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Chapter 7 - Annual Report on the Application of FUA

7.1 National organisation and responsibilities at the 3 levels of FUA

7.1.1 At Strategic Airspace Management Level 1

| FUA Level 1 | Y | High Level Airspace Policy Body: | N |
| Implemented: | | Finnish Civil Aviation Authority is responsible of Airspace Management (FUA level 1) in Finland FIR and Ministry of Transport and Communications is in charge of Airspace Management Policy. |

Partly implemented:
- High level Airspace Policy Body to be nominated approximately 04/2009
- Airspace Charter drafted, expected to be finished approximately 12/2009

Measures established to ensure consistency between:
- ASM and ATFM: Y Same unit is responsible for both, ACC-Tampere
- ASM and ATS: Y As above

The State has notified the Commission the identified persons/organisations responsible for all the tasks listed in Art. 4.1 of the FUA Regulation: Y

Reference of the Communication: 30/11/07 SES-report 2007

The State has ensured that the following tasks related to ASM Level 1 are performed by the responsible body (referred to above):
- Regularly review and address users' requirements
- Approve activities which require airspace reservation or restriction
- Airspace reservations and restrictions require approval from CAA
- Define temporary airspace structures and procedures to offer multiple airspace reservation and route options

According to the acceptance procedures of CAA; Aviation act defines, that ANSP prepare a proposal and approval is made by CAA.

LCIP2009-2013+ Finland 7-1 Released Issue
- Establish criteria and procedures providing for the creation and use of adjustable lateral and vertical limits of the airspace

Aviation act defines, that ANSP prepares a proposal and approval is made by CAA. Airspace design is very flexible; the whole Finland is divided in TSA areas. Each TSA-area is airspace of predefined dimensions, but upper and lower limit is freely defined according to the actual needs.

- Assess the national airspace structures and route network with the aim of planning for flexible airspace structures and procedures

On-going monitoring by ANSP. Regular coordination meetings are held with airspace users including military operator and MoTC/CAA/ANSP.

- Define specific conditions under which the responsibility for separation between civil and military flights rests on the ATS units or on the controlling military units

Not applicable; ANS services are provided only by the civil ANSP. Military does not give ATS-service in Finnish airspace.

- Establish mechanisms to assess performance of FUA operations

On-going monitoring by ANSP. Regular coordination meetings are held with airspace users including military operator and MoTC/CAA/ANSP.

- Based on the outcome of this assessment, periodically review and revise as necessary, airspace procedures

The review period of airspace assessment is not defined, but this will be defined during the work of re-drafting the airspace charter and when establishing the High Level Policy Body. Based on the decisions made in the coordination meetings (mentioned above), e.g. military operator has, in some cases, given up their rights to accommodate the others.

- Establish mechanisms to archive data on the requests, allocation and actual use of airspace structures for further analysis and planning activities

ANSP has a data repository for collecting data.

The State has abandoned application of permanent airspace restrictions: Y

Yes, Finland has abandoned the model of permanent airspace restrictions in context of FUA (civil-military). The whole airspace is civil airspace and it is allocated for military purposes on request based on actual needs. To accommodate the military airspace needs, the whole airspace is divided in TSA-blocks, which can flexibly been used.

Permanent restrictions are made by the Government. According to the aviation act CAA can make a decision in case of temporary airspace restriction, but the maximum duration of the restriction is two weeks.

Changes since previous FUA Report: None

**7.1.2 At Pre-tactical Airspace Management Level 2**

|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|

Fully implemented;
- Airspace Management Cell has been created and it is operational.

The airspace is allocated in accordance with the conditions and procedures defined in Article 4.1:

The established AMC (referred to above) is provided with adequate supporting systems to perform and communicate the pre-tactical airspace management tasks:

Changes since previous FUA Report: NONE

Airspace Reservation procedures and AMC-TOOL application is used to communicate and perform the pre-tactical airspace management tasks.
### 7.1.3 At Tactical Airspace Management Level 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUA Level</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Fully implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>- All Tactical Airspace Management procedures have been ensured. Finland has a fully integrated civil-military system, where military has no role in ATS-provision. At the moment Airspace Management Cell consists of civil personnel, but the coordination between military-units and Airspace Management Cell will be further enhanced by adding a special military coordinator to work together with the ANSP personnel in Airspace Management Cell from 1.1.2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State has ensured that the relevant ATS Units and controlling military units:

- establish coordination procedures and communication facilities to allow the real-time activation, deactivation or reallocation of airspace allocated at pre-tactical level: N/A

No military controlling unit exists in Finland.

- establish coordination procedures to ensure the timely and effective exchange of any modification of planned airspace reservations and the adequate notification to all affected users: N/A

No military controlling unit exists in Finland.

- establish coordination procedures and supporting systems to ensure safety when managing interactions between civil and military flights: N/A

No military controlling unit exists in Finland.

- establish coordination procedures to permit direct communication of relevant information to resolve specific traffic situations where civil and military controllers are providing services in the same airspace:
  - Specifically: Position of aircraft N/A
  - Flight intention of aircraft N/A

All airspace reservations are released as soon as activities having caused their establishment cease: Y

Responsible unit, which has reserved the airspace, informs the ATC-unit when the operation within the reserved area has been ended. ATC-unit will release airspace by the means of AMC-TOOL-application. System indicate real-time picture of airspace allocation for all ATC-units.

| Changes since previous FUA Report | NONE |

### 7.2 Cooperation between Member States at the 3 levels of FUA

#### 7.2.1 At Strategic Airspace Management Level 1

The State coordinates its airspace management policy with the respective States to jointly address the use of cross-border airspace structures: Y

Finland has delegated responsibility for the provision of air traffic services at three locations: one for Sweden and two for Norway. Creation of common cross border area with Sweden for military training purposes is on-going.

State level agreement with Sweden concerning the delegated airspace and cross border area is expected to be officially signed by 03/2009. Agreement negotiations at CAA-level are also at final stage.

The preparation of agreement with Norway is planned to start immediately after the finalisation of the above agreements with Sweden. The agreement between Sweden and Finland will be used as a model agreement when preparing the agreement with Norway.
Type(s) of cross-border airspace use is applied in the State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border area</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared reserved airspace (TRA and TSA)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional routes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State has established with neighbouring States one common set of standards for separations between civil and military flights for cross-border activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes since previous FUA Report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-level agreement with Sweden (Level 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.2 At Pre-tactical Airspace Management Level 2

The State has established a joint or multinational AMC with neighbouring States:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes since previous FUA Report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.3 At Tactical Airspace Management Level 3

The State has established a common set of procedures to manage specific traffic situations and/or to enhance the real-time airspace management between civil and military units involved in or concerned with cross-border activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes since previous FUA Report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3 Safety assessment

The State has established a safety management process to conduct all safety assessment activities before the introduction of any changes to the operations of the FUA:

| Y                                      | Any change that affects the ATM must be assessed. Assessments are made by the ANSP according to their Safety Management System procedure. |

### 7.4 Performance assessment

Evaluation of the functioning of agreements, procedures and supporting systems established at the 3 levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Y At present according to the NSA oversight processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airspace capacity</td>
<td>Y At present according to the NSA oversight processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Y At present according to the NSA oversight processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of aircraft operations of all users</td>
<td>Y At present according to the NSA oversight processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Compliance monitoring

The State is fully compliant with the FUA Regulation (EC Regulation 2150/2005):

Finland is fully compliant with the FUA regulation. System will be further developed taking into account the Eurocontrol specification and by re-drafting Airspace charter and formally nominating High Level Airspace Policy Body. At the moment function of the HLAPB is taken care by Ministry of Transportation and Communication together with CAA/ANSPI/MIL.

The State has established the following FUA compliance monitoring processes:

| Inspections | N * | Periodicity -- | Outcome sent to EC -- -- |
| Surveys | N * | Periodicity -- | Outcome sent to EC -- -- |
| Safety Audits | Y * | Periodicity CAA/NSA Audits made 2007 and 2008, but minimum requirement is once in every two years | Outcome sent to EC Y 30/11/2007 |

Additional comments: * see 7.6 below.

7.6 Problems encountered and need for changes

Problems encountered in the implementation of the FUA regulation and need for changes

The definitions and differences between inspections, surveys and safety audits need to be clarified.