



FABEC Implementation Phase

Optimal use HR resources

EC Information

Annex Q



Co-financed by the European Union
Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T)

DOCUMENT SUMMARY

Objective : Provide required evidence when establishing FABEC			
Origin : Chairman Committee HR/Training (SC HR/T)		Audience : FABEC Provisional Council, ANSCB, ASB, AFG, European Commission	
Title : EC Information Annex Q			
Reference : FABEC_AFG_EC Information_Annex Q_v1-0			
Version : 1.0	Date : 16.04.2012	Status : <input type="checkbox"/> Draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Released	Classification : <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FABEC limited <input type="checkbox"/> Addressees limited

DOCUMENT CHANGE RECORD

Version	Status	Date	Reason for changes	Author of changes
0.1	Draft	03 Mar 12	Initial draft	AFG
1.0	Released	16 Apr 12	DSIM initiative deleted	AFG

APPROVALS

Name: Jean-Renaud Gely	Signature:
Function: CM SC HR/T	
Date:	

QUALITY CONTROL

Name: Manuel De Klerck	Signature:
Function: AFG Quality Manager	
Date:	

ATTACHMENTS CONTAINED IN THIS ANNEX

ID	Origin	Status	Version	Date	Title
Q.1	SC HR/T	Draft		03 Mar 12	Training Services CBA
Q.2	SC HR/T	Final		03 Mar 12	(Extract) ATCO Basic Training Cooperation

1 INTRODUCTION

Functional Airspace Blocks have to be justified by their overall added value, including optimal use of human resources.

The implementation of FABEC includes changes to technical and operational as well as support systems, providing an equal challenge to all FABEC ANSP staff. Common systems and procedures are being promoted to harmonize working methods.

The FABEC context includes a more international dimension being added to most functions. Enhanced cooperation within FABEC on HR and Training matters generates a wider range of opportunities.

2 FABEC INITIATIVES IN THE HR AND TRAINING DOMAIN

2 initiatives are introduced in following paragraphs which took place within a FABEC context after the Feasibility Study report phase. Supporting evidence provided is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the FAB IR. More detailed information is available.

2.1 *FABEC Cooperation on Training*

FABEC cooperation in training was identified as a measure adding economic value and becomes effective gradually on a short to medium term basis. Implementation of a common operational concept in combination with a convergence in common technical systems and services enables an opportunity for cooperation in the area of training for ATCOs and ATSEPs. The established FABEC NSA Committee is an important enabler to get full benefits from cooperation in training.

The existing recruitment, and initial training systems in the FABEC ANSPs exhibit a number of differences (deriving from differences in operational needs, educational background and other influences such as culture and language), but there are also a number of commonalities and opportunities to cooperate to maximise the success rates of initial training and to improve cost effectiveness. The associated evolutionary process leads from sharing of information and materials in the short term, through common development and some common courses in the medium term, to generalised common courses in the long term. The application of this process may differ between the phases of training - as for example the content and format of unit training largely depends on (local) operational needs - making harmonisation more difficult than in the initial training phase.

In general, the evolutionary process in cooperation on ATSEP training is similar to that for ATCO training.

Based on the results of the Feasibility Study Report, it was decided to launch a Training Task Force.

The Training Task Force developed a Training Services Business Case aiming at optimizing training processes and results by a collaborative approach amongst FABEC training organizations and processes and assesses their financial and structural impact. The case is focused on quality, cost efficiency and implementation. It was recognized that optimization could be achieved in the fields of Recruitment and Selection, Initial Training ATCO, Initial Training ATSEP, Competence Scheme, Development Training, Sales and Regulation Management. The Business Case also evaluated 4 institutional scenarios.

FABEC CEOs accepted the Training Services Business Case in the spring of 2011. The FABEC Training Services Business Case was drafted at FABEC level and did not demonstrate the impact on individual ANSPs. FABEC CEOs therefore decided to start a

detailed FABEC Training Services Cost Benefit Analysis to understand and agree on the impact of the different Training Initiatives.

The results of this analysis is given in Attachment 1 and will lead to further action and decision making within a FABEC context.

2.2 FABEC Agreement on ATCO Basic Training

The cooperation within FABEC is advanced - most notably through the agreed Common Core Content specifications - allowing for the joint provision of ATCO Basic Training. Additionally, a FABEC common basic course is seen as the enabler for a flexible allocation of ATCO trainees within the FABEC training system according to this systems' capacity. The joint provision of training courses allows all participating partners to gain valuable experience for the future training provision within a FABEC context.

The specific need of EUROCONTROL Maastricht UAC for Basic Training also needed to be taken into account. It was not clear if EUROCONTROL Institute in Luxembourg (IANS) - as former supplier for Maastricht UAC – would continue to offer this specific product.

Therefore, as Maastricht UAC generates a need for Basic ATCO Training courses for 24 to 36 trainees per annum (representing approximately 6% of the overall FABEC basic trainees), a sustainable solution to the provision of basic training was required in the short term, aiming at increased utilization of existing basic training infrastructure within FABEC training entities and contributing to an optimization of overhead.

All FABEC training entities supported a joint approach to offer the training within FABEC through a cooperation agreement, allowing for both the allocation of their own training needs as well as offering the necessary capacity to Maastricht UAC in the overall FABEC training system.

A Cooperation Agreement between FABEC partners was signed during spring 2011 and an extract of the FABEC ATCO Basic Training Cooperation Agreement is given in Attachment 2.



FABEC Implementation Phase

FABEC Training Services CBA

EC Information

Attachment Q.1



Co-financed by the European Union
Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T)

Page intentionally left blank

FABEC Training Services

CBA reviewing the FABEC Training Services Business Case

Draft report

Executive Summary

This study was produced under contract A/M/A&L/S/C1 – IO 48965. The aim of the study was to provide an overview of the FABEC training initiatives and the associated financial implications to the individual ANSPs. The report describes the options for cooperation in the given area, as seen by the individual ANSPs and training organisations within FABEC and should be seen as the ‘next step’ from the previous study represented by the “Business Case for FABEC Training Services” document, prepared in February 2011, which focused on the FABEC level.

This report is based on provisional draft elements of the study that have to be consolidated and approved.

Objectives of the study

This study provides:

- A summary of current/expected FABEC ANSP involvement in selected areas within the FABEC training domain;
- An initial view on financial effects to FABEC ANSPs resulting from the current/expected activities under the selected areas within the FABEC training domain;
- A summary of observations and findings relevant to the FABEC training domain, as concluded in the course of the study.

The study should allow FABEC CEOs to decide on opt-in or opt-out for the different training initiatives

Scope

The scope of the study is defined by the areas of cooperation as identified in the original Business Case and is geographically defined by the FABEC States and the relevant training organisations/ANSPs: Belgocontrol, DFS, ENAC/DSNA, LVNL, MUAC and skyguide. ANA Luxembourg is not considered in this report because of the size of the ANSP and the minor role in the FABEC training domain.

The cooperation in the training domain has evolved in the meantime, but this report is based in the original Business Case endorsed by the FABEC CEOs.

Approach

The Business Case served as the starting point for this study in terms of defining the potential areas of cooperation, along with an initial consideration of the estimated benefits from individual measures.

The original objective of this study was to undertake a cost-benefit analysis of the FABEC Training Services. The cost-benefit analysis was required to evaluate the costs and benefits of the Training Services initiatives and to assess whether the projects would bring positive benefits.

During the initial stages of the work, it became clear that FABEC ANSPs did not have identical understanding of the original business case and that there was no general buy-in from all FABEC ANSPs to the approach taken in the Business Case and the results. Consequently, it was agreed by the project team that this study would take a “bottom-up” approach, and would review the Business Case work and liaise closely with individual FABEC ANSPs to understand their perspective on costs and benefits for each initiative. The agreed objective was to provide traceable, transparent sources of costs and benefits and to involve the individual ANSPs directly in the study to ensure a common understanding of what was being proposed for Training Services cooperation.

The content of this report is based on the outcomes of workshops and bilateral interviews undertaken with the six ANSPs. The interviews were the primary means of capturing the data from the ANSPs, both quantitative and qualitative, which was subsequently used to determine the

aggregate FABEC layer whilst having a detailed understanding what the impact is for each FABEC ANSP involved in the study.

Financial analyses are based on the expected benefits and costs stemming from the specific measures/actions, as indicated by the individual ANSPs. We have assumed constant price levels for the costs and benefit timelines.

Training initiatives and opportunities for cooperation

The study analysed and assessed the potential benefits in the following areas of cooperation:

Recruitment and selection;

Initial training for ATSEPs;

Initial training for ATCOs;

Competence scheme;

Development training;

Sales;

Regulation management.

To provide better granularity, each opportunity was examined at the sub-initiative level.

ANSPs response to initiatives

The opportunity and willingness to engage in the different initiatives and sub-initiatives varied between ANSPs. The ANSPs' responses to each sub-initiative are summarised below.

Recruitment and selection

In relation to **joint marketing activities**, LVNL rather sees benefits with regard to the marketing effect in a common recruitment stand with MUAC and/or Belgocontrol, on the basis that other partners are involved. However, neither Belgocontrol nor MUAC see benefit. MUAC has previously had a joint stand with LVNL and did not see it as the best solution. Skyguide and DFS already cooperate on a joint stand at recruitment fairs and consider it beneficial. ENAC wants to keep strong its own brand.

The proposal to **exchange applicant data to improve the accuracy of the selection process** is only seen as beneficial to skyguide who already cooperate with DFS in this initiative. DFS is cooperating with skyguide, but sees no quantified benefit.

In terms of **preventing the multi-testing of applicants**, Belgocontrol only consider French and Dutch language and are already participating in the BASS/KWEST system. MUAC participates in KWEST and considers that benefits can be achieved from this initiative with no additional costs. ENAC and LVNL foresee no benefits. Skyguide sees benefits, on the basis that other partners, DFS or ENAC are participants. The foreseen benefit per eliminated applicant varies considerable between ANSPs (from €10k benefit by eliminating 20-30 candidates according to MUAC, to €40k benefit by eliminating 8 candidates according to DFS) because recruitment and selection cost of ANSPs per applicant are quite different.

Skyguide and DFS are already cooperating in the initiative to **focus on just two main selection tools**. The benefits for skyguide are around €30k from 2013, but there are no benefits for DFS. LVNL also sees benefits, but these could be achieved without cooperation with other civil partners. Collaboration on national level with the RNLAf is expected to release these benefits.

It should be emphasised that partners within the 'clusters' in the Recruitment and Selection initiative are already working closely together in the given area and towards usage of a single selection tool within these clusters.

Initial training for ATSEPs

LVNL, DFS and skyguide see a one-off benefit in 2013 of developing a common course based on the **Eurocontrol Common Core Content requirements**. DFS and skyguide see a further annual productivity benefit stemming from the savings in maintenance of the course.

Skyguide also see productivity benefits of **exchanging students and eliminating ATSEP basic courses beyond economic sustainable class sizes**. Some courses could be dropped each year, and common developments of ATSEP qualification modules could be organized depending on whether the other ANSPs (LVNL, MUAC, Belgocontrol) which are considered by skyguide as candidates for this sub-initiative also participate. However, these ANSPs do not see this productivity benefit as applicable to them.

Only skyguide see benefits of reducing operating costs through the **exchange of instructors to cover local peak demand**. DFS do not see costs or benefits, but do indicate they could cooperate with skyguide in this area, and that they have the capacity available to cope with additional demand at no extra cost.

A limited number of equipment items (estimated 10% of the total number) were identified to support the initiative **to develop training for joint systems/equipment training for identical equipment**.

Initial training for ATCOs

The **development of a common ATCO basic course** is seen as an enabler and is supported by all ANSPs. There are significant one-off incremental staff costs but no direct benefits.

The second element of this initiative proposed the **delivery of a common ATCO basic course in FABEC** including establishing the means of exchanging instructors. Most ANSPs saw no realistic means of implementing this initiative. Only skyguide see specific benefits materialising; however, this is only valid if there is at least one other partner in this activity; otherwise the overall benefit is zero.

The proposal to **share the maintenance of a common ATCO basic course** at FABEC-level was well received by most ANSPs. Significant annual savings for a number of the ANSPs were stated. The initiative brings productivity benefits, although incremental staff costs are incurred.

It should be noted that although the benefits contained in the sub-initiatives around the ATCO Basic course (development, delivery, maintenance) are not high, it is one of the areas where there is a clear intention for cooperation between the partners, as it is a starting point for closer cooperation in future.

Most ANSPs identified practical difficulties and saw the ability to **exchange trainees and have multiple course start dates** within FABEC system as only a vision at this stage. skyguide and DFS did not comment on the initiative.

The final sub-initiative was the proposal to **harmonize rating training standards**. This was again considered to be impractical at present.

Competence scheme

The **exchange of course modules for annual competence, refresher and emergency training** to eliminate multiple effort for development of courses was supported, at least in part, by all ANSPs. Most FABEC partners would opt-in and all recognise the potential benefits.

Development training

The potential to **exchange trainees to increase class sizes and balance supply of available courses to demand** was recognised by most FABEC partners for some parts of development training. Belgocontrol and MUAC do not see specific benefits in the activity while the rest of group expects some productivity benefits.

Sales

The sales initiative proposes that **spare FABEC capacity is jointly marketed to generate additional revenues**. There was some scepticism and uncertainty about the scope of the initiative and how it would be implemented. Only skyguide identified additional revenues but since these are dependent on cooperation from other parties, the benefits to skyguide in this initiative is considered to be limited at this stage.

Regulation management

A **joint approach to regulation management** has a potential to bring benefits for individual ANSPs which were stated to range from marginal to 0.5 FTE per year.

Some ANSPs identified potential benefits as a result of **establishing a common entity representing FABEC** that could represent FABEC and undertake preparatory works for new EASA IRs. Monetary savings were only expressed by LVNL; however, there was some indication from others that the 'single voice' may have some potential for minor benefits.

The matrix below shows the sub-initiatives relevant to regulation management with 'opt-ins' as the stakeholders see benefit or interest in a stronger political positioning even with the lack of direct financial or productivity benefits.

Costs and Benefits

The following types of benefits would be defined for the purposes of this study:

Productivity benefit – represents reduced effort resulting in productivity gain rather than staff reduction opportunity;

Staff reduction benefit – represents substantial reduction of effort invested in an activity; and

Reduction of other direct operating costs – represents reduction of costs other than staff employment cost.

Cost types considered in this study are also split into two categories:

Incremental staff costs – representing additional effort required, expressed as increased staff employment costs; and

Incremental other direct operating costs – representing additional costs other than staff employment costs.

Opt-in and Opt-out

The following table provides a high level overview of clear Opt-in options which could be identified between FABEC ANSPs.

Opt-in = activity line where (nearly) all FABEC partners intend to join

Opt-in 2 = activity line where – due to given conditions – preferably the 3 BeNeLux partners cooperate as a group

Opt-in 3 = activity line where – due to given conditions – preferably DFS and skyguide cooperate as a group

The opt-in matrix below highlights those sub-initiatives where more structured cooperation between some or all of the partners is possible as opposed to ad-hoc cooperation to cover for occasional unforeseen situations. The general perception of the stakeholders is that such ad-hoc cooperation would be possible in majority of the sub-initiatives; such cooperation, however, can be achieved with the current contractual cooperation framework, i.e. it does not require more formal FABEC structures.

	Belgocontrol	DFS	ENAC	LVNL	MUAC	skyguide
Recruitment and selection						
Joint Marketing		Opt-in 3				Opt-in 3
Exchange data	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3		Opt-in 2	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3
Prevent multi-testing	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3		Opt-in 2	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3
Common selection tools	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3		Opt-in 2	Opt-in 2	Opt-in 3
Initial training ATSEP						
Student exchange for Basic course		Opt-in 3				Opt-in 3
Exchange instructors for Basic course		Opt-in 3				Opt-in 3
Initial training ATCO						
Develop Common ATCO Basic course	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in
Deliver Common ATCO Basic course at different locations	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in		Opt-in
Maintain Common ATCO Basic course	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in		Opt-in
Competence scheme						
Exchange course modules	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in
Development training						
Maintain common courses		Opt-in 3	Opt-in 3			Opt-in 3
Sales						
Deploy spare training capacity						
Regulation management						
Eliminate multi NSA work	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in
Joint positioning EASA	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in	Opt-in

It can be observed that there is a high potential between DFS and skyguide to opt in together in a high number of initiatives. For recruitment and selection, a close continued cooperation between Belgocontrol, MUAC and LVNL is indicated. For the development and maintenance of some courses there are opportunities where all FABEC partners can be involved.

To understand any blank area in the matrix, a reader should refer to the more detailed information in the report.

FABEC-wide results

The financial analysis shows that the major type of benefit at the FABEC level is productivity gain benefits (expressed as monetary savings in this report). This is a result of the frequent indication by training organisation representatives that the measures within sub-initiatives can only reduce staff workload, rather than lead to short term headcount savings.

FABEC-wide results are the result of the aggregation of the ANSP inputs. The tables below provide the FABEC-wide undiscounted benefits and costs for the whole period of the analysis.

Benefits

ANSP/training organisation	Productivity benefits 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 290,000
MUAC	€ 52,000
ENAC	€ 2,233,400
LVNL	€ 1,144,000
Skyguide	€ 3,904,700
DFS	€ 1,274,000

ANSP/training organisation	Reduction of DOCs 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 0
MUAC	€ 130,000
ENAC	€ 0
LVNL	€ 3,985,000
Skyguide	€ 818,000
DFS	€ 520,000

ANSP/training organisation	Revenue benefits 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 0
MUAC	€ 0
ENAC	€ 0
LVNL	€ 0
Skyguide	€ 0
DFS	€ 0

ANSP/training organisation	Staff reduction benefits 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 0
MUAC	€ 0
ENAC	€ 0
LVNL	€ 0
Skyguide	€ 0
DFS	€ 0

Costs

ANSP/training organisation	Incremental staff costs 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 314,000
MUAC	€ 83,000
ENAC	€ 1,115,500
LVNL	€ 1,450,000
Skyguide	€ 223,500
DFS	€ 390,000

ANSP/training organisation	Incremental DOCs 2011-2025
Belgocontrol	€ 0
MUAC	€ 0
ENAC	€ 0
LVNL	€ 0
Skyguide	€ 0
DFS	€ 0

ANSP-level

The NPV values for individual ANSPs vary significantly, from negative values (Belgocontrol, -€114.9k) to significant positive values (skyguide, €2.6m) – a result of different views on the same sub-initiative/measure by different ANSPs, resulting in significantly different costs and benefits associated with the same activity.

NPV

ANSP/training organisation	NPV
Belgocontrol	€-114,900
MUAC	€ 26,600
ENAC	€ 594,100
LVNL	€ 2,162,200
Skyguide	€ 2,621,500
DFS	€ 756,900

Conclusions

Different perception of cooperation and priorities

The difference in the needs and 'motivation' to opt in can be significant - from willingness to invest for the benefit of others while seeing no direct benefit to own entity (but at the same time looking to spark the FABEC spirit to create the ground for cooperation in other areas) to focusing on producing additional revenue for their own organisation.

The willingness to participate is also influenced by an organisation's thinking in terms of future cooperation. Where some entities think more along the lines of pragmatic solutions, other organisations tend to favour training as a business.

A common training concept

Whilst a number of FAB-level training objectives have been defined, the level of participation and potential benefits would benefit from a common FABEC training concept which would provide focus and define a coherent long-term vision for cooperation and thus contribute in achieving consensus between the partners. Such training concept should underpin a FABEC operational and technical concept on how services are delivered by qualified staff.

New initiatives at FABEC level (e.g. FRA project) might as well create FABEC opportunities for specific common training. The view is that new initiatives are not constrained by existing

requirements and established processes to fulfil these requirements (which often translate in difficulties in trying to find a common ground in the associated training); therefore the opportunity to 'start from scratch' in defining training requirements for new initiatives can facilitate closer cooperation in other areas of training.

In addition, there are several examples of sub-initiatives in which entities intend to pursue bilateral or trilateral cooperation arrangements and in other cases where there are already working arrangements in place between limited numbers of partners. This may be a starting point for more global cooperation.

Learning lessons for FABEC as a whole

Whilst it is clear that the financial benefits from cooperating in training are less than originally anticipated, the lessons learned in developing cooperation in the training domain can bring benefit to FABEC as a whole - in particular, the need for domains to have a common concept which supports an approved FABEC vision and strategy.

Cooperation will produce benefits

Despite the challenges, a number of benefits were identified. Potential for cooperation was assessed and a summary of the results given the likely take-up by ANSPs is summarised below:

The major type of benefit at the FABEC level is productivity gain benefits expressed as monetary savings. There are substantial savings expected in direct operating costs (other than staff costs), which are mostly linked to the selection processes and the licence fees related to these processes.

On the cost side, there is a substantial amount of incremental staff costs which stem from the need for coordination and hence increased workload, but also from additional activities associated with the measures to be introduced within the sub-initiatives. At the same time, there are only negligible additional direct operating costs currently expected by the training organisations.

Currently, only skyguide sees benefits from the additional revenues (attributable to FABEC); however, the main drawback is the fact that there is no agreement on the key aspects of the sales-related arrangements.

NPV values for individual ANSPs vary significantly. Whilst the synthesis of Belgocontrol inputs shows a negative NPV for the observed period (-€114.9k), the NPV figure for skyguide is above €2.6m. This is, inter alia, due to very different views on the same sub-initiatives/measures by different ANSPs, resulting in significantly different costs and benefits expected from the same activity.

It is clear from the results that the potential benefits are smaller than those previously proposed in the Business Case. All this is primarily because there is limited interest for some of the proposed initiatives by some of the ANSPs and because the potential benefits - particularly those relating to the sales initiative were over-estimated in the original Business Case.

Page intentionally left blank



FABEC Implementation Phase

**FABEC ATCO Basic Training
Cooperation Agreement**

EC Information

Attachment Q.2



Co-financed by the European Union
Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T)

Page intentionally left blank



ATCO Basic Training

COOPERATION AGREEMENT

Version 1.0

EXTRACT COOPERATION AGREEMENT

Article 1: Parties

This Cooperation Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and among

the European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL), Rue de la Fusée, 96, 1130 Bruxelles, hereinafter referred to as "**EUROCONTROL**", represented by its Director General, Mr David McMillan;

DFS Deutsche Flugsicherung GmbH, Am DFS-Campus 10, D-63225 Langen, hereinafter referred to as "**DFS**", represented by its Chief executive officer, Mr Dieter Kaden;

the French Republic, acting collectively via the Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile represented by the Direction des Services de la Navigation Aérienne, hereinafter referred to as "**DSNA**", represented by its Director, Mr Maurice Georges, whose principal place of business is 50 rue Henry-Farman 75720 Paris Cedex 15; and via the **Ecole nationale d'aviation civile, ENAC**, represented by its Director, Mr Marc Houalla, whose principal place business is 7 avenue Edouard Belin 31055 Toulouse France

Skyguide, Swiss air navigation services Ltd, route de Pré-Bois 15-17, P.O. Box 796, 1215 Geneva 15, Switzerland, hereinafter referred to as "**Skyguide**", represented by its Chief Executive Officer, Mr Daniel Weder; and

BELGOCONTROL, Tervuursesteenweg 303, 1820 Steenokkerzeel, hereinafter referred to as "**Belgocontrol**", represented by its Chief Executive Officer, Mr Jean-Claude Tintin;

Luchtverkeersleiding Nederland, a legal entity governed by public law and established by the Aviation Act (*Wet Luchtverkeer*) of 18 June 1992 (*Staatsblad* 1992, 368), hereinafter referred to as Air Traffic Control The Netherlands "**ATC-NL**", domiciled at (1117 CV) Stationsplein Zuid-West 1001, Schiphol-Oost, the Netherlands, represented by its Chief Executive Officer/Chairman of the Executive Board, Mr Paul Riemens;

Administration de la navigation aérienne, BP 273, L-2012 Luxembourg, hereinafter referred to as "**ANA**", represented by its Director, Mr Ender Ulcun;

Article 2: Purpose of this Agreement

- 2.1. The purpose of this Agreement is to:
- a) enable the Parties to jointly provide air traffic controller basic training to the Parties of this Agreement in compliance with the core objectives and the overall course content established pursuant to:
 - (i) Directive 2006/23/EC, ESARR 5 and
 - (ii) the EUROCONTROL specifications for ATCO Common Core Content Initial Training (EUROCONTROL Spec-0113);
 - b) coordinate the request/s for training and the capacity of the Parties' training units in order to make the best possible use of available capacity to carry out training course/s;
 - c) specify how the Parties will answer the training needs and standards of performance;
 - d) define the rights and obligations of the Parties against each other, including, but not limited to, their internal liability;
 - e) contribute to the harmonisation of the training content, planning and execution without prejudice to ongoing initiatives on the future FABEC training;
 - f) provide an intermediate approach to bridge the gap towards the implementation of a more integrated FABEC solution for training;
 - g) generate economies of scale through joint provision of training courses;
- 2.2. Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to create a formal organisation or legal entity amongst the Parties.
- 2.3. This Agreement shall be without prejudice to agreements entered into by the Parties concerning training of their own personnel.

Article 3: Governance

- 3.1. This Agreement will be governed by a Steering Committee.
- 3.2. Each Party shall designate one (1) representative to the Steering Committee and notify in writing the name to the other Parties, except the French Republic which may designate two (2) representatives acting collectively.
- 3.3. The main tasks of the Steering Committee are:
- a) define training courses for the purpose of this Agreement (content, duration, entry and exit levels) without prejudice to the definition of courses within the FABEC programme;
 - b) approve the allocation of the training courses and distribution of the packages as set out in Annex A to Parties' training units, matching demand and available capacities to the widest extent.
 - c) oversee the progress and planning;
 - d) take corrective actions;
 - e) propose amendments to this Agreement and/or its Annexes, including the cost sharing arrangements.

Page intentionally left blank