



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities DG

Social Dialogue, Social Rights, Working Conditions, Adaptation to Change  
**Social Dialogue, Industrial Relations**

### SECTORAL DIALOGUE COMMITTEE CIVIL AVIATION

#### **ATM working group meeting 24 June 2010 Concise minutes (adopted on 25 November 2010)**

Chair: morning: Mr Etienne (workers), afternoon: Mr Martis (employers)

#### **1. Adoption of the agenda and the minutes of the last meeting (18 March 2010)**

Participants introduced themselves. The agenda was adopted with one change in the order of the points. The minutes were adopted with changes in section 3 and 4.

#### **2. ATSEP's competence scheme**

ETF updated the participants on recent developments. Together with CANSO, they would continue working together within EASA (rulemaking group ATM.001). CANSO announced they would need more time for getting a wider feedback from its membership before proceeding.

#### **3. Feedback on CANSO social dialogue strategy**

Mr Hutchins (CANSO) introduced the employers' internal document and invited the workers' side to give their feedback. The document had already been discussed by CANSO's CEOs who would formally approve it in the coming days. As far as FABs were concerned, the CEOs had confirmed that FABs were an issue for discussion related to social changes (arising from technical changes), but not technical changes as such.

ETF thanked CANSO for their openness to share their internal document. For ETF, the document was a starting point to work together even though they did not share all points (difficulties with points 3.1, 3.2 and 4). ETF regretted that issues such as gender issues or stress at work were not on the list of possible subjects. This was not in line with the reference to "working practices" under point 1. ETF also did not agree with the negative statement that agreements should be concluded to avoid legislation. CANSO thanked for these remarks and considered that the gender issues and stress at work could be addressed under the heading "attraction and retention". The term "working practices" certainly referred to national bargaining issues.

For ATCEUC who had sent editing comments before, the documents was fine provided that the employers would have the possibility and will to change their opinion after discussing an item with the workers' side.

After discussion, it was agreed not to develop a joint strategy but rather concentrate on the joint long term agenda.

#### **4. Long term agenda and work programme**

CANSO presented their working draft "Social dialogue. Long term candidate items – CSDP reflections" (May 2010) containing the items mobility, training and FABs. In ETF's view, CANSO put too much focus on the review; one should also look where to go and how to improve the situation. The text as such was not acceptable but the workers' side agreed with the three priorities. ATCEUC agreed to put FABs as first priority, stressing that mobility and training were linked to FABs even if they could be dealt with independently. ATCEUC could not agree with all parts of the document but considered it as a basis for discussion. CANSO replied that one should first assess the present situation and then see if further action was needed. A discussion on the link or hierarchy between the different levels of social dialogue (at national, at FAB, at European level) followed. CANSO saw them in a horizontal way, independent from each other. ETF and ATCEUC agreed that the three layers were horizontal (collective bargaining remaining at national level), but there were nevertheless links: at FAB level, providers needed to talk to national unions composing the FAB (the latter can involve their supranational organisation). The EU level was helpful to provide guidance on how to best organise social dialogue at FAB level. ATCEUC deplored that there was lack of compliance with the 2007 guidelines to which CANSO had subscribed. CANSO still considered these guidelines as a reference having added value. The employers suggested verifying if the guidelines needed to be updated and whether another questionnaire exercise had to be repeated. As far as training and mobility was concerned, CANSO considered that these items should be discussed between both sides of industry at FAB level (self-determination). ETF understood CANSO's fear that the EU social partners could drive the FABs' agenda on training and mobility but reassured that such an ambition was inexistent. Both sides agreed that there was need for assessment and reflection.

Eventually, it was agreed to discuss these issues further in a small working group, in particular the clarification on the right level of discussion. An ad hoc meeting was fixed for 27 September with 5 delegates per side of industry<sup>1</sup>. Meanwhile, ATCEUC would prepare a joint project proposal by the end of August to be submitted in response to the social dialogue call for proposals.

#### **5. Information from DG Mobility and Transport (DG MOVE)**

Ms Thomas (DG MOVE) informed the social partners of the next steps related to the single European sky (see slide presentation on the new regulatory approach). The exchange of views touched upon the following subjects (the list is not exhaustive): the definition of the term "human factor" (no harmonised use between ICAO, the Madrid conference and the EASA rulemaking group ATM.001); appropriate social partner consultation on network management functions and guidelines; crisis management of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The preparatory e-mail exchange would include 4 ATCEUC and 6 ETF delegates.

EU (volcanic ash) and the time pressure resulting from the decided acceleration of the single European sky.

As far as consultation arrangements in the single European sky framework were concerned, Ms Thomas announced that she would send the latest version of the draft Commission decision (aimed at setting up an expert group) to the social partners. She explained the choice of this type of group which was necessary to allow for reimbursements. The social partners gave already some feedback on the draft, including the scope of social partner consultation which should not be restricted to three items. The workers' side also asked to be properly consulted on the burning issues (while waiting for the setting-up of the specific expert group), namely the target setting on ANS performance for the first reference period, management network functions implementing rules (IR) and FAB guidance material IR. The information should be sent as soon as possible and a specific consultation meeting would be welcome.

## **6. EASA activity review**

Mr Liorzou (ETF) reported on recent EASA developments regarding the ATCO licensing draft IR and other EASA draft IR. He mentioned that for the first time EASA was addressing the human factor/performance. CANSO said that the Commission should clarify the definition (human factor, see above). The workers' side informed CANSO that it was sometimes difficult for their experts to identify the CANSO view in EASA's different working groups since CANSO's experts often talked on behalf of their respective ANSP. It would be beneficial if the experts of both sides of industry could have an exchange of views on the issues at stake.

## **7. Common position on the single European sky implementation**

ETF wondered whether a common expression on the implementation of the second SES package was possible. CANSO said that they did not know yet which would be the employers' main points to address. Since the Commission would make available related documentation on 2 August only, CANSO's position would be defined in the second half of August. ETF reiterated its wish to try to come to a common view.

## **8. Any other business**

The next working group meetings are planned for 25 November 2010 and 24 February 2011 (tbc). In addition, a one-off ad hoc subgroup meeting on FABs was fixed for 27 September 2010.

**List of participants 24 June 2010**

<p><u>Employers (11 ♂, 4 ♀):</u></p> <p><i>CANSO:</i> Ms Arello (IT) Ms Bender (DE) Mr Cazalis (FR) Mr Cerny (CZ) Mr Friese (DE) Mr Fuscaldi (IT) Mr Hutchins (UK) Mr Josefsson (SE) Mr Liu (NL) Mr Martis (<i>CANSO</i>) Mr Michalak (PL) Mr Muir (UK) Ms Rullier (<i>CANSO</i>) Mr Schöneck (HU) Ms Willert (DE)</p>	<p><u>Workers(17 ♂, 0 ♀):</u></p> <p><i>ETF:</i> Mr Antoniani (IT) Mr Ballestero (<i>ETF</i>) Mr Dworzynski (PL) Mr Etienne (FR) Mr Fischer (DE) Mr Graham (UK) Mr Joffrin (FR) Mr Lakatos (HU) Mr Liorzou (FR) Mr Markov (BG) Mr Martynek (PL) Mr Mooney (<i>IFATSEA</i>) Mr Payr (AT) Mr Rubini (IT)</p> <p><i>ATCEUC:</i> Mr Burgues (<i>ATCEUC</i>) Mr Sacchetti (IT) Mr Wörz (<i>IFATCA</i>)</p>
<p><u>European Commission:</u></p> <p>Ms Durst (DG EMPL/F.1) Ms Thomas (DG MOVE/E.2)</p>	