



Interim Deployment Steering Group

*Fourth Meeting
13 November 2013*



Welcome

- *All IDSG's documents are available at:*
 - http://ec.europa.eu/transport/air/sesar/deployment_en.htm
 - <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=2744>
- *Working documents are available through OST*



Agenda

1. Welcome

- **Recent developments and way forward**
- **TEN-T EA call 2012**

2. Finalising the Interim Deployment Programme

- **Opinion of the Commission**
- **Review of the update**

3. Executing the Interim Deployment Programme

- **Examples of monitoring results and recommendations**

4. Work programme update

5. Conclusions



Context

- *Limassol's conclusions on SESAR deployment*
- *Commission's draft Implementing Regulation on SESAR deployment*
- *Pilot Common Project's definition*
- *Growing importance of IDSG's work*
- *Next TEN-EA multiannual call*



Finalizing the IDP

From IDP V1.0 (IDSG/3) to V2.0 (IDSG/2)

- *Inputs to be considered:*
 - **Commission's and Single Sky Committee's opinion**
 - **Additional work by the Experts Team since IDSG/3**
- *All this results today in IDP V2.0 where:*
 - **The main body is an evolution of IDP V1.0 which brings further clarification at activities and WPs levels**
 - **Annex 1 provides details down to the tasks level, including geographical applicability and target completion dates**
 - **Annex 2 provides a "Gantt chart" view (today limited to ANSPs contribution)**



IDP V1.0 – Commission's opinion

- *"Need to optimise stakeholders' and States' reporting efforts as IDSG's monitoring exercises could to some extent overlap with LSSIP reporting exercise"*
- **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Need for clarification is acknowledged**
 - ✓ **Additional ET/9 (12 December) to look at IDP monitoring**
 - ✓ **More under agenda's item 3**



IDP V1.0 – Commission's opinion

- *"IDP is a major achievement which needs to be broadly disseminated when finalised to raise stakeholder's awareness on SESAR deployment. The structure should be improved to facilitate non IDSG member's buy-in."*
- **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Take any opportunity to raise ATM's community awareness (e.g. AAB)**
 - ✓ **Structure of the IDP is driven by WBS which should not be changed (agreed by IDSG/3)**
 - ✓ **Editorial effort**
 - ✓ **Assess result in the updated IDP V2.0**



IDP V1.0 – Commission's opinion

- *"Geographical applicability should be defined for each of the tasks in the WBS;"*
 - **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Done**
 - ✓ **Assess proposal in the updated IDP V2.0, in particular new Annexes 1 and 2**



IDP V1.0 – Commission's opinion

- *"A target completion date should be defined for each of the tasks in the WBS;"*
- **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Done**
 - ✓ **Target completion dates as currently proposed should be understood as dates reported bottom up by the stakeholders**
 - ✓ **When there are relevant regulatory target dates or requirements derived from Network performance needs, top-down target dates may need to be agreed**
 - ✓ **Assess proposal in the updated IDP V2.0, in particular new annexes 1 and 2**



IDP – Commission's opinion

- *"Military involvement should be better explained for tasks where the need for military resources is identified;"*
 - **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Need to better highlight military dependencies, i.e. tasks by the military stakeholders critical to the achievements of the selected priorities**
 - ✓ **The MIL requirements will also become more clear as the IDP evolves (WPO of each activity area)**
 - ✓ **Assess proposal in the updated IDP V2.0**



IDP – Commission's opinion

- *"The IDP is understood as being derived mostly from the ATM Master plan's level 3 (ESSIP plan). Both of them being living documents, their interrelation in time should be better explained, in particular a potential loop back from IDP to ESSIP should be mentioned, if any;"*
- **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Feedback from IDP to ESSIP should be performed through recommendations**
 - ✓ **See example of recommendations which address ESSIP at agenda's item 3**
 - ✓ **Process is in place for ESSIP content to be updated based on such recommendations**



IDP – Commission's opinion

- *"The IDP includes several objectives that will be implemented stepwise, i.e. through baseline, then step 1, such as:*
 - **free routing (WP 2.3),**
 - **PBN/RNAV (WP 6.3),**
 - **STAM phase 1(WP 1.2) and**
 - **Airport CDM (WP3.1.2 and 3.2).**
- *In the context of the IDP, only the baseline part of those objectives is addressed. Therefore, they should be clearly designated and detailed not to risk any confusion with their continuation as part of step 1."*
- **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Agreed, clarified through better description of the activity areas and the related work packages**
 - ✓ **Assess result in the updated IDP V2.0, in particular new annex 1**



IDP – Commission's opinion

- *"There is a need to better describe the scope/tasks of WP 2.2 "CDR optimisation" to avoid misalignment with Network Strategy Plan".*
 - **ET/8 answer:**
 - ✓ **Agreed, clarified through better description of the WP 2.2**
 - ✓ **Assess proposal in the updated IDP V2.0**



IDP – Commission's opinion

- *Other expectation for future reports:*
 - **In addition to report on the status of the tasks identified in the IDP, explore the possibility to also report on the potential consequences when a task is flagged as "late" or "not implemented".**
- **ET's provisional answer:**
 - ✓ Noted
 - ✓ Will be considered when developing the first monitoring report to IDSG/5



IDP V2.0 - Status

- *Main improvements since IDP V1.0*
 - **Better definition of the activity areas and their related WPs and tasks, providing for:**
 - ✓ Better readability of the IDP
 - ✓ Easier identification of the military dependencies
 - ✓ Better separation between IDP and PCP
 - **Geographical applicability and target dates**
- *Remaining issue:*
 - **Harmonise the level of detail of the information reported by the stakeholders**



IDP V2.0 – Way forward

- *Discussion and comments*
- *Conclusions*
 - **Agreement to re-submit to the Commission?**
 - **Provisional adoption as IDSG's working reference?**
 - **IDP V2.1 = IDP V2.0 + comments by IDSG/4**



Executing the IDP – monitoring *Potential issue*

- *At least 3 references against which IDSG could monitor*
 - **ESSIP target dates (ATM MP level 3)**
 - **Ois IOC dates (ATM MP level 2)**
 - **Target dates as provided by stakeholders**
- *IDP is a project view from which a project oriented reporting could be more easily derived*
- *However, it is anticipated that EC and SSC would prefer/better understand a planning oriented reporting*



Executing the IDP – monitoring *Potential mitigation**

- *LSSIP is the (independent/planning oriented) tool for assessing **overall** implementation status*
 - **Reference: planning documents (ESSIP + NSP)**
 - **Potential to become the monitoring/reporting tool for the future Level 1**
- *A tool** needed for (dependent/project oriented) assessing **critical** deployment status*
 - **Initial reference: planning documents (ESSIP + NSP)**
 - **Future reference: IDP v2.0**
 - **Similar tool will also be needed at future Level 2**

* **Current thinking; ET/9 planned on 12 December to analyse**

** **Selection not yet performed**



Executing the IDP – Examples

W.P 1.1: AFP implementation

Initial reference

ESSIP loopback

Baseline for future reporting

Stakeholder	ANSPs, NM
Applicability area	ECAC
Comments / Status assessment	<p>Current status is assessed as "red" against planning reference (ESSIP : FCM-03, FOC = 12/2012)</p> <p>IDSG ET recommends that ESSIP Target date is re-assessed considering current States' planning and the actual impact of this deployment on performance targets.</p>
Deployment Timing:	
Task 6 to 17	<p>AFP message deployed by ANSP and fully tested by NM 2012: Albania, Austria, Greece, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, Spain (some integration testing ongoing), Switzerland, the Netherlands (missing task 10)</p> <p>AFP message deployed by ANSP and under testing by NM status 2012: Denmark, Germany (estimated completion Q1 2013)", Ukraine, Maastricht UAC (estimated completion Q1 2013)", Sweden</p> <p>AFP message deployed by ANSP, but not fully tested and integrated by NM: Turkey, Bulgaria "(testing planned for 2013)", Serbia, Ireland, Czech Republic, Romania. "(testing planned for 2013)"</p>
	<p>2013: Hungary, France, Italy, Finland (15th Nov 2012 Finavia will take in operational use a new software version which has the full AFP functionality according to FCM-003. However, the schedule to activate this functionality is still open), Estonia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Romania, Latvia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Ireland.</p>
	<p>2014: Moldova, Norway, Poland, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Cyprus, Malta (only task 10), the Netherlands(only task 10),.</p>
	<p>2015: The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Slovak republic, Slovenia. Luxembourg. . Armenia. UK</p>



Executing the IDP – Examples

W.P 1.2: STAM

phase I

ESSIP
loopback

Initial
reference

Additional
recommendation

Baseline
for future
reporting

Stakeholder	ANSPs, NM. AUs
Applicability area	Selected set of FMPs, mainly those in Europe's "core area". Then as a priority deployment should focus to other performance (mainly capacity) constraining areas.
Comments / Status assessment	<p>This deployment is referenced in MP level but there is not yet an ESSIP objective and therefore a planning reference at MP level three (ESSIP). A need for a future ESSIP objective is identified.</p> <p>However, an initial status assessment can be made against the Network Strategy Plan that foresees initial implementation of STAM in some critical areas by end of 2014. Therefore, the Status is assessed as "green" against the NSP.</p> <p>The deployment will need to be continued beyond 2015, therefore IDSG ET recommends an assessment for inclusion in the PCP for deployments beyond 2015.</p>
Deployment Timing:	
Tasks 20, 21, 23, 25, 27 to 31	<p>Planned for 2014: Bordeaux FMP, Marseille FMP, Brest FMP, Karlsruhe FMP, Roma FMP, Geneva and Zurich FMP.</p> <p>The phasing of AU participation in STAM deployment is to be progressively developed. As from 2015 onwards deployment will address remaining "core area" ANSPs and other performance constraining areas (e.g Spain, Greece, Cyprus, Poland etc).</p>
Task 22 Capacity balancing tool via CHMI	Completed
Task 24 Dynamic Demand and Capacity balancing tools via NOP	December 2013



IDSG's work programme

- *Report to Commission and SSC 48*
 - **Agreement to re-submit IDP V2.1 ?**
 - **Cover WP to explain improvements and clarify the reporting issue**
- *Next steps*
 - **Switch to steering and monitoring**
 - **Initialisation by IDSG/ET/9 on 12 December 2012**
 - **Need to agree on the most efficient frequency to refresh recommendations and monitoring reports**



IDSG's work programme

- *Agreed SSC meeting dates in 2013*

***7-8 March**

***11-12 June**

***22-23 October**

***17-18 December**

- *Proposed IDSG dates, in synchronisation with SSC meetings:*

***7 February**

***14 May**

***25 September**

***14 November**



Conclusions