than a month to make the decision. While this was not a task for the ICB, the Chairman stated that he was happy to help in this process.

Mr Robinson (AOPA) enquired as to how many seats would be made available per stakeholder group and whether the airspace users would get a number of representatives.

The Chairman stated each stakeholder group would get one seat each. These groups were from the Airports; ANSPs; Airspace Users; Manufacturers; and Professional Staff Associations.

Mr Robinson (AOPA) stated his concern that there was only one airspace user representative. He added that if this representative came from an airline background, that,

while GA shared a number of objectives with the airlines (e.g. safety), he feared that GA representation would be lost.

The Chairman stated that the member of each stakeholder group would need to come together and agree common positions on the SESAR JU Administrative Board. He added that this was not an ICB task and that it was for industrial sectors to jointly nominate by the 12th February 2007.

Mr De Sciscio (EC) informed the ICB that the first meeting of the Administrative Board was expected to be in March 2007.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) informed the ICB, for information only, that an ad-hoc Provisional Council Meeting concerning EUROCONTROL's engagement as a founding member of the SESAR JU would be held on the 8th February 2007.

Mr Magee (ETF) enquired as to whether there was a set time limit of office for each representative.

The Chairman responded that there was nothing written in the regulation on the topic of terms of office. He stated that there was, however, nothing stopping each stakeholder group from making such an agreement. This could go further and deal with working methods and the use of a veto. He added that a system needed to be applied where the greater interest overrules the minority point of view; otherwise the whole process is powerless.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) commented that SESAR had produced a governance paper for each individual stakeholder group and that ICB members could take this as an example on how to organise their approach.

The Chairman added that he believed the Industry should discuss and reach an opinion on a nomination for the SESAR JU Managing Director. If this is not possible then an agreement on the required applicant qualifications should be reached.

Mr De Sciscio (EC) clarified that according to the Statutes of the JU it is the Commission that will have to propose 3 candidates for the post of executive director. The Commission will select these candidates through an open call process. This would take place as soon as the Council Regulation establishing the JU was adopted.

Ms Desseaux (CANSO) enquired that if the EC already has outlined the candidate credentials, then why does the ICB need to repeat the exercise.

Mr Johan Orsingher (EADS) commented that it might be useful to have the views of the ICB concerning the weighting of criteria for the correct candidate.

Debrief by the SESAR ExCom Chairman

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) gave a presentation on the progress of SESAR. He stated that the D2 Deliverable had been accepted by EUROCONTROL on the 22nd of December 2006, and the SESAR Consortium was currently well into preparing SESAR Deliverable D3. He stated that SESAR Deliverable D3 would be the most difficult task to deliver as it would define; the

Operational Concept, Operational Principles, Architectural Principles and the supporting technologies. The target concept will also address difficulties identified in SESAR Deliverable D1 including performance requirements. He stated that the target concept will be feasible in terms of technology, regulation, scale, the nature of change and affordability. He added that implementation must be executed in a series of transitional steps but at the same time the target for 2020 and beyond must not be forgotten.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) stated that there should be a stable draft of the Operational Concept within the next three weeks, which will form the basis for developing architecture and technology requirements. The KPIs will be further refined during this process and CBA will be carried out. He continued by saying that a trade-off methodology was being utilised and fed into the final concept to ensure that it is mature and achievable. He emphasised that this was a very demanding process but one that will provide a good concept.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) concluded by providing an overview of the SESAR Deliverable D3 milestones, stating that by the end of February 2007 there would exist a draft operational concept and that by the end of April 2007 this would be refined. He finished by saying that delivery of the final draft of SESAR Deliverable D3 would be at the end of June 2007.

The Chairman highlighted that the ICB terms of reference stated that the SESAR Operational Concept has to be agreed by the ICB. He stated that it had been agreed with SESAR that an early draft would be made available so that the Institutional Sub-group could form an opinion for the ICB.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) replied that a draft would be made available to the ICB but reminded members that SESAR had a contractual obligation to deliver to EUROCONTROL. He went on to add that SESAR would, of course, be happy to receive any sort of input from the ICB. He did warn, however, that the strict timescale meant that it would be impossible to adopt the ICB's position on the Operation Concept.

The Chairman replied that the ICB, according to its terms of reference, will not provide input to the SESAR Consortium, but has to endorse the concept of operations development by SESAR. This means that the ICB will have to deliver an opinion to the Commission on this part of the deliverable.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) pointed out that if the ICB was to totally disagree with the Operational Concept then SESAR would have failed in its obligation to obtain buy-in from the Industry. This would result in a delay to the most significant deliverable within the Definition Phase.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) stated that in terms of stakeholder buy-in, almost all of the different parties have the means to follow development within SESAR. He urged the ICB to ensure members were up to date with SESAR development and that if concerns arise then these should be fed into the process as part of buy-in.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that with respect to the Institutional Sub-group meeting in early 2007, the ICB had an urgent obligation to give the Commission a formal position on SESAR Deliverable D3.

The Chairman stated that in terms of SESAR deliverables, the ICB has agreed only to provide an opinion if requested to do so by the Commission or another ICB member. However, he re-iterated that comment on the Operational Concept is a formal obligation under the ICB terms of reference. He concluded by saying that the ICB would provide the Commission with an endorsement or an official position. If problems arise, then members should utilise existing communication channels to the SESAR Consortium before the problems are discussed in the ICB.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that he agreed with the Chairman but added it was important to know when a draft of the Operational Concept would be available and how the ICB would act.

The Chairman stated that the first draft would be available in three weeks. The draft would be reviewed by the Institutional Sub-group and their opinion discussed at ICB/15 in March 2007.

Mr Chris North (EC) stated that the Commission has an obligation to make a report on SESAR available to the Council by the end of March 2007. In making this presentation it would be helpful for the Commission to be in a position to state that the ICB either: 1) has an agreed position on the Operational Concept or 2) that discussions have begun.

The Chairman asked Mr Dlugi whether the draft Operational Concept will allow the ICB to fulfil the request of Mr North.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) replied that at the release of the draft on the 26th/27th February 2007 a decision would be made regarding the Operational Concept. The intention is that there will be an ExCom sanctioned document available for the ICB to review (i.e. after the planned 22nd February 2007 Institutional Sub-group meeting).

The Chairman stated that there might be a need to call an extra Institutional Sub-group one week after the release of the draft.

Mr North (EC) responded by saying there wasn't a need for an official position but it would be useful to have an agreement on any issues and ensure there are no 'show-stoppers'.

Report by the SESAR Sub-group

The Chairman introduced the Institutional Sub-group's report on SESAR by stating that the major topic for discussion was SESAR Deliverable D2. He added that it arrived at the decision that no formal ICB position on SESAR Deliverable D2 was needed.

Mr Robinson (AOPA) enquired as to whether the concept designated Europe as a continual airspace or in line with the current structure that would adapt its interfaces progressively.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) responded that this was not the task of the SESAR Deliverable D2 and that only a few, non-specific remarks, were made in terms of how the future ATM System may be constructed. He stated that Task 2.2.2 would look at airspace design and added that it didn't make sense to look at the operation of aircraft without looking at the volume of airspace its self. He added that there were a number of different alternatives being

assessed and that the only certainty was that there will be Controlled and Uncontrolled airspace.

Mr Robinson (AOPA) stated that further comments would be provided by GA and naturally GA will have an interest to protect as much airspace as possible.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that there was no doubt that what SESAR concluded would have a serious impact on airspace design. However, the objective of the SESAR Definition Phase is not to define the airspace of the future. He added that EUROCONTROL was carrying out parallel work on these issues and that this process should not be seen as a threat to the GA community. He admitted that depending on the concept that was chosen, there would be trade-offs that would have an impact on airspace design.

The Chairman stated that the Institutional Sub-group report on SESAR recommended that its activity continued in its current form and that the ICB should accept this recommendation. He asked the ICB to note that nominations of candidates to the SESAR JU Administrative Board had been discussed.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that SESAR Deliverable D2 had fulfilled its contractual obligation and that EUROCONTROL had accepted the deliverable. He went on to say that a number of open-ended elements from SESAR Deliverable D1 and SESAR Deliverable D2, which needed to be concluded before the end of SESAR Deliverable D4. This was expected to happen in the next 3 to 6 months before the issue would be closed for a significant period of time. He warned the ICB to be aware of this and that any response needed to be made in good time so that it could be dealt with by SESAR.

The Chairman enquired as to whether this would be taken care of during the Stakeholder Group sessions.

Mr Dlugi (SESAR ExCom) confirmed that it would be and added that GA was represented at the User Advisory Board, where a consolidated view from the user would be gathered and communicated to SESAR. He added that this was the case for all stakeholder groups. With reference to 'open-ended elements' he stated that any communication was not only a 'pull' action, but in fact a 'push-pull' action. He commented that stakeholder groups must ensure that their positions were being heard through the continued consultation that was taking place. He re-iterated Mr Redeborn's point by saying that buy-in was a huge factor in relation to the SESAR concept.

The Chairman moved to close the agenda item – no further comments were received.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/7 - Commission advised that all administrative arrangements for SESAR JU will be initiated immediately following final approval of regulation expected for 12th February 2007.
- D14/8 - Chairman requested that stakeholder groups concerned agree on nominations of the five Industry representatives to Administrative Board of JU and inform the Commission by the above date.

- D14/9 - Institutional Sub-group will discuss possible ICB request to Commission for suitable candidate and/or qualifications for position of Executive Director for SESAR JU.
- D14/10 - Report of Institutional Sub-group was accepted.
- D14/11 - SESAR ExCom will make available draft after 27th February 2007 for discussion at Institutional Sub-group.
- D14/12 - Commission requested first ICB opinion before meeting of TTE Council on 22nd and 23rd March 2007. Institutional Sub-group will deliver a draft opinion to the Commission before that date. Final ICB position will be decided at ICB15.

Action Items

- A14/6 - Nominations of five Industry representatives or Administrative Board of the SESAR JU to be sent to the Commission by 12th February 2007.
- A14/7 - Helios to arrange an Institutional Sub-group meeting to discuss the draft SESAR Operational Concept that will become available on 28th February 2007.
- A14/8 - Provide ICB opinion on the draft SESAR Operational Concept to the Commission before the TTE Council meeting 22nd and 23rd March 2007.

Agenda Item 5 – Safety

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/5: Safety Discussion Paper

The Chairman began by saying that in light of the ICB's desire to have safety on the agenda; a Commission paper intended for the HLG had been adapted and distributed to initiate discussion.

Ms Desseaux (CANSO) stated that CANSO believed that safety should be incorporated as a standard input to the HLG and that it should be dealt with by the Institutional Sub-group, starting at the meeting on the 25th January 2007.

The Chairman stated there was a need for the ICB to address the issue of safety and to provide some opinions and recommendations. He commented that there was no need to agree a consensus on the paper at this meeting, instead there needed to be an agreement on how to facilitate the discussion on the subject.

Mr Stuart Condie (ACI Europe) commented that there was too much detail to be discussed in a full ICB and that the subject should be dealt with in the Institutional Sub-group.

The Chairman stated there existed a great amount of time pressure within the sub-groups concerning the production of papers in response to SESAR and the HLG. He went on to enquire as to whether an additional ad-hoc sub-group would be necessary.

The Vice-chairman stated that this issue required a different approach and could not just be a set of questions, as this would not provide the required input to the HLG.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) commented that the document provided a number of questions (e.g. EASA); these would need to be prioritised at the sub-group on the 22nd February 2007. This would provide input for the next HLG and would go one step further to providing a position and finalising the correct response.

The Chairman stated that there would be a fresh attempt to discuss the subject at the Institutional Sub-group on 25th January 2007.

Mr Magee (ETF) stated he was not convinced that the ICB needed a position on safety. He added that the Social Dialogue Committee for Aviation had been undertaking work on Just Culture etc. He asked what value could the ICB add by having a position on safety. He finished by asking how any sub-group opinions would be co-ordinated with any conflicting opinions from other sectors of the Industry.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated if there was a need to discuss this issue through a sub-group then he would be pleased to recommend a member of the EUROCONTROL safety staff to assist with it. He stated that at the present time the Industry was influencing ICAO and that it was driving change. He concluded that there was a mechanism in place to achieve this that might not be clear to all the members of the ICB.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that the HLG will make proposals regarding safety and as such there was a need for an ICB position when these documents were released.

Mr Condie (ACI Europe) stated that safety was a huge topic and enquired as to whether the ICB was only dealing with institutional arrangements – *this was confirmed within the group*.

Mr O’Connell (IATA) replied that he fully supported the discussion on safety through a very narrow focus and that he hoped that the Professional Staff Associations’ points could be raised at the Institutional Sub-group. He added that in terms of the last Institutional Sub-group there was excellent attendance and that any output would be good advice to the Industry’s HLG members. He suggested that there only needed to be one or two meetings on the subject of safety.

The Chairman concluded the agenda item by stating that safety would be placed on the agenda at the next Institutional Sub-group meeting on the 25th January 2007 and be dealt with in reference to the discussion that had just taken place. No further comments were received.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/13 -Institutional Sub-group will discuss and agree on ICB input on safety regulation to the high level group.

Action Items

- A14/9 – At the meeting on 25th January 2007, the Institutional Sub-group shall discuss ICB input to the HLG concerning safety regulation issues.

Agenda Item 6 – Status of Existing Mandates

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/6: Status of Existing Mandates, Report by EUROCONTROL

The Chairman introduced the input paper from Eurocontrol and opened the floor to the ICB members.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that there had been some delay to the Aeronautical Data Integrity. He commented on Voice Channel Spacing by saying that some Member States had approached EUROCONTROL for a second opinion based on the equipage of their military fleets. This may require revisiting the issue of State aircraft exemptions.

Mr O'Connell (IATA) enquired as to the status of the Airspace Design Mandate.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) responded that this mandate was still under discussion at EUROCONTROL and the Commission and that the organisations were attempting to find legally correct terminology which would meet ICAO criteria. He concluded that this had been successfully achieved in the past and that the ICB could expect a solution in the near future.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) stated that, concerning ATFM, he understood this mandate had been delayed by two to three months but that the table showed that these consultations would occur 16th February 2007. He asked if this was still the case. He went on to enquire whether there was already a formal document that was ready to go to the Commission concerning the ATFM Single AIP.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that with respect to ATFM, the notion of dates was simply the period within which stakeholders could respond and that there was no intention to call a meeting on the 16th February 2007. He added that it was planned to hold a consultation workshop on the first round of development for this IR. In response to Mr Verburgt's second point, he stated that in terms of AIP there might be a slight delay, the main issue on the Single AIP report is that it relates to the extension of the SES to the lower airspace. He added that users seemed unexcited about another AIP, in addition to the existing 40 in Europe, and instead preferred the notion of a single depositor for the entire group. He went on to say that this did not add a vast amount of value and this was, in turn, causing people to change their approach. He concluded that this would only lead to a delay of a few weeks.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) stated that it would be useful to provide a CS concerning CCAMS and that the proposal to search for a common transition altitude of around 18, 000 feet had been under discussion for a number of years now. He added that EUROCONTROL believed the transition level would actually need to be above 10,000 feet. However, many groups disagree on the need for a common transition altitude and there was not a consensus between operators and regulators at this time. Instead, interested parties were identifying intricate transport processes that could be applied through all flight levels. He warned that if an initiative was accepted at this point in time it might not be possible to reach a successful conclusion which Member States would accept.

Mr North (EC) stated that the reason for raising the issue today was in relation to a recent request from EUROCONTROL, enquiring whether or not legislative action (in terms of a mandate) was required on this issue. He continued that it was hoped to receive feedback from the ICB as to whether this course of action was worthwhile. He concluded that a possible solution would be to discuss the issue at the next meeting.

The Chairman asked Mr Verburgt (in his role as Chair of the Interoperability Sub-group) whether it would be possible to address this issue at the next sub-group meeting.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) responded by stating that if suitable material was received from EUROCONTROL then the Chairman's request would be possible.

No further comments were received and the agenda item was closed.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/14 - On the request by the Commission, the Interoperability Sub-group will discuss ICB opinion on the need for further mandates on the above subjects.

Action Items

- A14/10 - Helios to contact EUROCONTROL and EC to provide detailed information on the matters of SSR Codes (CCAMS), Altimeter Setting (QNH) and Transition Altitude.
- A14/11 - Interoperability Sub-group shall discuss ICB opinion on the matters of SSR Codes (CCAMS), Altimeter Setting (QNH) and Transition Altitude.

Agenda Item 7 – Activities of the Single Sky Committee

Mr North (EC) began by apologising on behalf of **Mr Andreas Boschen (SSC Committee)** who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr North also informed the ICB that Mr Boschen would be leaving his post with the SES Unit at the end of the month. As such Mr North confirmed that he would be taking over in Mr Boschen's role and would continue to keep the ICB informed on the activities of the SSC.

Mr North (EC) continued by reporting that two main points were approved at the last SSC meeting in addition to the standing agenda items. These were: 1) the specification and regulation relating to the Flight Message Transfer Protocol and 2) the discussion of the Safety Oversight Function relating to the transposition of ESARR 1 and the necessary support required by Member States. He added that a number of States had requested clarification regarding the six month extension period in relation to exceptional circumstances. He stated that all certification was required to be complete by the end of 2007. He also stated that the transposition of ESARR 6 had been discussed and that further work would be carried out by the Commission for presentation to the SSC.

Mr O'Connell (IATA) stated that he had read in previous minutes that it was acceptable for the ICB Chairman to attend the SSC. He enquired as to whether this was actually the case.

The Chairman responded by reminding the ICB that that he would be giving a presentation to the SSC on the topic of the ICB Work programme at the meeting on the 9th February 2007. He added that this would require a small delegation from the ICB to attend the SSC.

The Chairman moved to select the ICB delegation to attend the SSC on the 9th February 2007. The following members were selected to attend along with the Chairman and Vice-chairman: Mr Gerry O'Connell (Airspace Users); and Ms Marie Desseaux (ATSPs). The Manufacturers, Airports and Professional Staff Association undertook to advise Helios of their decisions before the SSC meeting.

Mr O’Connell (IATA) enquired as to whether the SSC work programme could be made available to the members of the ICB.

Mr North (EC) confirmed that this was possible and it could be provided in due course as the SSC Work Programme for 2007 was still under development.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/15 - The Commission’s report was received.
- D14/16 - ICB work programme will be presented to SSC in its meeting on 9th February 2007.
- D14/17 - ICB delegation will comprise representatives from the airspace users, Professional Staff Associations, ANSP’s, manufacturing Industry and airports plus Chairman and Vice-chairman.
- D14/18 - Commission will provide copy of SES work programme before meeting.

Action Items

- A14/12 - Helios to collect nominations to ICB delegation and make all arrangements concerning the SSC meeting on the 9th February 2007.
- A14/13 - Helios to draft presentation to SSC on major ICB tasks in 2006 and on the 2007 Work Programme.
- A14/14 - Helios to obtain SES work programme from the Commission.

Agenda Item 8 – Emissions Trading Scheme

The Chairman began by stating that the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) had been discussed at the last meeting. He then summarised the letter sent to Mr Daniel Calleja (Director Air Transport, Directorate General for Energy and Transport) concerning the ETS and stated that a response had been received. He concluded that any other action would need to be part of an ICB mandate.

Mr O’Connell (IATA) stated that from IATA’s point of view the ICB did not need to discuss the issue further at this stage.

Mr Simon McNamara (ERAA) added that the Commission had released a directive and that this would be dealt with elsewhere. He concluded that there was a need to maintain an open dialogue moving forward but that there was no need to continue the discussion at the ICB at this time.

The Chairman agreed that the issue would be put on hold and concluded the agenda item.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/19 - Agreed that no further action is required at the moment and that any ICB activity must be within the ICB mandate.

Agenda Item 9 – Current R&D Activities

Input Paper:

- ICB/14/7: Review of Existing ATM R&D

The Chairman confirmed that the paper had been distributed and welcomed any comments or questions from the ICB to be directed towards Helios.

Mr O’Connell (IATA) stated that he was in agreement with Mr Redeborn [comments from ICB/13] that the paper would have great value moving forward and beyond SESAR Deliverable D3.

Mr Paul Ravenhill (Helios/ICB Support) stated that there would be a meeting with the leaders of SESAR Work Package 3.1 (Integration of ATM Initiatives and Programmes) where the results of this research paper would be fed back into SESAR.

No further questions or comments were received from the ICB members and the agenda item was closed.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/20 - Report by Helios on major conclusions was received.
- D14/21 - The detailed work will be passed to WP3.1 of the SESAR definition phase.

Agenda Item 10 – Chairmanship of ICB Sub-groups

The Chairman requested the ICB to approve the following members as chairs of the ICB sub-groups:

- Interoperability Sub-group: Andries Verburgt (CANSO)
- Airspace and Service Provision Sub-group: Guenter Martis (IATA)

Mr Feitl will continue to serve as Chairman of the Institutional Sub-group (previously the SESAR Sub-group).

The above nominations were ratified and accepted unanimously by the members of the ICB. The agenda item was then closed.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/22 - Interoperability Sub-group: Andries Verburgt unanimously elected.
- D14/23 - Airspace and Service Provision Sub-group: Guenter Martis unanimously elected.

Agenda Item 11 – Any Other Business

The Chairman asked if there was a need to advance ICB/15 from the 27th March 2007 to the 20th March 2007, for better alignment with the High Level Group and Transport Council Meetings.

It was decided to keep the dates of the meetings the same as those that had been agreed at ICB/13. It was agreed that the Institutional Sub-group on 22nd March would deal with any issues arising and communicate any emergency information to the ICB.

The Chairman set the provisional date for ICB/16 as Wednesday 30th May 2007 at 10:00 hrs in Brussels.

Mr O'Connell (IATA) stated that he could not remember a discussion on the MET CSs and enquired if this paper had been accepted.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) responded by saying that there had been a long discussion within the Interoperability Sub-group on this topic. He added that some recommendations had been made and that further work was necessary.

Mr Redeborn (EUROCONTROL) informed the ICB that the MET issue would be picked up in due course. He added that there would be related savings but that there was a lot of resistance in the institutional structure.

Mr O'Connell (IATA) added within the next year there may be a need to look at the certification of MET. He finished by stating that he hoped the ICB would be able to afford this issue the attention that it required.

Mr Verburgt (CANSO) assured Mr O'Connell that all subjects were being discussed with due diligence.

No further comment or reaction was received and the Chairman closed the 14th Meeting of the ICB by thanking all the members present for their contribution to a constructive meeting.

Summary of Decisions

- D14/24 - Institutional Sub-group: 25th January 2007 at 14:00 hrs in Brussels at ACI. Helios will distribute agenda and invitations.
- D14/25 - Institutional Sub-group: 22nd February 2007 in Brussels. Time and venue to be advised.
- D14/26 - Institutional Sub-group to discuss SESAR Operational Concept: date and venue to be advised.
- D14/27 - Institutional Sub-group: 22nd March 2007 in Brussels. Time and venue to be advised.
- D14/28 – ICB/15: 27th March 2007 at 10:00 hrs in Brussels. Venue to be advised.
- D14/29 – ICB/16: 30th May 2007 at 10:00 hrs in Brussels.

Action Items

- A14/15 - Helios will distribute all meeting documentation to members.
- A14/16 - Helios to arrange ICB/15 on 27th March 2007 in Brussels (start time 10:00am).
- A14/17 - Helios to arrange ICB/16 on 30th May 2007 in Brussels (start time 10:00 hrs).

Summary of Action Items

Action	Details	Responsibility	Status
A14/1	Incorporate changes to ICB/13 minutes and distribute final version.	Helios	Closed
A14/2	At meeting 25 th January 2007 Institutional sub-group shall discuss and agree on input to the HLG.	Sub-group	Closed
A14/3	Professional Staff Associations to provide nominations for a controller and pilot to speak at HLG hearings.	Professional Staff Associations	Open
A14/4	Report of Institutional sub-group: make changes agreed at ICB/14 and distribute final version of report.	Helios	Closed
A14/5	Draft formal letter to the Commission outlining a prioritised list of CSs proposed by the Interoperability Sub-group.	Helios	Closed
A14/6	Nominations of 5 Industry representatives or Administrative Board of the SESAR JU to be sent to the Commission by 12 th February 2007.	ICB Members	Open
A14/7	Helios to arrange an Institutional Sub-group meeting to discuss the draft SESAR Operational Concept that will become available on 28 th February 2007.	Helios	Closed
A14/8	Provide ICB opinion on the draft SESAR Operational Concept to the Commission before the TTE Council meeting 22nd – 23rd March 2007.	Helios	Open
A14/9	At meeting 25 th January 2007 Institutional Sub-group shall discuss ICB input to the HLG concerning safety regulation issues.	Sub-group	Closed
A14/10	Helios to contact EUROCONTROL and EC to provide detailed information on the matters of SSR Codes (CCAMS), Altimeter Setting (QNH) and Transition Altitude.	Helios	Closed
A14/11	Interoperability Sub-group shall discuss ICB opinion on the matters of SSR Codes (CCAMS), Altimeter Setting (QNH) and Transition Altitude	Sub-group	Open
A14/12	Helios to collect nominations to ICB delegation and make all arrangements concerning the SSC meeting on the 9 th February 2007.	Helios	Closed
A14/13	Helios to draft presentation to SSC on major ICB tasks in 2006 and on the 2007 Work Programme.	Helios	Closed
A14/14	Helios to obtain SES work programme from the Commission.	Helios	Closed
A14/15	Helios will distribute all meeting documentation to members.	Helios	Closed
A14/16	Helios to arrange ICB/15 on 27 th March 2007 in Brussels (start time 10:00am).	Helios	Closed
A14/17	Helios to arrange ICB/16 on 30 th May 2007 in Brussels (start time 10:00am).	Helios	Open

ICB Members, Observers, and Commission present at the meeting

All those listed below participated in the meeting.

Members

Chairman, Vice Chairman

Mr Fritz Feitl	Chairman
Mr Eric Kroese	Vice-chairman

ATSPs (nominal representation 4)

The ATSPs are represented by CANSO.

Ms Marie Desseaux	CANSO
Mr Andries Verburgt	CANSO
Mr Benard Martens	CANSO

Manufacturing Industry (nominal representation 4)

The manufacturing Industry is represented by ASD.

Mr Luigi Iodice	Selex SI/ASD
Mr Johan Orsingher	EADS/ASD
Mr Jean-Pierre Barthelemy	ASD
Mr Markus Durstewitz	Airbus/ASD
Mr Bertrand De L'Epinois	EADS/ASD

Professional Staff Associations (nominal representation 5)

The Professional Staff Associations are represented by the Joint ATM Working Group (4 members) and ECA/IFALPA (1 member).

Mr Joe Magee	ETF
--------------	-----

Airports (nominal representation 2)

The Airports are represented by ACI Europe.

Mr Stuart Condie	ACI Europe
Mr Knut Walther	ACI Europe

Airspace Users (nominal representation 8)

Airspace Users are represented by IATA, AEA (2 members), IACA, ERAA, ELFAA, EBAA and IAOPA.

Mr Gerry O'Connell	IATA
Mr Jeff Poole	IATA
Mr Simon McNamara	ERAA
Mr Martin Robinson	AOPA
Mr Guy Battistella	IACA
Mr Pedro Vicente Azua	EBAA
Mr John Hanlon	ELFAA
Ms Sylviane Lust	IACA
Mr Rudolf Schuegraf	Europe Air Sports

CNS Service Providers (nominal representation 1)

CNS Service Providers are presented by SITA and ARINC who alternate attendance.

This Stakeholder Group was not represented at the meeting

Meteorological Service Providers (nominal representation 1)

The Meteorological Service Providers are represented by the Aviation Meteorology Group.

Mr Dennis Hart	Avimet
----------------	--------

Observers

EUROCONTROL (nominal representation 1)

Mr Bo Redeborn EUROCONTROL

Non-European Interests (nominal representation 2)

Non-European Interests are represented by the FAA and AIA.

Ms Carey Fagan FAA

Mr Kurt Edwards FAA

Military (nominal representation 1)

Military interests are represented by CMIC.

Mr Rob Peters Military CMIC

Research Establishments (nominal representation 1)

The interests of research establishments are represented by EATRADA.

Mr Marcos Fernandez EATRADA

Standardisation Bodies (nominal representation 2)

The interests of Standardisation Bodies are represented by ATMSCG.

Mr David Bowen ATMSCG/Eurocae

SESAR Coordination (nominal representation 1)

Mr Olaf Dlugi SESAR ExCom

Commission

Mr Sven Halle	European Commission
Mr Chris North	European Commission
Mr Eduardo Morere Molinero	European Commission
Mr Marco De Sciscio	European Commission
Mr Jyrki Paajanen	European Commission (part time)
Mr Koen De Vos	European Commission (part time)
Mr Paul Ravenhill	ICB Support
Dr Mike Fairbanks	ICB Support
Mr Kevin Tucker	ICB Support
Dr Peter Choroba	ICB Support
Mr Alex Catlin	ICB Support