

EGHD/14 Meeting minutes (Draft A)

Date/time: 31 January 2017 10:00 – 16:30

Location: Salle Lamoureux, DM28, DG MOVE Brussels

1 Welcome

Item		Who
1	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Agenda • Minutes of previous meeting 	Chair EGHD Support
2	Review of EGHD Actions	EGHD Support
3	Work Programme 2017	EGHD Support
4	Paper review process	Chair
5	Remote Towers Position Paper <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position Paper review • Recommendations development 	All
6	Performance	All
7	Wrap up	All
8	Any Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EGHD Annual Report • EGHD Portal 	EGHD Support

Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) welcomed members and introduced the proposed agenda and it was approved as per the above schedule.

One comment on the Draft Minutes of EGHD/13 was received by ETF. The draft minutes were approved as a true reflection of the meeting. IFAIMA provided a single amendment to the Draft Remote Towers Teleconference Summary 8 November and no comments were received on the Draft Teleconference Summary 28 November. The summaries were also approved as accurate representations of the discussions.

2 Review of EGHD actions

EGHD Support explained, bar two, all other actions from EGHD/13 and the two subsequent teleconferences have been closed. EGHD/13/02, for the Commission to draft and distribute the EGHD Rules of Procedure was due for submission at this meeting, however, the internal procedure to

produce a Commission Decision has changed. The format of the Rules of Procedure requires adjustment and will be further reviewed and formally adopted once the EC Decision is approved. Therefore, the deadline for this action has been extended until the next meeting.

The deadline for EGHD/Nov16/08, for EGHD Support to distribute the updated Remote Towers Position Paper including recommendations (Draft B) prior to this meeting has been extended until before the next teleconference. This is discussed under agenda item 5.

All actions generated from this meeting and other outstanding actions are detailed at the bottom of this document.

3 Work Programme 2017

Chloe Kirkpatrick (EGHD Support) explained; the EGHD Work Programme for 2017 was developed from extensive discussion last year and was included in the pre-meeting distribution for this meeting for final comment before approval.

Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) requested that Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS), listed as a candidate for future Work Programmes, should be reconsidered as a high-priority topic as the rapidly developing nature of the industry requires attention sooner than was previously thought. Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) suggested the inclusion of RPAS as a sub-topic under the upcoming work item, 'Introduction of Advanced Technology'. Members agreed with this proposal but, with reference to the current work of the ICB on the subject, highlighted the need to avoid overlap with other groups and specify the human dimension.

EGHD Support continued with a finalisation of the timeline for 2017 following previous consideration during 28 November Teleconference. It was decided the final EGHD meeting of this year should be organised towards the end of the year in October. The agreed timeline for this year's meeting is as follows:

- Teleconference, Monday 20 March
- EGHD/15, Tuesday 25 April
- Teleconference, June (exact date TBD)
- EGHD/16, Thursday 19 October
- Teleconference, November-December (exact date TBD)

Action EGHD/14/01 - EGHD Support to update the Work Programme as per the discussions and distribute to Members

4 Paper review process

Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) described the reviews of the recent Position Paper, The Human Dimension in Remote Tower Operations (Draft A). Consolidated comments and tracked changes from all members on the paper were extremely numerous meaning that development of the paper was limited.

Considering this paper to be the first the group will issue; the volume of comments is a positive reflection of the enthusiasm of its members and of the newness of the group. However, the following steps were proposed to assist in the comprehension of members' comments, quality of the paper-review process and to be more efficient.

1. Comments identified by a single organisation name/title
2. Ideally, papers would be reviewed by people part of or aware of previous EGHD discussions
3. Limit number of comments (max ~10 - 15 per organisation)

4. If review reveals that significant discussion is required on a particular subject, hold review process on specific item and notify EGHD Support
5. New areas of interest not considered in previous discussions to be highlighted to EGHD Support

Beatrice Feuerberg (EGHD Support) clarified that these are guidelines to ease the review and are not intended to dismiss open issues. Should more comments on a subject be required, the review should be halted and a discussion held.

It is not the intention for the group to approve a paper without all members' endorsement regardless of previously stated timelines of publication, the Chair clarified. Members agreed to the proposed guidelines and will adopt them in future reviews of Position Papers.

5 Remote Towers Position Paper

5.1 Position Paper review

Beatrice Feuerberg (EGHD Support) introduced this agenda item, where the many comments on the Human Dimension in Remote Tower Operations (Draft A) Position Paper has revealed areas still to be addressed. Five main topics of concern were raised across all organisations' comments and these structured the following discussion. Printed facilitation slides were distributed to members providing detail on each topic and the comments received.

What is the role of the EGHD with regard to already defined regulation and processes?

EGHD Support recalled a debate within the comments as to whether the paper should refer to regulation and processes which have already been defined. Human performance and safety is considered in certain processes and the paper could recognise the concerns already addressed in regulation.

Oliver Wessollek (IFAIMA) queried why human performance was being considered over the human dimension. It was explained that, when considering remote tower operations there are already human performance assessment procedures available which should be considered for inclusion in the paper.

With regards to the question of how the EGHD can influence assessment processes of study conclusions, Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) suggested identifying flaws in current regulation and quality indicators related to human performance which an EGHD Reaction Team could respond to. This Reaction Team should be composed of members already involved in EASA and understand ongoing processes to limit wide discussions, potentially including some professional staff members, CANSO and EGHD Support.

Acknowledging the need for the group to assess only human performance aspects and bind discussion Mike Shorthose (EGHD Support) also saw importance in identifying whether other groups are adequately addressing the issues identified, to which the Chair agreed. Jean-Denis Larrere (EGHD Co-Chair) noted the need to consider the number of meetings the EGHD has, as comparing this group's output to that of SESAR or EASA would be unreasonable.

Guisy Sciacca (IFATCA) recognised that the technical aspect of remote towers operations has been and is currently being considered across several fora and saw a need to focus on the end-user and their reaction, especially in terms of cognitive processes as this may have an impact on the regulation being discussed. Citing experience working in the SESAR remote tower VLD in Milan, the work of controller is significantly different and this will have a cognitive effect and potentially impact safety. It should not be the users' responsibility to determine how much training is required.

EGHD Support clarified; the group does not have the capacity to undertake a human performance assessment but can evaluate them and recommend actions where appropriate. Melanie Morel (EGHD Support) explained; reference material on how to apply a human performance assessment process has been developed in the frame of SESAR.

With regards to training, Billy Josefsson (CANSO) noted the conservative approach to training for Sundsvall tower, providing more than was eventually considered necessary, and acknowledged there is still more to learn with system design automation and working environment especially between different remote tower locations. After IFATCA enquired about the training method (examining the reduced training time and lack of a need for conversion training), CANSO proposed that gaps or flaws in regulation may be identified by interviewing current remote tower users – ie those at Sundsvall tower in Sweden – and welcomed questions from members to be forwarded to the relevant personnel.

Does the paper require technical examples and evidence of the concerns?

EGHD Support explained this topic was an open concern in the Position Paper as members wanted to include technical details related to specific technical solutions. Inevitably discussions will relate to what is already known and is operational but it is perhaps better to not refer to specific manufacture solutions as this may limit the scope of the paper. Members agreed specific technical concerns would not be addressed in the paper.

Reliability of data and potential impacts on liability

Melanie Morel (EGHD Support) elaborated that issues may arise from interpretation of data which prompted references to liability and Just Culture in members' comments on the Position Paper.

Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) agreed liability will be an issue, especially from a controller's perspective where roles and responsibility of issuing permissions are currently unclear and questioned whether the role of the controller in the new technology is clearly defined. New technologies, due to an increase of inputs provided to the ATCO, should not increase controllers' tasks and responsibilities. However, in remote towers, the controller may be required to provide a minimum standard or undertake more work now than they are currently capable of doing. **EGHD Support clarified that the rules for delivering ATC service has not changed in remote tower operations and more information available to a controller could be considered a useful positive to the new technology.** ATCEUC considered these rules very generic and cannot refer to specific technologies, for example remote towers, as there are numerous circumstances where they may be applicable.

Members agreed this discussion is relevant to all new technologies and automation and, as such, includes remote towers.

IFATCA noted that the EGHD should consider system integration where the extent of controllers' liability is unknown in a technologically sophisticated environment. Design and engineering should not be a controllers' responsibility and there needs to be assurance of data reliability.

EGHD Support proposed that the Remote Towers Position Paper should acknowledge provision of ATS does not change in remote tower operations and also should outline liability concerns.

Costas Christoforou (IFATSEA) asserted that remote towers will alter roles and duties of ATSEPs especially as there must be a controller position to secure information reliability.

Regarding the human dimension, Anders Liebl (IFATCA) commented on the need to consider flexible working methods in the case of malfunction and how this may impact controllers' work. For example, a screen defect may lead to misinterpretation of information. Billy Josefsson (CANSO) acknowledged the need to understand this impact and cited experiments at Sundsvall which determined controllers are more flexible to changing working conditions than predicted. IFATCA noted the need for

completed studies to confirm and quantify this. Charles-André Quesnel (ETF) agreed and noted that remote towers do not represent a huge change in way of working but is a technically new environment and steps need to be taken to ensure the controller knows how to operate it.

Training and license endorsement

Before this discussion, the *Annex I to Decision 2015/010/R1 'AMC and GM to Part ATCO' Amendment 1* was distributed to members for awareness of the existing text on remote towers related training elaborated by EASA.

IFATSEA explained; remote tower operations will require ATSEPs located on the remote site as the sensors will require maintenance on-site.

Similar to elsewhere in aviation, remote towers are a technical means to providing a service and, therefore, Daniel Liebahrt (ETF) did not see it necessary to have a mix of unit and ratings endorsement. ETF believed an operator should have a rating to work on a remote tower, comparable to the rating required to use a remote tower as contingency or required before any implementation of new tools. This would be an endorsement attached to an ADV or ADI rating and not linked to unit rating. ETF was unsure what would be required should an ATCO working in a remote tower centre moved to a conventional tower with no previous experience ETF considers a specific endorsement necessary and perhaps a specific rating.

ATCEUC suggested a single remote tower rating could be used in two remote tower centres located in the same building. Therefore, a controller may use both in a single shift.

Danilo Pisciotto (CANSO) informed the group that the CANSO remote tower expert sees no need for a separate unit endorsement but a rating endorsement. IFATCA queried whether this would mean a conventional ATCO would be placed in a remote tower operation without new training which CANSO explained already occurs in Sundsvall remote tower – where ATCOs shift between conventional and remote towers. This requires conversion training similar to that required between different tower approaches.

ETF continued, every tower and is different and this impacts each tower's working environment and therefore controllers require an endorsement. Anders Liebl (IFATCA) agreed: each airport is considered separately and controllers should be trained for each tower. Complexity of operations including density of traffic will be covered in training and this will be more involved where tower operation is more complicated.

Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) suggested a dedicated Working Group, potentially associated with EASA, to assess what training or licensing is required.

Competences schemes

This topic was covered under the discussion on training and defined regulation and processes.

5.2 Recommendations development

After a short break, the group moved on to the development of EGHD recommendations to the Commission – the remaining area of discussion to complete the Remote Tower Position Paper. The facilitation slides provided a table of suggested recommendations with proposals for how the principles may be achieved. The purpose of the discussion was to formulate what policy contributions to implement the principles – actions which may be recommended to the Commission.

The following principles were discussed out of a total of eleven. It was agreed that those not considered should be elaborated on outside of the meeting and submitted to EGHD Support for incorporation into Position Paper.

1. To ensure **operational suitability** of technical solutions, procedures and training/competencies, human performance assessment process should be properly applied.

The EGHD determined this principle would be best fulfilled by the establishment of a Human Performance User Group. Jean-Denis Larrere (EGHD Co-Chair) proposed this User Group could evaluate and define guidelines on how to perform the human performance assessments and assess whether improvements to the system could be made. Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) continued; the proposed Group could define an 'average user' for each group (ATSEP, ATCO, pilot, etc) who would be representative of the end user. Paul Neering (EGHD Chair) also saw the User Group as an opportunity to call for transparency.

Mike Shorthose (EGHD Support) remarked on SESAR 2020, with its strong validation activity at the start, and inquired if the human dimension is adequately covered in this period. The Co-Chair voiced a potential concern that a validation team would be unavailable or inadequate. The Chair noted IFATCA's preference for an international validation team. EGHD Support suggested a method of EGHD involvement in the SESAR process would be to consolidate this group's interest into a single representation for relevant consortiums.

2. To take into account operational constraints and needs, and to ensure **change acceptance, local staff** should be involved throughout development process.

Guenter Martis (CANSO) stated that the remote tower concept is a very marketable system and that this recommendation should be concerned with development of the system and becomes irrelevant if it is referring to already-developed 'off the shelf' solutions.

EGHD Support explained this principle is relevant to the customisation phase and systems with different levels of maturity as previous discussions agreed that operational staff involvement in the development process can be taken for granted. The Chair agreed, noting that current systems are successful because they benefited from involvement of staff in the development of off the shelf solutions. Costas Christoforou (IFATSEA) added; each solution needs to be appropriate for each country and provider and, as such, each off the shelf solution requires modification to be fit for purpose. ETF continued; direction from staff, as is done currently, is important and necessary.

EGHD Support suggested that the recommendation may apply to manufacturers development of solutions however CANSO proposed this is a general requirement and not specific to this remote towers discussion. All other members agreed that customisation of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) solution is always required due to individual local needs. The Commission explained that it is feasible to address this recommendation to manufacturers.

IFATCA suggested a change in wording of the principle to, 'involvement in solution design' which was agreed.

CANSO suggested staff involvement in solution design may be relevant in customisation configuration. IFATCA agreed but added that involvement should also happen whilst systems are still being developed. Oliver Wessollek (IFAIMA) reiterated the need for involvement in the customisation phase also.

EGHD Support proposed that ANSPs may be able to share best practices. This could be relevant to the User Group where it may be used as a platform for sharing how difficulties implementing technical concepts were overcome.

CANSO proposed a wording change removing 'encouragement' from local staff involvement in the *how* to implement this principle.

The Chair and CANSO concurred that the aviation environment would not benefit from more regulations but would be improved with human performance best practices.

The Chair also suggested incorporating Principle 2, 'to take into account operational constraints and needs, and to ensure **change acceptance, local staff** should be involved throughout development process' should be incorporated within Principle 1.

5. To get benefit from **return of experience on remote tower operations**, operational experience on RTO should be collected and used for designing and validating solutions, especially for future multi-mode of operation

Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) informed the group ATCEUC has strong opposition to multi-mode operation. Rather than removing the recommendation because members to do support multi-mode, IFATCA advocated the recommendation is retained to highlight EGHD concerns. ATCEUC elaborated that safety concerns exist which may inhibit operations and single mode experience cannot be utilised for development of multi-mode. The Chair clarified that the group does not consider sequential operations to have the same issues.

6. To not lead operators to ask questions on data integrity and availability issues, **clear lines of liability** should be defined for the relay and interpretation of data.

Oliver Wessollek (IFAIMA) restated the importance of data reliability and the question over where liability lies should a decision be made on incorrect data.

Guenter Martis (CANSO) stated the need for a more concise description of the difference in data delivered and used in remote towers operation in comparison to a conventional system. The Chair added; there needs to be responsibility for data integrity and availability throughout the network.

Costas Christoforou (IFATSEA) described a key difference in data delivery and use between remote and conventional towers. For conventional systems radars are located on-site, the data is received, is sent to the tower centre, processed and the image displayed. A remote tower system sees video, sound and other sensory data delivered to a remote tower centre through fibre optic cables. A data delivery delay between the remote location and control centre can be expected and will be increased with distance between the remote sensors.

Noting this argument concerns liability in providing integrity of data, Mike Shorthose (EGHD Support) summarised the human dimension; where there is concern data is not up to date and a recommendation may be to establish clear service levels and responsibility for delivering service levels.

9. To ensure that operators have **appropriate competencies and training, licencing and endorsement** should be adapted to the remote tower context and associated modes of operation

Following conversation on training earlier, EGHD Support confirmed that the recommendation for this principle will become that a Working Group should be established to further consider training requirements.

10. In order to [what is the rationale on the human performance aspect? Assurance of same/sufficient quality standards], **there should not be any remote tower operation cross border until EU Framework is in place to standardize remote tower implementation**

Anders Liebl (IFATCA) recognises this principle as not simply a standardisation issue but also a legal one. Should a remote tower be operated cross borders of countries with different rules, which ones will be applied if a mistake is made is unclear. CANSO saw a need for agreement between states and service provider. ATCEUC determined it a Commission responsibility to prescribe how laws would be applied.

The Chair summarised that the recommendation to the Commission would be to prohibit cross border remote tower operations.

Action EGH/14/02 - Members to send inquiries regarding training at Sundsvall remote tower to EGH Support, to be forwarded to CANSO

Action EGH/14/03 - EGH Support to distribute an updated Remote Towers recommendation table for comment

Action EGH/14/04 - Members to submit to EGH Support comments on the Remote Towers recommendation table

6 Performance

Beatrice Feuerberg (EGH Support) explained that, whilst the ICB is also working on the topic of Performance in quarter one of 2017, the EGH can provide added value by capturing the impacts on the human. Facilitation slides were provided with questions to prompt discussion on the impact to the human from both an ATM and AU perspective.

Previous discussions during the Teleconference on 28 November 2016 identified the following areas for the EGH to consider:

1. Addressing how the EGH should be involved in the process of defining performance regulation, in conversation with the Commission
2. Raise opinions on the issues with performance planning and its future regulatory landscape, as experts within your community
3. Form a detailed opinion on specific human consequences of performance improvements and associated regulatory changes

Jean-Denis Larrere (EGH Co-Chair) emphasised the third work area should be most important for the EGH.

Danilo Pisciotto (CANSO) disputed that there had been no ANSP consultation in the target setting process, recognising there is some consultation but it is insufficient as it fails to capture all the details and interdependencies of the KPAs and KPIs. The target setting process and at what level targets are set is not calibrated. Paul Neering (EGH Chair) agreed to reword the principle to include 'insufficient consultation'. Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) wished for the EGH to consider the 'involvement' of staff in target setting rather than 'consultation'.

Charles-André Quesnel (ETF) noted; the outcome of the consultation was not aligned with the opinion of the ANSPs and they largely felt ignored. The Vice Chair questioned how the EGH should be more precise in defining what is needed in a target in terms of the human dimension. For example, ATCEUC has a Proactive Flow Management Team with collaborative decision making processes with airlines for *en route*. This is considered one of the most proactive approaches across Europe but has resulted in one minute delay. Performance regulation puts pressure on staff which is not seen as necessary as they are already proactively improving the system.

Daniel Liebahrt (ETF) added that average delays – the metric measured for Performance Plan capacity KPIs – does not consider the number of aircraft. Flow management systems can increase the number of flights with the same number of staff using the same systems and the efficiencies this creates is not acknowledged and staff can be blamed for delays. The Co-Chair advocated encouragement of good behaviours by staff, recognition of those behaviours and rewards.

EGH Support remarked; it is worth noting in the paper that no credit is given for performance achievements, aside from those stated in Performance regulation, but that staff do have a general commitment to performance improvements throughout the system. The group agreed and emphasised the opinion that performance indicators are flawed. Oliver Wessollek (IFAIMA) added that the interdependencies between the KPIs are not fully understood.

IFAIMA continued; KPIs should also be flexible and realistic. When it is clear a target will not be reached, this needs to be taken into account in relevant Performance Plans. CANSO agreed with the need to recognise local factors, especially in terms of cost efficiency.

EGHD Support questioned how flexibility and responsiveness in response to unforeseen incidents may be achieved and CANSO suggested shorter timeframes for revision of Performance Plans. The Chair agreed – changes should occur at the moment of traffic change, not after.

Mike Shorthose (EGHD Support) questioned, if investment leads to cost efficiency targets not being met but results in general service improvements, whether this would be recognised. There is a requirement for a solution-lead Performance Scheme. The Vice Chair linked this issue to cost efficiency targets, which should not be utilised to drive solutions.

The Chair mentioned there is a professional staff organisation paper being drafted. This paper states that trust in the system is diminishing. This is a concern to staff associations as, at a number of locations, working conditions have deteriorated. This can be a positive outcome for the ANSP from a RP-target perspective but the staff do not consider this to be sustainable. These methods impact controllers' behaviours and thinking in a negative way.

Guenter Martis (CANSO) noted that maintenance of working conditions in the face of cost reduction is the same across all industries. ANSPs are under pressure from States (cost) and from AUs (traffic) and one solution to this may be technology to simplify processes but this will introduce a constant change process. CANSO saw the need to set grand targets to achieve some success.

ETF countered that KPIs have been relevant for the past decade and staff associations have concluded they are too unrealistic. Further, there is currently too much emphasis on cost. The Chair proposed a constructive approach where the EGHD may wish to identify negative effects of the Performance Scheme on the system and then provide a proposal of how to change this. ATCEUC saw a need for ANSPs to consider staff as part of the solution in achieving better performance and providing a decent service.

Loïc Michel (ECA) acknowledged most Performance concerns are relevant to ANSPs and not typically pilots. CANSO enquired if cost pressure is applied to airlines and if pilots are concerned about potential impacts to safety. ECA did not see a correlation between the Performance Scheme and safety levels. However, ATCEUC did recognise a relationship between Performance and safety and that some reductions in cost are beyond rationalisation. This may not impact on safety indicators but is relevant to quality of safety as pressure to deliver a service can reduce the ability to deliver quality of service. IFATCA acknowledged this is difficult to measure due to the rate of traffic.

Towards recommendations

To formulate an EGHD Position on Performance, EGHD Support requested solutions to the concerns raised. Tina Kobilšek (Commission) confirmed the purpose of this work topic is for the EGHD to provide recommendations and the more tangible they are, the more valuable an input. The Chair recommended referring to the staff association Position Paper to be published shortly. CANSO also produced a paper on Performance in preparation for the RP3 Hearing which could be used as a reference.

Danilo Pisciotto (CANSO) noted CANSO's support for many opinions heard during the RP3 Hearing and the following ICB Workshop but did not see the benefit in adding to the number of KPIs as this will increase administrative burden. The Chair proposed that KPIs negatively impacting the human should be identified. CANSO warned this would be a difficult task because the main goal of the Performance Scheme is to reduce cost and this will inevitably impact the human across the aviation system.

Giancarlo Saviantoni (ATCEUC) reiterated the need for staff involvement in the target setting phase, seeing participation of citizens and staff in the planning for RP1 and RP2 as too low. Lack of involvement will negatively impact quality of service.

CANSO saw NSAs as key to gathering inputs and it is important this is done iteratively. The Commission should be required to involve the NSAs and they would have the responsibility to collect and deliver local factors to the highest levels. CANSO suggested the recommendation would be to investigate the overall target setting process to allow for an iterative approach. EGHD Support warned at the difficulty of producing a recommendation not already explored by other groups.

Action EGHD/14/05 - Members to provide EGHD Support with relevant Performance Position Papers

7 Wrap up

Beatrice Feuerberg (EGHD Support) confirmed the next meeting dates. A teleconference to discuss the Draft B Position Paper and further the Performance topic discussion will be held on 20 March, 10:00 CET. The next meeting, EGHD/15, will take place on Tuesday 25 April 2017 in Brussels.

EGHD Support also explained the way ahead for the EGHD's current work topics. Remote Towers recommendations should be provided by members to EGHD Support who may then produce Draft B of the Remote Towers Position Paper – to be expected for review by members prior to the teleconference in March.

Performance will also be further discussed during the March teleconference.

8 Any Other Business

8.1 EGHD Annual Report 2016

Chloe Kirkpatrick (EGHD Support) announced the publication of the EGHD Annual Report 2016. Prepared with assistance from the Chairs, this booklet summarises the key developments over the year and what can be expected for the group in the year ahead. This will be distributed to members and the heads of each member organisation as well as wider SES bodies shortly.

8.2 EGHD Portal

The EGHD Portal provides a public area for information and a members-only area for accessing pertinent documents and an event calendar. A discussion board function also exists which the Chair suggested may be useful in preparation for teleconferences.

Having launched in summer 2016, some members have accepted the invitations and are active on the Portal. However, many did not accept the invitations which have now expired. Chloe Kirkpatrick (EGHD Support) informed the group that invitations will soon be re-sent and urged members to log into the site as it is a useful repository of all EGHD documents, including those which have outstanding comments. The group was assured that, should there be any problems logging on, members can inform EGHD Support and the issue will be dealt with.

Action EGHD/14/06 - EGHD Support to re-send EGHD Portal invitations to the necessary members

Participants

First name	Last name	Organisation
Paul	NEERING	EGHD Chair
Jean-Denis	LARRERE	EGHD Co-Chair
Giancarlo	SAVIANTONI	ATCEUC
Danilo	PISCIOTTU	CANSO
Guenter	MARTIS	CANSO
Billy	JOSEFSSON	CANSO
Loïc	MICHEL	ECA
Charles-André	QUESNEL	ETF
Daniel	LIEBAHRT	ETF
Oliver	WESSOLLEK	IFAIMA
Michael	SOBANEK	IFAIMA
Anders	LIEBL	IFATCA
Giusy	SCIACCA	IFATCA
Costas	CHRISTOFOROU	IFATSEA
Tina	KOBILŠEK	Commission
Beatrice	FEUERBERG	EGHD Support
Melanie	MOREL	EGHD Support
Mike	SHORTHOSE	EGHD Support
Chloe	KIRKPATRICK	EGHD Support
Apologies:		
Johan	GLANTZ	ECA
Tom	LAURSEN	IFATCA

Actions

Action	Description	Responsibility	Deadline
EGHD/13/02	Commission to draft and distribute the EGHD Rules of Procedure	Commission	April 2017
EGHD/Nov16/08	EGHD Support to distribute the updated Remote Towers Position Paper including recommendations (Draft B)	EGHD Support	10 March 2017
EGHD/14/01	EGHD Support to update the Work Programme as per the discussions and distribute to Members	EGHD Support	February 2017
EGHD/14/02	Members to send inquiries regarding training at Sundsvall remote tower to EGHD Support, to be forwarded to CANSO	Members	February 2017
EGHD/14/03	EGHD Support to distribute an updated Remote Towers recommendation table for comment	EGHD Support	14 February 2017
EGHD/14/04	Members to submit to EGHD Support comments on the Remote Towers recommendation table	EGHD Support	27 February 2017
EGHD/14/05	Members to provide EGHD Support with relevant Performance Position Papers	Members	6 March 2017
EGHD/14/06	EGHD Support to re-send EGHD Portal invitations to the necessary members	EGHD Support	February 2017