

Minutes of the Eleventh meeting of the Expert Group

on the Social Dimension of SES

Conference Centre Albert Borschette – Wednesday 05th February 2014

Participants (full details at Annex):

- MOVE E2 Chair/Sec

- CANSO
- ATCEUC
- ETF
- IFATCA
- IFATSEA
- IFAIMA

Apologies

- ECA

1. Welcome

The chair welcomes all and thanks the members of the group for attending.

The agenda was accepted as proffered with no amendments. No AOB topics were requested by the members.

The Chairman gave a brief overview of progress on key dossiers - SES 2+, Centralised Services, the Pilot Common Project, Target Setting for RP2 and the SJU Extension, updating attendees on the current timeline for each file and highlighting decision points and potential problems in the process(es). A number of minor questions were posed to gain more clarity and the Chairman offered to provide further updates at future meetings.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting (from Wednesday 20th November 2013) were accepted as presented, with a single input from members.

3. Amendment to Network Management IR

The Chairman reminded attendees of the requirement under Article 25 of the Network Management Implementing Rule (677/2011 - hereafter 'the NM IR') to review the progress and effectiveness of the execution of the network functions by 31st December 2013. They noted that the Commission had presented papers to the Single Sky Committee indicating their intention to use the opportunity that this requirement presented to update the NM IR to reflect perceived weaknesses in the original text, and to adapt the text to reflect lessons learned in the first 30 months of NM operations. There were, he opined, some areas that required more immediate attention, such as the EASA observation (as a result of the audit process) that the NM was at risk of triple governance structures which resulted in difficulties achieving Board agreement of the budget for example, and other areas, such as alignment with SES 2+ and Centralised Services requirements, that could be delayed until more of their likely effect was better understood.

It was for this reason that the Commission had elected to opt for a 2-phase amendment process; the first phase would look for relatively benign amendments to the NM IR which could realistically achieve agreement at Single Sky Committee in the near-term (April), and a second wave of amendments that would need greater consideration and further information and could be discussed towards the end of 2015. The Group was asked to consider its possible input to this process, and potentially offer a joint position on areas that they felt needed to be addressed both in the short term, and in the longer term.

Members noted that a number of the areas suggested for improvement/amendment did not strike them as having a sense of urgency that required immediate attention, and could therefore be deferred until a potential 2nd review in 2015. They did, however, agree that the issue of triple governance, and particularly the budget approval process, required a solution to be identified as soon as possible. They also questioned the matter of NM support in safety related matters, wondering if there was an increased risk of duplication with the efforts and work of EASA. The Chairman felt that there was some room for Eurocontrol resource/expertise to offer support to ANSPs in preparation of their Safety Management Systems, but that the exact scope and limitations on such work needed to be better understood and may not in fact be required in legislation.

One Member offered to coordinate efforts to produce an Expert Group position paper on the issue of an amendment to the NM IR; they called for inputs to them by Tuesday February 18th which would allow them time to tie them together to produce a draft for dissemination before the 25th. The Commission would look to pass on any agreed position by the end of February.

4. SESAR Pilot Common Project

The Commission gave an update on the process of consultation of the PCP, reminding attendees that the consultation would formally close on February 14th, but that comments would be accepted up to the end of Feb. The Commission also reminded members that the consultation in this case was limited to the content of the technical annex, the legal covering text (i.e. the IR) would be negotiated with the Member States through the comitology process; however, the issues that were of interest to the members were contained within the annex, and it is therefore important that all affected stakeholders contribute at this time. One representative made a number of observations, he felt that the operational impact of the changes has not properly been addressed, and certainly was not reflected in what could be seen of the CBA; he also observed that there was no way to see whether or not the additional training requirements had been considered, and how that effort would affect the business case for change. He also opined that the safety implications of the numerous and varied changes had not been exposed within the consultation material; he asked whether or not a safety impact assessment had been carried out, and, if so, would that material be made available.

One Member focused on the interdependencies between the 6 AFs, noting that the Commission's proposal had put some distance between 'binding' and 'non-binding' requirements. He observed that many of the binding orientations had dependent links with the content of the 'non-binding' ones – how would this work if there was no compulsion to deliver the non-binding elements?

The group commented on the potential weakness of the CBA, sensitivity analysis around the various deployment scenarios has not been undertaken, the CBA is based on a full deployment of all AFs. One representative observed that, for AF3, FUA and FRA were two entirely different things but were put together under the same requirement; FUA applied everywhere but the FRA concept was to be applied above FL310 only; he went on to note that FRA requirements – such as MTCD – were not all necessarily well linked.

The Commission again asked if the group was minded to contribute to the consultation paper collectively through the submission of a joint paper. One representative offered to distribute the slides generated previously describing the organisations position with respect to the PCP with the idea that this could form the basis of a position for the group. Members accepted this proposal and committed to seriously considering whether or not they could offer their own organisations view on the PCP in order to produce an Expert Group position paper.

The Commission confirmed that it would accept and transmit this paper (and the one on the NM IR) only if common agreement was achieved.

5. AOB

There was no further business.

6. Date of Next Meeting

Following discussion on the best point of influence, the Chairman/Secretary proposed association of the group to the Single Sky Committee calendar for 2014; those meetings were briefed as:

SSC 53 – 02/03 April 2014

SSC 54 – 01/02 July 2014

SSC 55 – 12/13 November 2014

We would therefore propose programming the Expert Group to meet approximately 4 to 6 weeks in advance of the SSC, meaning that although the specific papers would not be available for the upcoming SSC, the agenda would be known and the discussion flow from the previous SSC would be captured. The Chairman therefore proposes that the Expert Group aims to meet next on Wednesday May 14th in the afternoon.