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**Chapter 7 - Annual Report on the Application of FUA**

### 7.1 National organization and responsibilities at the 3 levels of FUA

#### 7.1.1 At Strategic Airspace Management Level 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUA Level 1 Implmented:</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>High Level Airspace Policy Body:</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Minister of Transports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defined by letter of agreement (LoA) between Government entities.

- **Measures established to ensure consistency between:**
  - ASM and ATFM: N  
  - Military activities have a negligible impact on traffic capacity, therefore no specific measures have been foreseen at level 1
  - ASM and ATS: N  
  - 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: N

**Date and Reference of the Communication:** N/A

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 N

No request for change by users.

- Approve activities which require airspace reservation or restriction N

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA.

- Define temporary airspace structures and procedures to offer multiple airspace reservation and route options N

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.
- Establish criteria and procedures providing for the creation and use of adjustable lateral and vertical limits of the airspace

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

- 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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

- Establish mechanisms to assess performance of FUA operations

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. De facto these tasks are performed by the DAC/NSA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

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

No assessment ever performed.

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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

The State has abandoned application of permanent airspace restrictions:

N A permanently restricted airspace never existed

Changes since previous FUA Report:

No changes occurred

7.1.2 At Pre-tactical Airspace Management Level 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUA Level 2 Implemented:</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Airspace Management Cell – AMC:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>ATS is responsible for daily airspace allocation. List of contacts as per LoA</th>
<th>Joint Civil-Military Cell:</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 management done as per LoA. There is no AMC or a Joint Civil-Military Cell. Due to negligible MIL activity no plans for the future do exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The airspace is allocated in accordance with the conditions and procedures defined in Article 4.1:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Negligible MIL activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The established AMC (referred to above) is provided with adequate supporting systems to perform and communicate the pre-tactical airspace management tasks:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>There is no AMC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Changes since previous FUA Report: | No changes occurred.

7.1.3 At Tactical Airspace Management Level 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUA Level 3 Implemented:</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>No national MIL activity. Coordination is done with foreign MIL ATS as per LoA. Level of integration is therefore separated.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The State has ensured that the relevant ATS Units and controlling military units:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- establish coordination procedures and communication facilities to allow the real-time activation, deactivation or reallocation of airspace allocated at pre-tactical level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered. Nevertheless coordination procedures are applied as per LoA, COM facilities do exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered. Modifications are done as per LoA.

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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

- 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: N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Position of aircraft</th>
<th>Flight intention of aircraft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No simultaneous civil/military control activities in the same airspace.

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

As per LoA.

Changes since previous FUA Report: No changes occurred.

### 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: N

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

Type(s) of cross-border airspace use is applied in the State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-border area</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>GE, F, BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shared reserved airspace (TRA and TSA) Y BE

Conditional routes Y GE

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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. X-border activities are handled as per LoA. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

Changes since previous FUA Report: No change.

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

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

Due to negligible activities there is no need for a joint or multinational AMC.

Changes since previous FUA Report: No change.

#### 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: N

Due to negligible activities there is no need for a joint or multinational AMC.
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: N No changes to a FUA have ever been performed.

7.4 Performance assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of the functioning of agreements, procedures and supporting systems established at the 3 levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of aircraft operations of all users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Compliance monitoring

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

The State has not formally established responsibilities for these activities. A fundamental review of current policy should be considered.

The State has established the following FUA compliance monitoring processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspections</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Outcome sent to EC</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome sent to EC</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Audits</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Periodicity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome sent to EC</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments: NSA is being constituted; monitoring processes are not yet fully in place.

7.6 Problems encountered and need for changes

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

Implementation of SES generates substantial additional workload for small organizations.