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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This executive summary provides an overview of the EUROCONTROL initial plan in response to the European Commission’s mandate for the development of regulatory material with regard to the development of a risk classification scheme. The initial plan is the first deliverable of the mandate to the European Commission. It describes the proposed project plan and work breakdown structure, the methodology and processes and the consultation activities. It also provides an initial analysis of the mandate requirements.

Following agreement on the initial plan, the next step will be to deliver an intermediate report defining the regulatory approach by April 2007, which will describe an outline of the draft regulatory material and key points of the impact assessment. Prior to its submission to the European Commission, the intermediate report will be the subject to written consultation and a workshop which will include the airborne part and EASA, it will propose several scenarios. It is intended to hold a workshop to summarise and discuss the comments received, and to present the approach which has been retained. On the basis of the regulatory approach, EUROCONTROL will develop the final report which will include the draft regulatory material, justification material, identification of means of compliance and EUROCONTROL proposed actions to support Stakeholders to implement the regulatory material.

The draft Final Report (including proposed draft regulatory material) should be delivered to the European Commission by December 2007. The formal consultation on the draft regulatory material will be launched on the basis of the draft final report, after it has been transmitted to the European Commission. A workshop on the consultation will then be held. The draft material will be further updated on the basis of the consultation activities and further discussions with the European Commission, and the final report should be submitted to the Commission by April 2008.

The mandate manager will implement a management structure and development process, taking into account experience from the previous mandates to EUROCONTROL. The regulatory approach, the draft regulatory material and its justification will be developed by the “Mandate Working Group”. The mandate deliverables will be subject to internal review by the “Review Group” whose members are not members of mandate working groups.

Stakeholders’ comments shall be collected as soon as possible during the development of the regulatory approach and regulatory material by means of both informal and subsequent formal consultation processes. In order to ensure successful consultation and to better prepare the overall consultation processes, both will be carried out independently with each being separated into two sub-phases; the first dealing with the regulatory approach and the second with the regulatory material and its justification.
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Scope

This document is the proposed EUROCONTROL Initial Plan for the development of a Risk Classification Scheme (RCS) for the Design of Air Traffic Management (ATM). It responds to the Mandate (hereafter known as the ‘RCS Mandate’) received through letter ref. TREN F2/AB/mr D(2006) 205495, dated 15 March 2006 from the European Commission. Fulfilling this mandate is seen as being the principal means of achieving the aims stated in preamble sixteen of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2096/2005 of 20 December 2005 laying down the Common Requirements For The Provision of Air Navigation Services which states that "the Member States and the Commission, acting together with EUROCONTROL, should complete and update" the maximum tolerability for all severity classes which have not yet been established by ESARR 4.

The scope of this document is to provide the EUROCONTROL analysis of the received RCS Mandate and, based upon it, to describe the planned activities in order to successfully produce the required deliverables.

1.2. Objectives

The objective of this document is to:

- Analyse the received mandate for the development of the draft regulatory material on a Risk Classification Scheme for the design of ATM;
- Propose an approach for the achievement of the mandate;
- Present the work packages, work breakdown structure, timescale and the effort needed for the achievement of the mandate;
- Present the team organisation for the achievement of the mandate;
- Present the consultation process and the different Stakeholders involved in the formal consultation.
2. INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RISK CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

2.1. Background

The establishment of Tolerable Levels of Safety (TLS) is required by ICAO standards in Annex 11. States must establish their national safety minima or common safety minima for neighbouring states taking into account the structure of the industry of the ATM service provision within their area of responsibility within airspaces and at aerodromes.

Under the Chicago Convention, States are accountable for the provision of safe air traffic services (ATS) within their defined airspace. Safety is also an integral part of the ECAC ATM Strategy for the Years 2000+, whose overall safety objective is: “To improve safety levels by ensuring that the numbers of ATM induced accidents and serious, or risk bearing, incidents do not increase and, where possible decrease”, on a continental scale.

In pursuit of this objective, EUROCONTROL’s SRC POLICY DOC 1 and EUROCONTROL Safety Regulatory Requirement 4 (ESARR 4) (Risk Assessment and Mitigation in ATM) require a total system approach to the setting and monitoring of safety levels, the analysis of incidents, the identification of hazards and the development of remedial actions. They deal with the provision of ATM as a whole and with the safety levels in the airspace in its entirety.

EUROCONTROL’s SRC POLICY DOC 1 “ECAC Safety Minima in ATM” seeks to derive Safety Minima for ATM in the ECAC region.

ESARR 4 specifies the requirement to more formally and systematically assess and control the safety impact of changes to the ATM system. Within the overall objective of ensuring safety, the objective of this requirement is to ensure that the risks associated with hazards in the ATM system are systematically and formally identified, assessed, and managed within safety levels, which as a minimum, meet those approved by the designated authority.

2.1.1. Risk Classification

The estimation of safety relies on the combination of the possibility of harm occurring against the benefit which can be derived through mitigating measures. Therefore, the definition of the safety of any system needs to be assessed in terms of the harm which must be prevented and the rates at which this harm (or hazard) can be tolerated to occur.

The effect of harm is designated as “severity” (ref. Severity Classification Scheme, SCS). The more severe the harm is, the higher the severity. All the possible effects of harm (death, injuries, lost of service, increase of workload, etc.) on the air transport operations are classified according to the importance of their effects, in terms of “severity classes”. The rates at which this harm occurs are called the “likelihood of occurrences”, and the combination of this likelihood (or probability) and the severity is called “risk”.
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The tolerable rate of an occurrence of a particular severity is realistically never limited to zero, and also needs to be balanced with the cost and the benefits which are achieved. For any given severity, there should be a defined maximum rate of occurrence that can be tolerated. Practically, the maximum rate of occurrence for each severity class is called “tolerable risk” and is defined within a RCS. It formally specifies the maximum tolerable frequency of the occurrence of the effect of a hazard of a certain severity class.

This tolerable rate is set on the basis of past experience, historical data and expert judgement. However, at the regulatory level other factors could be taken into account, such as the estimation of the traffic growth in the next decades, subsequent policy decisions, the general public’s opinion on the safety of air transport, the economical impact of accidents and incidents. All the elements contributing to the definition of the RCS should be agreed and justified.

If risks are identified that are found to be unacceptable i.e. they exceed the tolerable limits specified in the RCS, risk mitigation strategies must be applied to render their effects tolerable.

2.1.2. ATM System Design

A tolerably safe design of a system is an *a priori* construction which relies on risk mitigation strategy which must be applied during the definition and the design of a new system or of any change within the system. It allows the implementation of all possible solutions which eliminate potential risks or reduce the severity of the effects of the hazard(s) or the likelihood of the occurrences of the effects. Such solutions could include:

- Elimination of a potential risk by increasing the separation minima in given scenario;
- Reduction of the severity by introduction of safety barriers as safety nets,
- Reduction of the probability by designing the system with redundancies, and introduction of procedures to take advantage of dissimilar redundancies.

The choice of solutions is driven by the estimation of the consequences of the hazard(s) on the system and balancing the risk against all the possible benefits derived through mitigation measures. Within airborne systems (and also in other safety related industries), the RCS is a tool currently used to support this process. It will provide an input to harmonise the way in which to design safety in ATM systems and to maintain and improve their dependability.

A qualitative categorisation of severity, based on an evaluation of the effects of the harm on the whole system, is already defined in the Common Requirements of Commission’s Regulation (EC) No 2096/2005 of 20.12.2005 laying down common requirements for the provision of air navigation services. In addition, associated quantitative probabilities of the effects of the hazards should be defined.

The definition of a RCS is an essential pre-requisite for developing tolerably safe design of ATM systems in accordance with ESARR 4. It not only enables a harmonised approach to ATM system design, but also provides a basis for harmonisation of the risk mitigation strategies applied to air and ground segments. Application of RCS on a pan-European basis is therefore as essential step in quantitative harmonisation of risk assessment and mitigation.
2.1.3. **Risk Classification Scheme at the Regulatory Level**

Safety regulation is the process for establishing, overseeing and enforcing safety levels in the public interest. Whilst Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) have a responsibility for providing services based on systems which have been designed safely, the definition of harmonised safety levels of ATM represents special importance for the National Supervisory Authority (NSA).

The risk assessment and mitigation process of ANSPs is subject to on-going safety oversight by means of auditing and continuous monitoring where the provider makes decisions about the acceptability of new systems/changes.

The Common Requirements entrust to the States the application at national level of European safety requirements for ATM systems. They provide a benchmark against which States may implement measures to enhance safety, or take other appropriate measures to improve it. However, more detailed regulatory actions are needed in order to achieve effective risk assessment and mitigation against harmonised safety levels within a total system approach.

2.1.4. **Need for an Integrated Approach at System Level**

Previous work in this field has applied the above concepts within particular aspects of ATM operations, such as the planning and the design of certain changes to the ATM system (e.g. Navigation System and RVSM).

There is now a need to carry on such a work with a total system approach. At the European level, this is being progressed by EUROCAE Working Group WG 64 which has produced ED 125. The definition of the RCS has already reached a good level of maturity. In order to reach the objective of obtaining tolerably safe ATM system design, the EUROCONTROL Safety Regulation Commission (SRC) intends to follow a similar approach to provide an *a priori* estimation of ATM potential risks, built on ATM safety best practices and consistent with ESARR 4 and the Common Requirements.

The further increase in the integration of airborne and ground systems has already led to a more consistent and harmonised way to take into account the risk assessment and mitigation process and its consequences on the dependability of the design of systems.

It should be stressed that the establishment of TLS, as required by ICAO Annex 11, is out of the scope of this mandate because it encompasses more than dependability and safe system design, it also requires very high quality of data reporting, and further effort is being put in place to ensure a consistent ECAC-wide reporting process.
2.2. Articulation of Regulatory Material / Community Specifications

The Community Specifications complement the regulatory provisions by specifying detailed technical or operational solutions. These Specifications are voluntary standards developed by EUROCONTROL or by European standardisation bodies in co-operation with EUROCAE. These voluntary standards are purposely developed as means of compliance with relevant regulatory materials.

The outcomes of the regulatory approach will determine the most suitable articulation between regulatory material and associated Specifications to be subsequently developed or amended, following the analysis of several possible scenarios. In accordance with the principle of a “layered” approach to the definition of EU safety rules, the regulatory material in the implementing measures related to the essential requirements attached to the basic legislation should not unduly prescribe detailed technical requirements and the Specifications should specify a solution providing compliance with the regulatory material.

According to this approach the regulatory material developed for the purpose of the RCS Mandate will take into account the EUROCAE guidelines ED 125: “Process for deriving Risk Classification Scheme and Specifying Safety Objectives in ATM in compliance with ESARR 4.”
3. PROPOSED APPROACH TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

3.1. Considerations for the Development of the Final Report

- The availability of reference material necessary to back up the regulatory approach. During the drafting of the regulatory approach, EUROCONTROL will provide the rationale to elicit the regulatory requirements of the regulatory material and traceability will be kept.

- The regulatory material should contain the minimum set of requirements required to achieve the objective of the regulation. The proposed method to structure the regulatory material into enacting terms and Annexes is to rely upon a generic structure of regulatory materials (stemming from experience gained with the development of the previous developments). The justification material will provide the explanatory material supporting the regulatory material.

- The final report will include the regulatory approach, the regulatory material, possible recommendations and the identification of further work.

- The ENPRM\(^1\) process will support the development of the final report.

3.2. Proposed EUROCONTROL Support

EUROCONTROL support to Stakeholders for the implementation of the regulatory material will be defined upon completion of the formal consultation.

3.3. ENPRM Mechanisms Applicable to the Development of the Final Report

The ENPRM regulatory process in its full application is not applicable to the development of the final report. It is a complete rulemaking process used for the development of EUROCONTROL regulatory products under the legal framework of the EUROCONTROL Convention.

However, the ENPRM process has been developed from existing best practice and was designed to ensure that material was developed with ease of transposition into European Community and national legal orders (the latter applicable outside EU). Moreover, it provides requirements to ensure the involvement of all Stakeholders and other organisations (e.g. ICAO, EASA) in the development process. Therefore, the use of applicable ENPRM process mechanisms will be made to bring benefits to the development of the final report as requested by the European Commission’s RCS Mandate.

\(^1\) ENPRM: Expand Eurocontrol Notice Proposed Rule Making
3.3.1. Consultation Activities

Consultation throughout the development of the RCS regulatory material is an essential aspect of the process and ensures appropriate Stakeholder involvement whilst enhancing transparency. For clarity it is important to note that there are 2 basic types of consultation activity:

- **“Informal” Consultation (WP2)**

  Informal consultation is a more general activity which commences at the start of the process and continues until formal consultation is launched. The ‘consultation’ aspect is achieved through the involvement of Stakeholders and experts (**focal points for RCS**) in various activities associated with the development of the draft material. This might include, inter-alia, participation in working groups, workshops, technical meetings and document reviews. In respect to this mandate, the informal consultation process extends from the delivery of the initial plan to the European Commission to the delivery of the draft final reports.

- **“Formal” Consultation (WP4)**

  Formal consultation is a specific and formatted process which submits for widespread ‘public’ consultation, a mature version of the draft regulatory material (ENPRM) or a discussion paper (Advanced-ENPRM) for comment. Stakeholders and other interested parties are invited to submit their formal positions and comments on the documents. These comments are reviewed systematically and can affect the final draft version of the documents.

3.3.2. Applicable Phases of the ENPRM Process

Mechanisms of the following phases of the ENPRM process are specifically applicable to the development of the final report: Drafting Phase, Consultation Phase and Review of Comments. Mechanisms of the adoption and publication phases of the ENPRM process are out of the scope of the SES mandate activities.

*Drafting Phases (WP1, WP2, WP3)*

Those phases address the development of the draft regulatory material and its justification material. ENPRM principles can be used as a reference for the regulatory drafting and for the impact assessment activities. The specific informal consultation arrangements will involve representatives nominated by the Stakeholders in the development and refinement of regulatory and associated products. During this phase, regular information will also be provided directly to relevant existing bodies and groups (CESC, CMIC, ACG, EAG, etc.) when they meet. Expert opinion will be sought on specific issues relating to regulatory products or specifications during the development of the documents concerned. It is expected that most of the exchanges will take place via electronic means.

---

2 An Advanced-ENPRM (A-ENPRM) is a formal consultation activity that publishes a discussion paper for widespread comment to gain information necessary to support the further development of the regulatory material and/or to seek views on a particular aspect or proposed approach. The results of an A-ENPRM will influence the regulatory approach. An A-ENPRM does not replace the ENPRM which publishes the mature draft regulatory material for formal comment.
During the very first part of this phase, a paper will be distributed with the aim of collecting the views and opinions of Stakeholders on the various alternatives (options) to be proposed for the regulatory approach. This may take the form of an ‘informal’ limited circulation paper, or it may require a more formal A-ENPRM discussion paper depending on the assessment of the required scope of the consultation.

EUROCONTROL will not favour or propose any of the possible alternatives. The collected opinions together with the analysis of the possible impacts will then be used to compare the various alternatives and select the one to be proposed.

Consultation Phase (WP4.1)

This phase applies to formal consultation activities and primarily those concerned with the circulation of the proposed draft regulatory material for widespread comment. However, it will also be applicable should an A-ENPRM consultation activity be used concerning the regulatory approach. In respect of the proposed draft regulatory material, the consultation will be conducted on the version intended to be included in the draft Final Report to be submitted to the European Commission. This report will contain a summary of the Impact Assessment. The outcome of the consultation will influence the final draft version of the regulatory material.

The scope of the formal consultation will be extended to all Stakeholders, notably national authorities (civil and military), EASA, civil and military ANSPs, airspace user organisations, international organisations, social and industry representatives. Other interested parties (including the public) will be consulted through the full use of the EUROCONTROL website.

Two stakeholder workshops are foreseen: the first to discuss the outcome of the regulatory approach following written consultation; the second following the formal consultation on the proposed draft regulatory material to present the results of the consultation (once comments received have been reviewed).

This phase of the consultation will be managed with appropriate procedures to maintain an efficient contact between drafting groups and Stakeholders.

Review of Comments (WP4.2)

This phase corresponds to the analysis of comments collected during the formal consultation activity (or activities). Drafting groups analyse the received comments and may provide further explanation to clarify some points, propose to include or reject an amendment on the basis of an appropriate rationale and on the conclusions of the impact assessment. Following the formal consultation process for the proposed draft regulatory material, a Summary of Responses (SOR) document will be developed as a deliverable of the final report. A public workshop will also be organised in order to present the results of the formal consultation on the proposed draft regulatory material.
4. EUROCONTROL’S RESPONSE TO THE RCS MANDATE

4.1. Project Plan

The development of the deliverables under the RCS Mandate is organised into the following work packages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP0 – Initial Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1 – Definition Of The Problem, Policy Objectives And Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP1.1: Problem Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP1.2: Policy Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP1.3: Alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP2 – Informal Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WP2.1: Preliminary Impact Analysis of the Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP2.2: Carrying On the Informal Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP2.3: Selection of Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP3 – Finalization of Impact Assessment and Justification Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WP3.1: Final Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP3.2: Drafting the regulatory material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP3.3: Drafting the Justification Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP4 – Formal Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WP4.1: Carrying On the Formal Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP4.2: Consolidation of comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP5 – Final Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WP5.1: Support to Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WP5.2: Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work packages WP1 to WP5 are organised to deal with main phases of the project:

1. The impact assessment starts at the earliest stage of the project. The impact assessment consists in the definition of the problem, the policy objectives and the identification of different alternatives.

As required by the mandate, the regulatory approach shall be submitted for written consultation. This written consultation might be subject to both an informal and formal process.
The informal consultation process will be performed in order to allow the stakeholders to choose a preferred regulatory approach among several alternatives. If there are no major issues about the Risk Classification Scheme for the design of ATM systems, the informal consultation will help to accelerate the formal consultation as any potential issues will be solved prior to formal consultation.

A questionnaire (milestone M1), including arguments for each alternative will be drafted in order to support the Informal consultation.

Those activities are covered by WP1, WP2.1 and WP2.2.

The preferred option among the different alternatives is identified and analysed in WP2.3. It will include the identification of the possible Community Specifications.

A document (milestone M2) will include the Key Features of the Regulation is drafted in order to help the further stages of the project.

The finalization of the impact assessment will be developed with regard to the impact of the preferred option (WP3.1), the regulatory material will be drafted (WP3.2) and the justification material will be drafted accordingly (WP3.3) on the basis of the results of the previous Work Packages.

The intermediate report (D1) is the main deliverable; it will include the identification of the problem, the policy objectives, and the possible alternatives. It will include the final impact assessment and the justification material.

2. In WP4, the ENPRM mechanisms will be used to manage the formal consultation (WP4.1) and review of comments (WP4.2) on the draft regulatory material. All comments received are analysed and a SOR document is drafted with proposed amendments of the draft final report.

3. Finally the WP5 will deal with the guidance to be provided to Stakeholders (WP5.1) in order to implement the regulatory material. It will address the preparation of the final report (WP5.2).
The workflow below presents the thread between the different tasks of the project and their relationships with the deliverables.

### Impact assessment

D0: Initial Plan

- WP1.1: Definition of the problem
- WP1.2: Policy objectives
- WP1.3: Alternatives

WP2.1: Analysis of the alternatives

WP2.2: Informal consultation

WP2.3: Selection of options

WP3.1: Finalisation of Impact Assessment
- WP3.2: regulatory material
- WP3.3: Justification

M1: Preliminary Questionnaires

M2: Key Features of Regulation

D1: Intermediate report

D2: Draft Final report

D3: Final Report

4.2. Meeting the Requirements of the RCS Mandate

In accordance with Section 5 of the European Commission’s RCS Mandate, EUROCONTROL will take into account the provisions of the Single European Sky Regulations, in particular Articles 4 and 6 of the Service Provision Regulation, the essential requirements of the Interoperability Regulation and the regulation laying down common requirements for the provision of air navigation services.

(Space Left Intentionally Blank)

---

3 Regulation (EC) N°2096/2005, OJ L 335/13 of 21/12/05,
In this context, the common requirements contain a severity classification scheme for the identification of the effects of ATM/CNS related hazards on the safety of aircraft. ESARR 4 contains a risk classification scheme with a maximum tolerable likelihood for ATM directly contributing to accidents in the ECAC region (i.e. severity class 1: the most severe, leading to an accident) which will be reviewed; maximum tolerable probability for the severity classes 2 (serious incidents) to 5 (less severe occurrences) have still to be developed. In accordance with Recital 16 of the Common Requirements, EUROCONTROL, acting with Members States and the European Commission, will complete and update those probabilities.

The following table shows how EUROCONTROL intends to fulfil the “Specific Issues” specified within the European Commission’s RCS Mandate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Commission’s Mandate: 5.1 Specific Issues</th>
<th>In the Initial Plan, this requirement is covered by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUROCONTROL will develop draft regulatory material that addresses the following points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(see Mandate §5.1 (1))</em></td>
<td>WP1.1 – clarification of the scope of the safety design target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirements for risk assessment and mitigation with regard to a new system or to changes to an existing system (part 3.2 of Annex II of the Common Requirements) apply to the ATM functional system and supporting arrangements under the managerial control of the ATS/CNS-provider (ATS, ATFM, ASM and CNS). Additionally, it will be assessed whether or not similar requirements would be applied to other services; taken into account the applicability of the common requirements and of the ESARRs to those types of ANS providers (MET, AIS);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(see Mandate §5.1 (2))</em></td>
<td>WP1.1 – to carry out the analysis of RCS for the design of ATM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of the risk classification scheme;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Space Left Intentionally Blank)*

---

4. *Idem, Annex II, paragraph 3.2*

5. *In this mandate, ‘system’ shall mean a combination of systems, procedures and human resources organised to perform a function within the context of ATM.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Commission’s Mandate: 5.1 Specific Issues</th>
<th>In the Initial Plan, this requirement is covered by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUROCONTROL will develop draft regulatory material that addresses the following points:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (3))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.1 – feasibility of risk apportionment of the safety budget (for design).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common criteria for using the risk classification scheme to derive design objectives for the constituent part of the ATM system under consideration, taking into account the level of provided ATM services/functions and the environment of operations in which it operates;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (4))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.2 – carrying out the analysis of the implementation of RCS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The timeframe and scope for implementation of the risk classification scheme (phasing-in, flexibility, derogations);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (5))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.1 – defining the conditions for the oversight of RCS by the NSA, taking into account the regulatory framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to verify compliance with the risk classification scheme and its criteria for use consistent with the Single European Sky legislation in particular with the role of NSA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROCONTROL shall give full consideration to the following aspects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (first bullet))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.1 – clarification of TLS as required by ICAO Annex 11, feasibility of apportionment for monitoring the national TLS, definition of Severity Classification Scheme (SCS), Risk Classification Scheme (RCS), Tolerable level of safety (TLS), Achieved Level of Safety (ALS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not relationships between the risk classification scheme for the design of ATM and the requirements of ICAO Annex 11, section 2.26 regarding the establishment of tolerable/acceptable level of safety for the provision of ATS, may be established;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (second bullet))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.1 – clarification of TLS as required by ICAO Annex 11, definition of the scope and the way to express tolerable level of safety, maturity for the implementation of TLS within EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not the maximum tolerable probability for ATM design may be established on the basis of historical data coming from existing European occurrences reporting process;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(see Mandate §5.1 (third bullet))</strong></td>
<td>WP1.1 – clarification of TLS as required by ICAO Annex 11, definition of the scope and the way to express tolerable level of safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether or not the severity classification schemes included in ESARR 4 and in the Commission Regulation laying down common requirements for the provision of air navigation services need to be refined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. The Development Process

According to the European Commission’s RCS Mandate, the regulatory material shall be accompanied by an impact assessment in the areas of civil and military organisations, efficiency and economic aspects.

To reply to this requirement, EUROCONTROL will provide, together with the draft regulatory material, a justification document including an operational, technical and economical impact assessment. A regulatory impact assessment will describe the current regulatory situation in the area covered by the mandate and the desired regulatory situation after full exploitation of the scope of the mandate.

As part of the final report, EUROCONTROL will also provide a document which will identify the material which has the potential to be adopted as Community specifications which are of interest, the draft regulatory material and further possible developments. Another part of the final report will describe the actions of EUROCONTROL to support Stakeholders in implementing the regulatory material.

The development of the mandate deliverables will be done in close consultation with Stakeholders. The consultation process will enhance transparency and notably take into account the views of the ATM Stakeholders, such as:

- Relevant national authorities (civil and military, in particular NSA),
- Civil and military air navigation services providers,
- Relevant airspace users’ organisations, including military airspace users,
- Relevant international organisations, in particular ICAO,
- Relevant manufacturers,
- Relevant social and industry representatives,
- Relevant European organisations, Community Agencies and programmes (i.e. JAA, EASA, GASR).

All Stakeholder comments will be analysed and weighed against the overall objective of the regulatory material.

The first consultation shall aim at collecting inputs and opinions of all Stakeholders on the objective and allow EUROCONTROL to prepare the intermediate report. EUROCONTROL shall analyse all input received.

The second consultation shall be based on draft regulatory material and shall include at least the following:

- Invite comments;
- Evaluate and report on the comments made and on the reasons of their inclusion/rejection in the final report;
- Organise a public workshop to discuss the results of the consultation process.

During the whole consultation process, EUROCONTROL will be available for reasonable requests by individual Stakeholders for meetings and discussions. Two public workshops are foreseen within the overall process: the first on the completion of the consultation on the regulatory approach; the second upon completion of the consultation of the draft final report in order to present the results.
EUROCONTROL will apply the relevant ENPRM mechanisms to manage the different phases of the development of the final report, including notably the drafting, impact assessment and consultation activities (see Section 3.3 for more details).

4.4. Reference Material

In accordance with Section 5.4 of the European Commission’s RCS Mandate, EUROCONTROL will take into account and further build upon any relevant material available during the scheduled timetable (existing or under development), in particular:

- SES regulations and implementing rules;
- The ICAO Chicago Convention, in particular Annex 11 and related guidance material;
- EUROCONTROL material, ESARRs and in particular ESARR4 and ESARR1, related guidance material and the EUROCONTROL Safety Assessment Methodology (SAM);
- EUROCAE material, in particular from WG 64;
- EASA relevant material;
- JAA relevant material;
- GASR relevant material;
- Regulatory material developed by Member States as available;
- Operational procedures developed by ANSP as available;
- Material arising from the SESAR definition phase as available.

EUROCONTROL document such as the “ATM Strategy for the Years 2000+” is also considered as reference material for the development of the regulatory material.

4.5. Reports and Deliverables

The final report will include the following elements:

- Draft regulatory material.
- Justification material, including a summary of the impact assessment.
- Impact assessment
- Identification of means of compliance and further developments.
- EUROCONTROL proposed actions to support Stakeholders’ efforts to implement the regulatory material.
- Summary of responses to comments collected during the formal consultation on the draft regulatory material.
In accordance with Section 6 of the European Commission's RCS Mandate, EUROCONTROL will deliver an initial plan, intermediate report and a final report as follows:

- The present document, the **initial plan** which describes the work programme, the proposed methodology and processes, the timing and planning of the project, including consultation and visits planned.

- The **intermediate report** which will inform about the work undertaken so far, any difficulties in respecting the initial plan, the outcome of the first round of consultations. It will possibly outline **draft version regulatory material** to be submitted to the 2nd phase of consultation.

- The **final report** will contain the results achieved. The main part of the final report will consist of draft regulatory material with the intention to be included in future SES-implementing rules. The final report shall also contain the conclusion of the impact assessment and describe the actions of EUROCONTROL to support Stakeholders’ efforts to implement the requirements.

The following table defines the timescale for the delivery of documents and reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents / Milestones</th>
<th>Intermediate report</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>P/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D0 - Initial Plan</td>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>WP0</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 – Preliminary Questionnaires</td>
<td>December 2006</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 – Key Feature of the regulation</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Intermediate report</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Draft final report</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Final report</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 P: provision, M: milestone
5. OVERALL MANAGEMENT

5.1. Organisation

This chapter describes how the development plan will be managed in its entire lifecycle. It addresses the internal management process of the EUROCONTROL Agency.

EUROCONTROL proposes an appropriate project organisation to fulfil the terms of the mandate, with a:

- Mandate Manager
- Review Group
- Technical Working Group.
- Focal Points Group

**Mandate Manager**

The Mandate Manager is responsible for the efficient achievement of the European Commission’s mandate and for co-ordination of the objectives of each groups of the Mandate. The Mandate Manager is responsible for the:

- Management of co-ordination activities within and outside the Agency.
- Management of production activities for the development of products required by the European Commission’s mandate.
- Management of supporting activities including in particular quality, configuration and planning matters.
- Management of reporting activities.

The Mandate Manager reports to the Director responsible.

**Review Group**

This Review Group is in charge of the internal review of the mandate deliverables, in particular the regulatory material, justification material and the identification of community specifications and further developments.

Members of the Review Group are not members of Mandate Working Groups developing regulatory products.

**Technical Working Group**

This working group will be in charge, depending of the phase of the project, of the drafting and technical assessment of the:

- Regulatory approach and the regulatory material;
- Justification material, including impact assessment.
Drafting Regulatory Material

The working group will be responsible for the identification of the regulatory objectives and the regulatory approach. Based on this approach, the group will proceed with development of the regulatory approach and regulatory material. It will also identify the potential community specifications related to the RCS and any further recommended developments, as appropriate. The group will integrate the outcome of the other phases of the regulatory process into the draft regulatory material.

Drafting Justification Material

The working group is responsible for the development of the justification part addressing in particular, the impact assessment. The group will provide the economic impact assessment associated with the proposed regulatory material. It will also provide any other justifications for the proposed rule, as appropriate.

Focal Points Group

This group is in charge of an informal review of the mandate deliverables, in particular the regulatory material, the justification material, and the identification of means of compliance and further developments.

Members of the Focal Point Group are not members of mandate working groups which develop the regulatory material. Members of Focal point groups are experts of the Stakeholders.

The focal point group is involved as early as possible in the development of the regulatory approach and the regulatory material, taking the maximum advantage of electronic communication means. The role of this group in of importance in order to identify as soon as possible the potential weaknesses of the regulatory development and in order to ensure the appropriation of the regulatory material by the Stakeholder.

The following picture illustrates the project organisation.
5.2. Quality Management

EUROCONTROL shall assure that the delivered products meet the expected level of quality. Each deliverable is reviewed by means of internal quality checks.

5.3. Configuration Management

EUROCONTROL ensures proper control of documents and records which contains at least the following elements:

- Reference documents used for the execution of the European Commission’s mandate are properly identified and made available to members of the different groups involved in this mandate;
- Common rules are established by EUROCONTROL’s SRU for the management of documents;
- Documents are approved for adequacy prior to issue;
- Documents are reviewed and updated as necessary and re-approved;
- Changes and current revision status of documents are identified;
- Relevant versions of applicable documents are available at points of use;
- Documents remain legible and readily identifiable;
- Documents of external origin are identified and their distribution controlled;
- Obsolete documents are prevented from unintended use and suitable identification is applied to them if they are retained for any purpose.

The facility to manage documents shall be properly organised to support the full set of document products necessary to the development of regulatory materials.
6. PLANNING

The following Gantt chart presents the overall planning of the development plan.
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APPENDIX A – DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK PACKAGES

A.1. WP0 – Drafting the Initial Plan

| WP1: Definition of the problem, policy objectives and alternatives |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Effort: | 66 man days |
| Duration: | 66 days |
| Start Date: | 25/04/2006 |
| End Date: | 12/07/2006 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference material</td>
<td>Initial plan</td>
<td>Definition of the tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.1.1. Objectives of the Work Package

The objectives of the work-package are to:

- Define the tasks of the project and their interactions,
- Draft the work package breakdown, milestones and workshops,
- Identify the resources needed for the project,
- Organise the management of the project.

A.1.2. Output

- Initial Plan (D0)

A.2 WP1 – Definition of the Problem, Policy Objectives and Alternatives

| WP1 – Definition of the problem, policy objectives and alternatives |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Effort: | 279 man days |
| Duration: | 173 days |
| Start Date: | 25/04/2006 |
| End Date: | 15/12/2006 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference material</td>
<td>Definition of the problem</td>
<td>Documents supporting the regulatory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial plan</td>
<td>Policy objectives</td>
<td>Milestone with EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.2.1. Objectives of the Work Package

The objectives of the work-package are to:

- Clarify the objective and scope of the regulatory material, including necessary definitions;
- Provide, from the regulatory standpoint, an analysis of the Risk Classification Scheme (RCS) for the design of ATM systems;
- Provide an analysis of the level of prescription and the implementation conditions;
- Identify the problem to be solved, the need for European Community action, the policy objectives and the various alternatives to be proposed as the regulatory approach;

A.2.2. Task WP1.1: Definition of the Problem

The work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- To explain what the objective and the scope of the regulatory material are, including the initial steps of the impact assessment,
- To carry out the analysis of Risk Classification Scheme for the design of ATM systems by identifying a list of operational and technical points having an impact upon Risk Classification Scheme for the design of ATM,
  - Clarification of the notion of “total system” approach: people, equipment, procedure, including airborne part and all interfaces with actors involved in safety as aerodrome and air operators,
  - Clarification of the notion of “managerial control”,
  - Clarification of the scope of the safety design target with regard to the mandate: ATC, ASM, ATFM, CNS and including or not MET or AIS,
  - Scope of ATM, likelihood to be considered, type of provider, complexity of the traffic, etc,
  - Feasibility of risk apportionment: assessment of the possible allocation of safety budget can be meaningfully performed in ATM taking into account the functional failures and the complex interactions of the system,
  - Clarification of Tolerable Levels of Safety (TLS) as required by ICAO Annex 11, and definition of Severity Classification Scheme (SCS), Risk Classification Scheme for design (RCS), Tolerable Level of Safety for the total airspace (TLS), Achieved Level of Safety (ALS),
  - Maturity of the TLS and possible further work.
- To issue recommendations for the implementation of a RCS,
- To clarify the role of safety nets with regard to the use of RCS,
- To take taking into account the existing arguments and practices in collision risk modelling to obtain a demonstration of safety which comply to the RCS.

Those activities will be carried on mainly by EUROCONTROL’s SRU by the mean of external contracts under the general responsibility of the Agency, representing the EUROCONTROL Organisation.
A.2.3. Task WP1.2: Policy Objectives

- Definition of a rationale to elicit appropriate regulatory requirements in order to meet criteria with some considerations about the level of prescription of regulatory requirements,
- Carry out the analysis of RCS aspects with regard to the regulatory approach, in particular:
  - The level of prescription of the RCS matrix,
  - The requirements fitting in with the scope of the rule,
  - Carry out the analysis of implementation conditions with, in particular the transitional arrangements, dates of implementation, exemption policy,
  - Propose an articulation between the regulatory material and community specification (in particular ED 125).

A.2.4. Task WP1.3 Alternatives: Identification and Preparation of the Preliminary Questionnaires

This work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- identify various alternatives that might be followed for the development of the draft regulatory material with regard to RCS,
- drafting the possible alternatives taking into account:
  - The result of the problem analysis,
  - the result of the policy objective,
  - The balance between potential Community Specifications and regulatory material,
  - Drafting the preliminary questionnaires.

A.2.5. Outputs

- Draft regulatory approach, without recommending any of the possible alternative options:
  - Definition of the problem
  - Policy objectives
  - Alternatives
  - Preliminary Questionnaires
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A.3. WP2 – Informal Consultation: Analysis of the Alternatives and Selection of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP2 – Informal Consultation : Analysis of the alternatives and selection of options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inputs
- Alternatives
- Preliminary Questionnaires

### Outputs
- selection of options
- comments on the alternatives provided by stakeholders
- Key features of regulation

### Nature
Document supporting the regulatory approach

A.3.1. Objective

The objectives of the work package are to:

- Prior to the consultation identify the potential impacts, of the different alternatives which are proposed to stakeholders,
- Ensure widespread visibility of the proposed regulatory approach of RCS by sending the different alternatives with their justification to stakeholders
- Collect views and opinions of Stakeholders on proposed alternatives.

A.3.2. Task WP2.1: Analysis of the Alternatives

The work to be achieved is the preparation of the arguments for each proposed alternatives.

The impact assessment will be organised in order to identify the problem(s), the need for actions at European Community level, the main policy objectives and the possible alternatives options.

The alternatives will be analysed with their strong and weak points, mainly with respect to their capability to support current and foreseen evolution of technical system and link to aircraft.

This analysis will take into account the potential impacts with regard to the economic, environmental and social (including safety) consequences.

A.3.3. Task WP2.2: Carry on the Informal Consultation

- Prepare the distribution list of the written consultation based on the Focal Points nominated by the Stakeholders,
- Distribute the preliminary questionnaires,
Prepare a list of comments received following the informal consultation, to be used during the review of comments,

To gather the comments of stakeholders.

A.3.4. Task WP2.3: Selection of Options

- To identify the preferred option among the proposed alternatives,
- Analysis of the preferred option,
- To outline the key features of the regulation on the basis of the result of the informal consultation.

A.3.5. Outputs

- Selection of preferred option,
- Key Features of regulation,
- List of comments on the draft regulatory approach and progress reports.

A.4. WP3 – Finalisation of Impact Assessment, Regulatory and Justification Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP3 – Finalisation of impact assessment and regulatory justification material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong> 86 man days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong> 36 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong> 21/02/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong> 10/04/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inputs** | **Outputs** | **Nature**
---|---|---
- Key Features of regulation,WP2 documents,Reference material | Intermediate report which includes :
- the final assessment
- and the justification material | Deliverable Intermediate report

A.4.1. Objective

The objective of this work-package is the development of the finalization of the impact assessment, the drafting of the regulatory material, the development of the associated justification material (including the impact assessment).

A.4.2. Task WP3.1: Finalisation of the Impact Assessment

On the basis of the preferred option identified at the previous work package (WP2.3):

- To propose an overall structure of the regulatory material
- To identify the preferred level of prescription
Define the overall structure of the regulatory materiel, the associated guidelines, in terms of preamble, enacting terms and Annexes.

Define the conditions regarding the oversight of RCS by the NSA, taking into account the existing SES regulatory framework.

A.4.3. Task WP3.2: Drafting the Regulatory Material

The objective of this task is the development of the draft regulatory material and the identification of needed community specifications.

In line with the outcomes of the regulatory approach and the proposed structure for the rule, guideline and support material, the work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- specify the preamble of the regulatory material;
- specify the regulatory provisions under each article and each annex;
- identify the community specification (existing, or to be further developed if any) associated to the regulatory material;
- Organise an internal review (i.e. WP2) of the regulatory material and its associated community specifications.

A.4.4. Task WP3.3: Drafting the justification material

The work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- Develop Part I “Justification of Design of the regulatory material” with:
  - The analysis of the objective and scope of the rule;
  - The Risk Classification Scheme for the design of ATM;
  - The analysis of the oversight of RCS;
  - The analysis of the implementation conditions.

- Develop Part II “Final Impact assessment” with:
  - The economic impact assessment;
  - The environmental impact assessment
  - The impact assessment on society (including on safety)
  - The impact upon other regulations.

The Part II will include the analysis of the replies of stakeholders, the comparison of the various alternatives options.

- Develop Part III: Overall structure of the regulatory material.

The results of the Work packages WP1, WP2 and WP3 will be re-used for the establishment of the justification material.

A.4.5. Deliverables

The deliverable is the Intermediate Report (D1) which includes the result of the previous work packages, the finalized impact assessment, the draft regulatory material and the associated justification material.
A.5. WP4 – Formal Consultation and Consolidation of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP4: Formal Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong> 170 man days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong> 181 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong> 24/04/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong> 17/12/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate report</td>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>Deliverable D2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.5.1. Objective

The objective of the task is to:

- Carry out formal consultation on the draft regulatory approach and draft regulatory material proposed in the draft final report submitted to the European Commission,
- Organise written consultation and workshops,
- Collect views and opinions of Stakeholders,
- Consolidation of comments.

A.5.2. Task WP4.1: Formal Consultation

The work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- Prepare the distribution list with notably national authorities (civil and military), civil and military ANSPs, airspace users’ organisations, international organisations, social and industry representatives,
- Prepare the consultation package,
- To prepare and to carry on workshops of stakeholders,
- Publish and distribute the consultation package.

A.5.3. Task WP4.2: Consolidation of Comments

The work to be achieved is broken-down as follows:

- Analyse and consolidate the views and comments expressed by Stakeholders on the proposed draft regulatory material,
- Prepare the draft final report (D2) with the outcomes of this review,
- Update the justification material in accordance with the outcomes of this review, if needed,
- Organise a workshop to present the results of the formal consultation.

A.5.4. Deliverables

- List of comments on the draft regulatory material,
- Draft final report (D2).
A.6. WP5 – Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP5: Final Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nature</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>Final report including all the input documents</td>
<td>Deliverable D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed support to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.6.1. Objective

The objective is to:

- Draft the cover paper introducing the different documents of the final report;
- Aggregate the different documents of the final report.

A.6.2. Task WP 5.1 – Support to stakeholders

The aim of this task is to define a package to support Stakeholders in the implementation of the regulatory material, especially the Eurocontrol states which are not members of the EU, willing to harmonize their respective legal provisions. The envisaged actions might, for example, support the planning of the implementation, awareness campaigns, training packages, support for the management of exemptions, etc.

The actions might also address the support for the supervision of compliance ensured by National Supervisory Authorities.

A.6.3. Task WP 5.2 – Preparation of the final report

- Draft the cover paper introducing the different documents of the final report;
- Aggregate the different documents of the final report;
- Draft the letter for the final delivery to the European Commission.

A.6.4. Deliverable

The deliverable is the final report.
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APPENDIX 2 – REFERENCE LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS FOR FORMAL CONSULTATION AND INVITATION TO WORKSHOPS

National Civil and Military Authorities
- Departments/ ministries of Transport and Defence of the EUROCONTROL/ECAC Member States
- Aviation Regulatory Authorities of the EUROCONTROL Member States
- FAA (Federal Aviation Administration)
- NAVCANADA
- US-Department of Defence

Air Navigation Service Providers
- Civil and Military Air Navigation Service Providers of the EUROCONTROL/ ECAC Member States

International Organisations
- ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organisation)
- EASA (European Aviation Safety Agency)
- ECAC (European Civil Aviation Conference)
- CANSO (Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation)
- JAA (Joint Aviation Authority)
- ACI (Airports Council International)

Airspace Users Organisations
- IATA (International Air Transport Association)
- IACCA (International Air Carrier Association)
- IAOPA (International Council of Aircraft Owner and Pilot Associations)
- EBAA (European Business Aviation Association)
- ERAA (European Regions Airlines Association)
- ELFAA (European Low Fares Airlines Association)
- AEA (Association of European Airlines)

Military Airspace Users
- NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation)
- Military Aviation Forces of the EUROCONTROL Member States

Industrial and Social Representatives
- IFALPA (International Federation of Air Line Pilot’s Associations)
- IFATCA (International Federation of Air Traffic Controller’s Associations)
- IFATSEA (International Federation of Air Traffic Safety Electronic Associations)
- ECA (The European Cockpit Association)
- AECMA (European Association of Aerospace Industries)
- EUROCAE (European Organisation for Civil Aviation Equipment)
- ATCEU (Air Traffic Controllers European Unions Coordination)
- ETF (European Transport Workers’ Federation)

EUROCONTROL Bodies (through their Chairman)
- CMIC (Civil / Military Interface Standing Committee)
- SRC (Safety Regulation Commission)
- PRC (Performance Review Commission)
- RC (Regulatory Committee)
- CESC (Chief Executive Standing Conference)
- SESAR (Single European Sky ATM Research)