European Commission

Study of certain aspects of Council Regulation 95/93

on common rules for the allocation of slots at Community airports

Annexes to the final report – 20 May 2000

CONTENTS

I Austria

Capacity assessments and the designation process

1.1 Airport designation in Austria is the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Science and Transport. Austria has no fully co-ordinated or co-ordinated airports.

1.2 Vienna airport has been classified as SCR according to the IATA schedule co-ordination definitions since the early 1980s. The Austrian Civil Aviation Authority stated that the SCR status was initially necessary in order to ensure safety and efficiency within its ground handling operations. The co-ordinator added that he believed that the need for (SCR) co-ordination at Vienna was also necessitated by wide-ranging capacity limitations on the runway, the taxiways and at the gates.

1.3 Austrian Airlines recently requested and commissioned "Gesellschaft fur Luftverkehrsforschung bR" to undertake a *full* capacity analysis of Vienna airport with the intention of assessing whether or not there is a need to designate the airport. We were informed that the results of the study have been discussed with the Austrian Civil Aviation Authority but as yet, have not been made public.

1.4 IATA recently received a request from the Vienna Airport Authority (through the schedule co-ordinator) to provide a proposal for conducting a capacity analysis of Vienna airport. To date, IATA has not received confirmation from the airport authority with regards to proceeding with the analysis.

1.5 To date, no interested parties have lodged an official complaint to the Austrian government regarding the co-ordination status of the airport. However, through our interviews with representatives of IATA and IACA, it was generally believed that this airport should become fully co-ordinated due to its lack of runway capacity.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

1.6 Since Vienna airport has not been designated, there are no specific capacity determination studies to analyse in accordance with the Article 6 of the Regulation. However, we understand that the local airport co-ordinators are responsible for carrying out the biannual assessments of capacity in consultation with the user airlines, ATC and the handling companies.

1.7 The Austrian Civil Aviation Authority informed us that there is congestion on the runway during certain hours across the week.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

1.8 The key runway co-ordination parameters at the airport for the Summer 1999 season were as follows:

Airport:	Vienna
Runway:	
Max. movements/10 mins	9
Max. arrivals or departures/10 mins	8/8
Max. movements/hour	54
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	48/48

1.9 For the Winter 1999 season, the 10-minute parameter was withdrawn and replaced by (an extended) 5-minute parameter of 5 movements (with a maximum of either 4 arrivals or departures). The hourly parameter was extended to 60 movements (with a maximum of 48 arrivals or departures).

1.10 We were provided with the breakdown for a peak week in September 1999, of the slots available and the slots used, along with an NAC chart for Summer 1999.

Co-ordinator

Overview

1.11 Scheduling Co-ordination Austria (SCA) carries out the co-ordination function. SCA consists of four persons in total, including a schedule co-ordinator. Local co-ordinators in the three largest[1] Austrian airports provide additional assistance to SCA.

1.12 The co-ordination function is fully financed by Austrian Airlines. Austrian Airlines appointed the current schedule co-ordinator when co-ordination began at Vienna Airport in 1969. The Austrian CAA intends to appoint all future co-ordinators in consultation with Austrian Airlines and other interested parties. The current schedule co-ordinator will retire in July 2001, by which time he believes the current slot co-ordination set-up will have been reformed.

1.13 The schedule co-ordinator co-ordinates the schedules of airlines in accordance with the available capacities as determined by the airport authorities. The Austrian CAA ensures that the schedule co-ordinator is acting in a fair, independent and transparent manner.

1.14 In March 1996, Austrian Airlines changed the working contracts, stating that all co-ordinators are now ‘dispensed from your obligation to serve Austrian Airlines in all loyalty and follow orders in matters that concern schedule co-ordination’.

1.15 It is important to note that the schedule co-ordinator remains an Austrian Airlines employee and as a result, his true level of independence from the national airline remains open to debate. However, the schedule co-ordinator stated that he operates with the maximum possible degree of independence, given the institutional set-up of SCA.

[1] namely Vienna, Linz and Salzburg airports.

1.16 As Vienna is neither a co-ordinated nor a fully co-ordinated airport, monitoring of slot usage only takes place in rather basic way. It is the intention of the airport to upgrade its software to improve this process. We understand that Vienna airport's information systems are only connected to SCA's and not to any other department within Austrian Airlines. However, this is not the case for the other Austrian airports subject to schedule co-ordination by SCA.

1.17 Negotiations between Austrian air carriers have started in order to set-up an independent company for the purposes of slot co-ordination at Vienna airport and data collection at the other Austrian airports. Each Austrian air carrier would take shares in the newly formed company in proportion to their share of slots at Vienna airport. The Austrian government may also take a 10% minority stake in the company.

1.18 Organisational restructuring is expected to happen in the very near future. The Austrian CAA informed us that all aspects of the Regulation would be complied with if it decides to change the status of Vienna airport to co-ordinated or fully co-ordinated.

Co-ordination Committees

Status

1.19 As Vienna airport is neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated, there are no co-ordination committees in existence.

II Belgium

Capacity assessments and the designation process

2.1 Responsibility for airport designation in Belgium lies with the Federal Ministry of Transport and Mobility. In its response to our initial questionnaire, the Ministry stated that Brussels-Zaventem airport is officially classified a 'co-ordinated' airport. However, this contradicts the opinion of the co-ordinator, who believes that no such designation has ever been made. Indeed, following further consultation with the Ministry there does appear to be considerable confusion amongst all parties as to the exact status of the airport. Therefore, for the purpose of this report we shall assume that Brussels-Zaventem is a not a designated airport.

2.2 Brussels-Zaventem airport is currently classified as SCR under the IATA schedule definitions.

2.3 An airside capacity study for **Brussels-Zaventem** airport has just been completed. However to date, we have not been provided with a copy. Eurocontrol produced the study, with assistance from Belgacontrol, IATA, various Belgian airlines, the Brussels airport operator (BIAC) and the co-ordination committee. The findings of the report were recently shown to the Belgian Civil Aviation Administration.

2.4 We were informed that the preference of all parties concerned was to change the airport's status to 'fully co-ordinated' as of 1 April 2000. However, the change in status has been delayed, following a request by the Commission for a full capacity analysis to be carried out (i.e. one that examines terminal and stand/gate utilisation as well).

2.5 We received complaints from IATA over the order in which the Regulation has been implemented in Belgium. A co-ordination committee has been formed both before designation and prior to the completion of a full capacity analysis (i.e. airside and landside).

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

2.6 Brussels Slots Co-ordination (BSC) carries out a biannual assessment of the co-ordination parameters for each scheduling season. However, it is likely that the airport authority, BIAC, will take over responsibility for producing this study in the future. Once produced, the full capacity determination studies will be shown only to the co-ordination committee.

2.7 We were informed that the recent capacity analysis produced by Eurocontrol highlighted the lack of runway and stand capacity to accommodate the total number of slots requested during several hours of the day. The number of aircraft movements at Brussels-Zaventem airport has increased by approximately 50% over the last four years.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

2.8 The key co-ordination parameters for the runway during the Winter 1999 season were as follows:

Airport:	Brussels-Zaventem
Runway:	
Max. movements/15 mins	17
Max. arrivals or departures/15 mins	15/14
Max. movements/30 mins	33
Max. arrivals or departures/30 mins	28/25
Max. movements/hour	66
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	45/42

2.9 For the IATA Summer 2000 season the runway capacity is expected to increase by two movements per hour.

2.10 We were provided with a list of the co-ordination parameters for the Winter 1999 season, the NAC chart for Summer 1999 and high-level summaries of slots requested, slots allocated and slots used for the Summer 1999 season. A series of additional data sets were also provided, highlighting the considerable growth in traffic at the airport and the high degree of capacity utilisation.

2.11 To date, we have not received any hour by hour, 'peak week' runway utilisation data. However, the charts provided suggest that the runway is subject to a considerable degree of congestion throughout the day.

Co-ordinators

Overview

2.12 The Ministry of Communications and Infrastructure re-appointed the national carrier, Sabena, to carry out the slot co-ordination function after the entry into force of the Regulation. Sabena had been providing schedule co-ordination services prior to the implementation of the Regulation following its appointment by IATA and the Ministry of Communications and Infrastructure in the 1980s.

2.13 Sabena set up a division called 'Brussels Slot Co-ordination' (BSC) and provided the operation with a separate postal address. BSC is financed entirely by Sabena.

2.14 The co-ordinator and his three[2] full-time staff are all employees of Sabena, reporting into the Aeropolitical department within the company. There is no fixed duration on the tenure of the co-ordinator.

[2] A fourth person will be hired by BSC in the near future.

2.15 Slot co-ordination is facilitated by the SCORE[3] co-ordination system. BSC has developed its own systems to monitor slot usage and to continually update the waiting lists for outstanding slot requests. Slot monitoring compares real time operational data (provided by the airport authorities) with the allocated slot times. The co-ordinator believes that the IT systems in place are able to meet all the reporting requirements of the Regulation.

2.16 The Belgian CAA believes that all employees of BSC act in an independent and transparent manner.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

2.17 A co-ordination committee (BIASCC) at Brussels-Zaventem airport has been set-up, despite the airport not being officially designated as either 'co-ordinated' or 'fully co-ordinated'. We received a complaint with regards to this pre-emptive arrangement, although in general, we do not consider this to be an infringement of the Regulation.

2.18 We understand that a written constitution has been finalised that conforms to the requirements of the Regulation. However, we were only provided with a 'draft' copy of this document. The first draft of the constitution was based closely on the UK model and circulated to all interested parties in March 1999. We were informed that objections were raised to some aspects of its content.

2.19 The draft constitution states that the BIASCC should fulfil the roles and responsibilities defined in Article 5 (1) of the Regulation, with regard given to the IATA Scheduling Procedures Guide.

2.20 An executive sub-committee will also be set-up. The overall role of this committee as described in the constitution is to direct the 'policy and general management of BIASCC'. Specifically, the Executive Sub-Committee's main responsibilities will be as follows:

- to represent the views of interested parties on slot allocation;
- to provide advice on capacity levels and scheduling constraints;
- regular liaison with the co-ordinator; and
- the determination of the arrangements for ballots.

[3] SCORE is also used in some airports in Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Switzerland and Canada.

2.21 If conflicts arise over the demand or allocation of slots, a Mediation Sub-Committee may be formed. The membership and rules of procedure are listed in the draft constitution.

Membership

2.22 The draft constitution states that the membership of the BIASCC is officially open to a representative from:

- all operators expressing an interest in slot allocation at Brussels-Zaventem airport;
- the airport authority;
- ATC;
- general aviation;
- IATA and IACA; and
- the co-ordinator and the Belgian CAA (as observers).

2.23 The co-ordinator, a representative of the airport authority and at least five other representatives must be present, in order to constitute a committee meeting as 'legal'.

2.24 The new constitution requires the Chairperson of the BIASCC to be elected each year subject to him/her being a resident of Belgium. The Deputy Chairperson must be an authorised representative of an operator registered in Belgium, holding at least 2% of the allocated slots at Brussels-Zaventem airport. The BIASCC will appoint a Secretary from amongst its members.

2.25 Membership of the Executive Sub-Committee is expected to consist of approximately 15 elected representatives from the BIASCC[4] of which at least one representative must come from the following categories of user:

- a charter operator;
- a courier operator;
- a 'full' cargo operator; and
- a long-haul operator.

Technical aspects

2.26 The Executive Sub-Committee will meet at least twice per year and the BIASCC once per year, with 21 days notice provided to all members prior to each meeting.

[4] The Executive Sub-Committee must comprise representatives of 6-9 operators (of which 4 must be Belgian), the airport authorities, ATC, general aviation, IATA or IACA, the co-ordinator (as an observer) and a further two operators to be designated by the co-ordinator.

2.27 The voting procedure within the BIASCC will be based closely on the method used in a number of other Member States, i.e. 1000 votes in total; 900 of which are distributed to the airlines based on slots allocated; 40 to the airport authority; 20 to ATC; 10 to general aviation; and 15 each to IACA and IATA. A qualified two-thirds majority vote is required to pass a motion.

2.28 The Executive Sub-Committee will not use a voting mechanism. When required, its advice and suggestions will be discussed and approved by the BIASCC. The BIASCC is able to disband the Executive Sub-Committee if following a vote, it achieves a two-thirds qualified majority in favour.

2.29 All meetings will be conducted in English.

Work of the co-ordination committee(s)

2.30 The initial work of the BIASCC has been to draft a constitution and provide advice on both the capacity study for the Summer 2000 scheduling season and the proposed night quota system.

III Denmark

Capacity assessments and the designation process

3.1 In Denmark, the Ministry of Traffic is responsible for designating airports as fully co-ordinated or co-ordinated. **Copenhagen-Kastrup** is the only fully co-ordinated airport and has been classified as SCR since the early 1980s.

3.2 The other Category 1 Danish airport, **Copenhagen-Roskilde**, is neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated. The airport is used predominantly by general aviation and light aircraft.

3.3 The airport operator, Copenhagen Airports (then known as KLH), carried out a capacity analysis at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport prior to the SCR designation, concentrating on the usage of the runway. No analysis was carried out for the purpose of airport designation. However, in line with best practice, consultation between the Danish CAA, the airport operator, the previous co-ordinator (SAS) and the airline Maersk Air took place in order to assess the appropriate co-ordination status of the airport.

3.4 We understand that the current airport operator, KLV, is currently discussing issues of airport capacity with the user airlines, the co-ordinator and ATC. In addition, the airport authority are working with an independent company, Roke Mannors, in order to perform a risk analysis of the entire airport, which should end with recommendations on how to handle the expected increases in traffic and capacity.

3.5 The Danish Civil Aviation Administration plays no role in the slot co-ordination process at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport and has never been asked to intervene in the work of the co-ordinator or co-ordination committee.

3.6 We did not receive any complaints regarding the current co-ordination status of Copenhagen-Kastrup airport.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

3.7 Capacity determination studies are carried out biannually by ACD together with representatives from ATC, the airport operator and user airlines. The biannual study of co-ordination parameters includes a small section on possibilities for increasing both landside and airside capacity, however, these studies are only shown to the co-ordination committee and are not made public.

3.8 We were provided with a summary of the key co-ordination parameters for the main area of congestion at Copenhagen-Kastrup i.e. the runway.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

3.9 The key co-ordination parameters for the Summer 1999 scheduling season were as follows:

Airport:	Copenhagen-Kastrup
Runway:	
Max. movements/15 mins	25
Max. arrivals or departures/15 mins	12 /13
Max. movements/hour	81
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	45/44

3.10 In addition, we received the NAC chart for Summer 1999 and a breakdown of the hourly movements for a busy week in September 1999.

Co-ordinators

Overview

3.11 The Ministry of Traffic in Denmark appointed Airport Co-ordination Denmark (ACD) as the co-ordinator for Copenhagen-Kastrup airport on 11 January 1996, following extensive discussions with the airport authority, ATC, SAS and Maersk Air.

3.12 The Ministry also appointed the Head of Co-ordination and according to the statutes of law, the co-ordinator is 'independent'. There is no time restriction on the length of tenure of the co-ordinator. One other member of staff provides assistance to the Head of Co-ordination.

3.13 ACD is a joint stock, non-profit making organisation. The Copenhagen-Kastrup airport operator covers 50% of the operating costs, whilst the Danish airlines using the airport, cover the other 50% in proportion to the slots they hold.

3.14 The Head of Co-ordination reports to the governing board of ACD. The board comprises two representatives from SAS, one from Maersk Air, two representing all other Danish airlines and two from the airport operator.

3.15 ACD uses the SCORE system to monitor and compare, slot allocation and slot usage and believes the system is able to comply with all aspects of the Regulation.

3.16 The Head of Co-ordination stated that ACD has never received a complaint concerning its work at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

3.17 A co-ordination committee (CSCC) was established at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport in February 1994. It is a fully elected body, with a mandate to fulfil the roles and responsibilities defined in Article 5 (1) of the Regulation.

3.18 The CSCC may form a Mediation Sub-Committee to assist with the handling of slot allocation complaints. The constitution states that members shall attempt to reach a settlement through discussion 'in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation and goodwill'.

Membership

3.19 The co-ordinator is also the Secretary of the CSCC, with membership open to a representative from:

- all operators using the airport regularly or who have expressed an interest in the allocation of slots and the co-ordination of schedules at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport;
- the representative organisations of air carriers using the airport regularly, e.g. Foreign Airline Carriers of Denmark;
- the airport operator; and
- ATC.

The Danish government is entitled to send an observer, though we were informed that a representative is rarely present at the meetings.

3.20 The Mediation Sub-Committee comprises the Chairperson and the two Vice-Chairpersons of the CSCC, an authorized representative of a Danish registered operator and an authorized representative of a foreign air carrier.

Technical aspects

3.21 The CSCC meets twice a year, usually in June and November. In the second meeting of every second year, the Chairperson and one of the two Vice-Chairpersons are elected by the committee. In the alternate year, the other Vice-Chairperson is elected. Voting takes place on a one-member, one-vote basis.

3.22 Meetings are conducted in Danish with the corresponding minutes available in English. Committee members are given two to four weeks notice of the time, date and location of all the meetings.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

3.23 We have not received a complaint regarding the work of the CSCC at Copenhagen-Kastrup airport from any of the people that we have interviewed over the course of our study. Indeed, the overall set-up and structure of the CSCC and its sub-committee conform closely to a 'best practice' model.

IV Finland

Capacity assessments and the designation process

4.1 Airport designation in Finland is the responsibility of the Finnish Civil Aviation Authority (FCAA). The only designated airport is **Helsinki-Vantaa**, which has been fully co-ordinated since 1995 and classified as SCR since the 1980s.

4.2 A new runway is currently under construction at Helsinki-Vantaa airport and is due to become fully operational by 2003. A full capacity analysis of the runway operations will be commissioned prior to the introduction of the additional capacity in order to review the designation of the airport.

4.3 Helsinki-Vantaa was operating as a schedule co-ordinated airport prior to the introduction of the Regulation. The Helsinki-Vantaa airport authority ensured that a capacity analysis was performed in the 1980s, prior to the adoption of the SCR classification. We were not provided with a copy of this original study nor were we provided with a copy of a capacity analysis produced for the purpose of airport designation.

4.4 Prior to the designation of Helsinki-Vantaa airport, the FCAA sent a letter to the airport authorities, ATC, Finnair and the various airline user committees to inform all parties of the implementation of the Regulation. There was no further consultation between the FCAA and the interested parties over the appropriate status of the airport. Despite the technical infringement of the Regulation, we did not receive any complaints over the designation process or status.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

4.5 The Airports Department of the CAA conducts the biannual capacity determination study. The ATC capacity is assessed by Operations Services in co-operation with Apron Services and ATC. Terminal and Passenger Services, in co-operation with the Customs Authority and the Frontier Guard assess the terminal capacity. Information on the co-ordination parameters is then communicated to the airlines, handling agents and all other parties concerned.

4.6 The Head of Co-ordination informed us that the main area and times of congestion at Helsinki-Vantaa airport are on the runway, for approximately 2-3 hours per day, in particular during the early morning rush hours.

4.7 A new terminal building was opened at the beginning of the Winter 1999 season, in order to cope with the increasing demand. There was a larger increase in the departing passenger limits (an extra 1150 passengers per hour) as opposed to the increase in the arriving passenger limits (an extra 300 passengers per hour). This imbalance was due to the ongoing reconfiguration of the arrival hall – a development which will not be completed until February 2001.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

4.8 The key co-ordination parameters for the Winter 1999 season were as follows:

Airport:	Helsinki-Vantaa
Runway:	
Max. movements/15 mins	12
Max. movements/hour	43
Terminal: (International)	
Max. no. arriving passengers/hour	1,800
Max. no. departing passengers/hour	2,950
Terminal: (Domestic)	
Max. no. arriving passengers/hour	1,500
Max. no. departing passengers/hour	1,500

4.9 We were provided with NAC charts for the Summer and Winter of 1999, as well as data on slot usage and terminal passenger traffic levels during a 'busy week'. In addition, we received a second letter containing statistical information on the development of traffic at Helsinki-Vantaa airport and more detailed information on the derivation of runway and terminal capacities for the Winter 1999 season.

Co-ordinators

Overview

4.10 The Finnish Civil Aviation Authority (FCAA) appointed the current slot co-ordination company, Airport Co-ordination Finland (ACF), in July 1994, following the implementation of the Regulation. In addition, the FCAA appointed a 'named' person (i.e. a Chief Co-ordinator) to be the person in charge of ACF, although no enabling legislation was issued. The appointment letter stated that the Chief Co-ordinator is specifically obliged to act in accordance with Regulation 95/93. As such, the Chief Co-ordinator has a degree of operational independence, since his employer (and financier) can not remove him from office without explicit approval from the FCAA.

4.11 The FCAA consulted the airport authorities and the air carriers using the airport before confirming the ACF's and the Chief Co-ordinator's appointments.

4.12 The national carrier, Finnair, finances the co-ordination function. The Chief Co-ordinator is assisted by three, part-time members of staff, all of whom are paid employees of Finnair.

4.13 There is no time restriction on the length of tenure of the Chief Co-ordinator but he or she must occasionally report back to the Commercial Department of Finnair regarding financial and administrative matters.

4.14 ACF uses an automated co-ordination system purchased from Cathay Pacific in conjunction with data provided by ATC to monitor the usage of slots. The Chief Co-ordinator stated the current system was unable to meet all the reporting

requirements of the Regulation and a replacement is actively being sought after. The new co-ordination systems will be financed entirely by Finnair.

4.15 We were informed that there is little interest amongst other carriers or the Finnish airport authorities, in contributing to the financing of the co-ordination process, despite the general concern expressed by some airline representative bodies over the 'perceived' degree of independence within the co-ordination function.

4.16 The Chief Co-ordinator expressed concern over the limited time available for him to perform his dual role of slot co-ordinator for Helsinki-Vantaa airport and schedule co-ordinator for Finnair.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

4.17 The Helsinki-Vantaa Co-ordination Committee was set-up in July 1994 and based closely on its predecessor, the Helsinki-Vantaa Scheduling Committee. The CAA stated that the roles performed by the Helsinki-Vantaa Co-ordination Committee are similar to those laid out in Article 5 of the Regulation. However, the Chairperson informed us that there was no written constitution to support the work of the committee.

Membership

4.18 The General Manager of Airport Operations chairs the committee at Helsinki-Vantaa Airport with a representative from the airport authority acting as secretary. The following organisations are permitted to appoint a representative to attend the committee meetings:

- all carriers operating at the airport;
- the Chief Co-ordinator;
- ATC;
- the Frontier Guard;
- the airport security and police services;
- CAA Finland;
- the handling agents; and
- the airport terminal and passenger services.

4.19 The Chairperson and the Chief Co-ordinator stated that there were no problems with the seniority of individuals attending the committee meetings.

Technical aspects

4.20 The committee meets twice a year and notifies its members two weeks in advance of the time, date, location and agenda of the forthcoming meeting. Committee members may raise new topics for discussion at the end of the meetings.

The meetings are conducted in Finnish or in English (depending on the linguistic skills of the attendees) and the Minutes are made available to all members.

4.21 There are no official voting procedures within the committee, nor has there ever been a need for a vote to take place to decide the views of the committee on a particular issue. In general, the committee reaches agreement through open discussion and debate.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

4.22 The majority of the work of the committee has involved discussions on the available capacity and the demand for runway slots and terminal facilities. There have been no major revisions suggested by the committee to the assessments of capacity at Helsinki-Vantaa airport.

4.23 The committee also discusses the usage of slots by carriers, the allocation of slots following the schedule conferences and the general performance of the co-ordinator.

4.24 The Chairperson informed us that there had been no complaints made to the committee regarding the allocation or usage of slots. The Chief Co-ordinator has managed to resolve all disputes prior to the committee meetings through direct talks with the parties concerned. As a result there have been no reasons for the FCAA to intervene in disputes between the parties involved in slot co-ordination.

V France

Capacity assessments and the designation process

5.1 The body responsible for airport designation in France is the Direction Generale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC). **Paris-Charles De Gaulle** and **Paris-Orly** are the only fully co-ordinated airports in France. Their status is unlikely to change in the near future.

5.2 Regulation 95/93 was transposed into French law by government decree in 1993 and a copy was included in DGAC's response to our request for information. DGAC informed us that it discussed the appropriate designation of French airports within the early co-ordination committee meetings.

5.3 The third Category 1 airport in France, **Paris-Le Bourget**, is not used by commercial traffic. It is neither a co-ordinated nor a fully co-ordinated airport and it is not classified under the IATA schedule co-ordination definitions.

5.4 Paris-Charles de Gaulle and Paris-Orly airports were classified SCR in line with IATA's schedule co-ordination definitions in the 1980s. As such, they were designated as fully co-ordinated without a further capacity analysis.

5.5 Assessments are only performed when DGAC believe it is necessary, e.g. due to major infrastructure improvements. The airports authority, Aeroports de Paris (ADP) carries out the assessments of capacity and discusses the findings within the Paris Co-ordination Committee before submitting the results to the DGAC for approval.

5.6 We were provided with a runway capacity assessment study for Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport (CDG), prepared by the French air navigation authorities and ADP, justifying the proposed increase in capacity made possible by the implementation of a third runway. The study was well presented and very thorough.

5.7 However, we received a complaint from an interested party regarding the outcome of this runway study. The new runway only offered an increase in the number of movements per hour of 12. After intense debate in the Paris Co-ordination Committee the increase in movements was raised to 17 per hour. The interested party expected an increase of between 25 and 30 movements following the completion of the additional runway and suggested that the more modest increase was to aid the evolution over time of the hub operations of Air France at CDG. We understand that the limited amount of airspace capacity available for expansion in the Paris terminal movement area was the principal reason for the small permissible increase in hourly runway movements.

5.8 ADP is also in the process of compiling a separate capacity assessment study of the terminal buildings at Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport.

5.9 We received no complaints over the designation status of Paris-Orly airport.

5.10 The airport operators at Lyon-Satolas, Nice-Cote d'Azur and Mulhouse are also in the process of compiling capacity assessment studies for their airports. The status of these airports may change in the near future depending on the outcome of the studies. It is important to note that if doubts arise over the future designation status of the regional airports, if there are military operations present, the airport can only be classified as 'fully co-ordinated' and never 'co-ordinated'. There is no obvious or logical reason for this policy.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

5.11 The airport authority is responsible for carrying out the biannual determination of co-ordination parameters. We were able to determine the co-ordination parameters for Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport from the data contained in the capacity assessment study for the third runway. The immediate area of concern at Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport is the lack of runway (and airspace) capacity.

5.12 Paris-Orly is subject to environmental regulations that limit the number of aircraft movements to approximately 250,000 per year with subsidiary half-hourly/daily co-ordination parameters well below the physical capacity of the airport. The annual administrative capacity of the airport has always been reached whilst the physical capacity has generally been reached during the daily peaks. The physical movement limit of the airport is 34 arrivals per hour for certain hours during the peak[5]. This was reached several years ago and therefore the runway co-ordination parameters have not been changed since. The actual demand for slots at Paris-Orly airport greatly exceeds the current annual movement limit[6].

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

5.13 The key runway co-ordination parameters for the Summer 1999 season at the Pairs airports were as follows:

Airport:	Paris-Charles de Gaulle	Paris-Orly
Runway:		
Max. arrivals or departures/10 mins	10/10	-
Max. movements/hour	95	-
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	53/54	34[7]/-
Max. movements per annum	N/A	250,000

[5] Article 2 of the French decree dated 06/10/94 restricts the runway capacity to half this limit between 0600-0700 and 2200-2300 local time, creating further administrative constraints during these hours.

[6] The French co-ordinator and Air France favour an alternative measure for accommodating the environmental concerns, by amending the aircraft movement limit at Paris-Orly airport in order to take into consideration noise differences between aircraft. The suggestion is to limit the permissible noise level to those experienced in 1994. This would lead to an overall increase in the number of annual aircraft movements at Paris-Orly airport.

[7] Maximum arrivals limit during certain peak hours.

5.14 We were also provided with histograms of the slots requested and slots used at the two Paris airports for a peak week in July along with the NAC charts for the Summer 1999 scheduling season.

Co-ordinators

Overview

5.15 On the 9 August 1996, the Direction General de l'Aviation Civil (DGAC) appointed 'Association pour la Co-ordination des Horaires' (COHOR) to take-over the co-ordination function from Air France, which had performed the role since 1971. This followed widespread dissatisfaction with the perceived degree of independence of a co-ordination function, financed in its entirety, by the dominant carrier of an airport.

5.16 The decision to change the co-ordination set-up in France was taken by the French government following extensive consultation with the existing Scheduling Committee.

5.17 COHOR is a non-profit making association of 10 French airlines[8]. COHOR's legal statute states that any airline holding a valid operating licence obtained according to EU Regulation 2407/92 can be a member. However to date, only French carriers have applied for membership.

5.18 The COHOR board elects the co-ordinator for a 4-year term. The COHOR board is limited to a maximum of twelve members, although currently, all members of COHOR are also members of the board.

5.19 The co-ordinator is assisted by 8 members of staff[9], all of whom (with the exception of the group secretary) have been seconded from Air France. Air France pays the salaries of its secondees and then bills COHOR for these costs. COHOR in turn recovers these and all other costs through fees paid by its members and from payments for the data services it provides to the airport authority.

5.20 COHOR recruited a British citizen to take over the role of one of the Air France secondees from 1 February 2000.

5.21 There are two components to the fee that each COHOR member pays to finance the co-ordination function. The first is a fixed fee paid by all members, calculated by dividing one-third of the total operating budget (net of revenues accrued

[8] I.e. L'Aéropostale, Air France, Air Littoral, AOM, Britair, Air Liberté, Corsair, Euralair, Protéus Airlines and TAT.

[9] The 8 members of staff consist of 4 co-ordinators for Charles de Gaulle, 2 for Orly, 1 computer maintenance engineer and a group secretary.

from other sources) by the total number of members. The remaining costs are recovered from the member airlines in relation to the proportion of total slots they hold at the airports co-ordinated by COHOR.

5.22 The COHOR Board must approve the co-ordinator's budget. In 1999, the annual budget was approximately 8 million FFR. The budgets for the last 3 years were approved without any restriction or challenge and remained almost unchanged over this period. The co-ordinator is unsure what would happen if COHOR rejected his budget.

5.23 COHOR uses a co-ordination system developed from the one employed by ACL in the UK to assist with the slot allocation process. The core system was purchased from ACL in 1997 and has subsequently been modified to adapt to the specific requirements of the French co-ordination function. Slot monitoring is performed using an in-house computer program.

5.24 The co-ordinator noted two main concerns with the current slot co-ordination arrangements in France. Firstly, although the current level of IT investment is adequate for the purposes of slot allocation, there remains a question mark over its adequacy for the purpose of slot monitoring. As is the case in most other Member states, the French co-ordinator is only able to monitor slot allocation and usage at the airports subject to full co-ordination.

5.25 The second main concern of the French co-ordinator related to the length of tenure of his position. At the end of his 4-year term, the co-ordinator must be re-elected by the Board of COHOR. Therefore, there is the potential risk that the co-ordinator may not be re-elected despite carrying out his duties in a fair, transparent and independent manner. The co-ordinator refers to his position as 'a judge being elected by prisoners'. DGAC is also unhappy with the existing length of tenure of the co-ordinator. It would like to see his term of office extended beyond the current four years and recently wrote to the Board of COHOR asking it to reconsider its procedures. To the disappointment of the DGAC, the COHOR board rejected these requests.

5.26 We also note that on a few occasions in the past, the co-ordinator has not accepted the advice of the Paris Co-ordination Committee. For example, during the hand-over period from the previous co-ordinator, the current co-ordinator ignored a request by the airport authority and the Paris Co-ordination Committee to restrict the check-in facilities available for charter operators at Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport, citing the lack of charter operators present at the meeting and the lack of objective evidence (e.g. a capacity assessment) to support the request.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

5.27 Prior to the implementation of the Regulation, a 'Scheduling Committee' advised the French co-ordinator. In May 1993, following the implementation of the Regulation in France, the Paris Co-ordination Committee was formed in order to succeed the Scheduling Committee.

5.28 The Paris Co-ordination Committee serves both Paris-Charles de Gaulle and Paris-Orly airport[10]. Following the appointment of COHOR, a new constitution was drawn up for the Paris Co-ordination Committee. We were recently provided with a copy of the constitution. The roles of the committee are almost exactly as listed in the Regulation.

5.29 A Complaints Sub-Committee may be convened following an official complaint to the main committee. The main committee must be informed of the opinions and views of the sub-committee, although it is the co-ordinator[11] who must take the ultimate decision over how to respond to the complaint.

Membership

5.30 The constitution lists the names of the organisations that comprise the membership of the Paris Co-ordination Committee. Only these organisations are 'official' members of the Paris Co-ordination Committee.

5.31 The committee is chaired by the Director of Air Transport at the DGAC, with membership open to the following organisations:

- three home-based airlines, i.e. Air France, Air Liberte and AOM;
- the Airline Representatives Council (ARC);
- IATA;
- the air transport trade union 'Chambre Syndicale du Transport Aérien' (CSTA);
- the regional/general aviation users at the airport (SCARA);
- military air navigation;
- ATC;
- the airport authority (AdP); and
- the co-ordinator.

5.32 The Paris Co-ordination Committee is not open to every user or potential user of the airport because the DGAC believes this would lead to excessively large meeting sizes, a lack of common seniority amongst members and a reduction in the efficiency of the co-ordination process. IATA and the ARC represent foreign carriers, drawing on their combined experience and knowledge of local airport problems and the slot allocation process. Each organisation is permitted to bring an individual airline representative to the committee meetings if specific problems arise.

5.33 Most foreign carriers operating in France are members of the ARC. Carriers usually send their Directors for France or the relevant European region to the ARC

[10] Should any other French airport be designated as co-ordinated/fully co-ordinated, it is unlikely that the Paris Co-ordination Committee would be asked to expand its coverage.

[11] The co-ordinator may also attend the Complaints Sub-Committee as an observer.

meetings. The ARC meets regularly to discuss all the issues to be raised in the following Paris Co-ordination Committee meeting.

5.34 We received a number of complaints over the structure of the Paris Co-ordination Committee, in particular due to the absence of full membership rights for foreign carriers. Doubts were expressed over the specialist knowledge of the ARC representatives for matters relating to slot allocation. However, we understand that IATA endeavours to send a representative from a foreign carrier with sufficient knowledge and experience.

5.35 Although we appreciate the reasons for limiting the committee size, we do not regard this process as 'best practice'. We were informed that at least two major European airlines would like individual representation on the Paris co-ordination Committee.

5.36 Membership of the Complaints Sub-Committee consists of the member airlines and the Chairperson from the main committee, as well as the complainant and/or his representative organisation.

Technical aspects

5.37 The Paris Co-ordination Committee meets at least twice a year with special sessions arranged when required. The committee members are notified of the time, date, location and agenda, three weeks prior to the next meeting. A 'miscellaneous item' is always included at the end of the agenda, allowing for additional points of discussion to be raised at the meeting. All meetings are conducted in French.

5.38 The Paris Co-ordination Committee members decided (in unanimity) not to employ any voting procedures. The co-ordinator and the Chairperson are more interested in the individual views of the committee members rather than their collective view as determined by a certain voting procedure.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

5.39 The co-ordinator believes that the most important function of the committee is to provide an arena for consultation between capacity users and capacity providers. The Paris Co-ordination Committee examines and passes comment on the capacity determination studies (and the capacity analyses) produced by the airport authority.

5.40 In the absence of slot performance committees in France, the Paris Co-ordination Committee has developed two local rules and supported a government led amendment to the official slot allocation decree, in order to enforce the powers of the co-ordinator in this area. The first of the local rules specifies the degree of intentional and repeated misuse of slots that is required for the co-ordinator to justify removing the historic rights of the airline to that slot. The second rule specifies the degree of intentional and repeated misuse of a slot that forms part of a series of slots, in order for the co-ordinator to potentially remove the historic rights to the whole series of slots. Both of these rules have been enforced on a few occasions, although, we were not informed of the individual circumstances.

5.41 In June 1999, the Ministry of Transport in France passed an amendment to the existing slot allocation decree that assisted the enforcement of the Regulation and the local rulings, regarding the monitoring of slot usage. If the French government deems it necessary, they may form a 'Special Committee' to assess any alleged abuse of slots by airlines, with the possibility of imposing a financial penalty if the allegation is proven. We were not informed of any occurrences where this Special Committee has been convened or of the composition of the committee.

5.42 The Complaints Sub-Committee has only met a few times, most recently in 1997, when a new entrant airline complained about the availability of slots at Paris-Charles de Gaulle airport. The committee concluded that the co-ordinator had tried everything within his powers to accommodate the requests of the new entrant and the only option available to the airline was to try to swap its slots with other airlines[12].

5.43 On another occasion American Airlines complained about the decision to allocate **all** the slots from the pool to new entrants, despite being within the scope of the Regulation. After considerable debate within the Complaints Sub-Committee, the co-ordinator agreed to allocate only approximately 50% of the slots from the pool to new entrants in the future.

[12] The new entrant eventually obtained its operating license (long after the slot co-ordination conference was finished and received the slots left over).

VI Germany

Capacity assessments and the designation process

6.1 Responsibility for airport designation in Germany lies with the Federal Ministry of Transport (BVM) in consultation with the State (Land) Governments. Airport co-ordination in Germany began in 1972. The German government stated that it has fully adopted all aspects of the Regulation.

6.2 There are eight fully co-ordinated and nine co-ordinated airports in Germany. All of the Category 1 airports are fully co-ordinated (and SCR) and their stati are unlikely to change in the near future[13]. The government consulted the relevant parties listed in the Regulation prior to the designation of each airport.

6.3 Detailed airport capacity studies were provided for Frankfurt (1999), Munich (1992), Berlin-Schönefeld (1999), Berlin-Tempelhof (1999) and Stuttgart (1995) airports. However, none of the studies that we were provided with were produced for the purpose of airport designation. Indeed, we understand that no publicly available capacity analyses were produced following the initial implementation of the Regulation in Germany for any of the Category 1 airports.

6.4 The government stated that it discusses the findings of all capacity analysis studies with the airports concerned, ATC, the Airline Operating Committees and the user airlines[14].

6.5 Capacity studies have been carried out periodically at **Frankfurt** Airport since the early 1970s. The capacity analysis study that we were provided with was completed by the US-FAA in July 1999. The study was entitled 'An Investigation of the present and potential future capacity of Frankfurt am Main International airport', although the documents we were provided with concentrated primarily on runway-related issues. The technical annex and the evaluation of alternative ways for increasing runway capacity were analysed in considerable depth, in light of detailed operational data and in accordance with a defined methodology.

6.6 **Munich (II)** airport was opened in 1992. An independent airport capacity expert carried out a capacity analysis study, which assessed the availability of capacity on the runway and at the gates. The study did not determine the terminal capacity. The methodology and list of assumptions that were adopted for the purpose of the analysis were clearly specified along with the definition of terms used and the study's original terms of reference. Extensive consideration was given to the impact of general aviation on the permissible number of annual and hourly aircraft movements.

---

[13] Cologne/Bonn Airport (non-Category 1), will change from being a fully co-ordinated to a co-ordinated airport from the Summer 2000 season onwards, due to the expected completion and opening, of its new terminal.

[14] Usually within the forum of a co-ordination committee meeting.

6.7 **Düsseldorf** was the only Category 1, fully co-ordinated German airport for which we did not receive any type of capacity analysis. Düsseldorf is subject to an administrative limit on the number of aircraft movements during its busiest six months period as a condition for being allowed to build a new runway. We were informed that all interested parties (i.e. member states, regional authorities, airport authority, ATC, users and the airport co-ordinator) believe that airport capacity is insufficient to meet the unconstrained demand for slots.

6.8 All of the parties that we interviewed were satisfied with the current designation status of Düsseldorf, Frankfurt and Munich airports.

6.9 The co-ordinator provided us with a brief letter from the Berlin Airport Authority that summarized the findings of a capacity analysis study for **Berlin-Tegel** airport. We did not receive a copy of the original study. However, due to the high utilisation of gate and runway capacity at Berlin-Tegel airport, the general view of the parties that we interviewed was that the designation status of Berlin-Tegel airport was appropriate.

6.10 We received a number of complaints over the current designation status of **Berlin-Schönefeld** and **Berlin-Tempelhof** airports. The capacity analyses studies that we were provided with concentrated on examining the respective terminal capacities at the two airports. Significant levels of congestion were identified in both airports in the areas of passenger handling. These conclusions were validated by the views of the co-ordinator.

6.11 In contrast, a representative of one of the major German airlines informed us that the overall level of passenger throughput in the terminal buildings did not justify the fully co-ordinated designation of Berlin-Schönefeld and Berlin-Tempelhof airports, based on the congestion criteria outlined in Article 3 of the Regulation.

6.12 Those in favour of retaining the designation status of Berlin-Schönefeld and Berlin-Tempelhof airports list the problems involved in co-ordinating just one airport within an airport system. Prior to the designation of all three airports in the Berlin airport system, we were informed that there were considerable difficulties in trying to separate the airspace of each airport and thus joint co-ordination was deemed essential. However, the airspace has since been restructured, allowing the separation to take place.

6.13 In general, there is no requirement for all airports in a system to have the same designation. Furthermore, the Regulation does not impose a *legal requirement* for 'co-designation', and indeed in the London area, five airports function with different stati.

6.14 The University of Stuttgart produced a comprehensive capacity analysis for **Stuttgart** airport in 1995. The co-ordinator provided us with a copy of this study, which analysed each aspect of airport capacity in turn. An updated study has almost been completed, although we understand that the conclusions are expected to be very similar to those in the original study i.e. identifiable shortages of capacity on the ramp and at the gates.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

6.15 The Ministry of Transport has ultimate responsibility for ensuring that updates to capacity determination studies are carried out before each scheduling period. The Ministry will usually instruct the airport concerned to perform the study using its own or commissioned resources. The Ministry consults the supreme aviation authorities of each Federal State, ATC, the airport authority, the airport co-ordination committees and the air carriers using the airport regularly before finalising its assessments.

6.16 At some German airports, a biannual update to the capacity determination studies is not always deemed necessary by the Ministry. This is often the case for Düsseldorf airport, where environmental restrictions limit the available capacity to a pre-defined number of slots per year. The administrative limits[15] on the number of movements at Düsseldorf airport constrain demand well below the physical runway capacity.

6.17 Based on our discussions with the German co-ordinator and our assessment of the capacity analysis, we believe that the main operational constraint at Frankfurt airport is on the runway. Indeed, the German government is in the process of debating the costs and benefits of constructing an additional runway.

6.18 There has been a steady increase in the number of available runway slots at Munich airport through operational improvements such as revised ATC procedures. However, there are still a few hours of the day where runway capacity is reached and without full co-ordination, significant operational delays would be likely.

6.19 At Berlin-Tempelhof and Berlin-Schönefeld airports we were informed that is terminal restrictions that restrict slot availability. The co-ordinator stated that runway capacity at these airports exceeds the capacity available for passenger handling.

6.20 Berlin-Tegel airport is subject to a particular severe gate shortage at certain times of the day. The number of departures at any one time is limited, with additional constraints such as the size of aircraft and varying passenger check-in times reducing this figure even further. Capacity has remained the same at Berlin-Tegel airport since reunification, whilst traffic volumes have increased considerably.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

6.21 The approximate co-ordination parameters during the Summer 1999 season for the Category 1, fully co-ordinated German airports were as follows:

[15] The limits have been raised slightly over the last couple of years.

Airport: / Runway movement limits	Frankfurt	Düsseldorf[16]	Munich	Berlin-Tegel*	Berlin-Schönefeld*	Berlin-Tempelhof*
Runway:						
Total/30 mins	43	22	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arrivals or departures/30 mins	23/25	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total/ hour	78	36	80	N/A	24	30
Arrivals or departures/hour	43/48	N/A	55/55	17/18	11/17	15/16

*Figures vary according to the categories of aircraft landing in any one given hour.

6.22 We were provided with NAC charts for each fully co-ordinated airport for the Summer 1999 scheduling season, along with data for a 'peak week' in September showing the number of slots allocated and the number of slots used. We were also provided with a graphical analysis of the declared capacities at each airport and the number of flights requested prior to the IATA schedule co-ordination conference.

Co-ordinators

Overview

6.23 Airport Co-ordination Germany (ACG) allocates slots at the fully co-ordinated airports in Germany. The Federal Minister for Transport appointed a 'natural' person to be the national slot co-ordinator. The co-ordinator believes he fulfils the role of an 'honest broker' between all the parties concerned with slot allocation.

6.24 The German legislation requires the co-ordinator to ensure that adequate finances are raised to fulfil the co-ordination function[17].

6.25 The co-ordinator has secured a number of agreements with German airlines/aircraft operators and their organisations, in order to cover ACG's expenses. The principal German airlines and aircraft operators, on the initiative of the Federal Ministry of Transport formed a committee, which agreed to cover the costs of airport co-ordination. Foreign carriers are not required to provide any financial support to the slot co-ordination function at German airports.

6.26 Airlines and aircraft owners are divided into two categories for the purpose of cost recovery, both of which must sign 'declarations of obligation' to support the revenue collection exercise. The proportion of costs to be recovered by the first category of users is calculated by dividing the number of slots they are allocated, by the total number of slots (German and non-German) co-ordinated and operated[18].

[16] Co-ordination parameters apply between the hours of 0700 and 2100 local time. Between 2100-2200 the number of permissible hourly movements is reduced to 35 and between 2200-2300 the number of movements is reduced to 15.

[17] The co-ordination budget for 1999 was DEM 6.5 million.

[18] Cost attribution and billing is performed on a quarterly basis.

6.27 Users belonging to the second category meet the costs associated with both their own slots and those of the non-German carriers, the costs being allocated on the basis of their share of slots. Consequently, the amount they pay per slot is higher than for the first category of users. The second category of users must also cover any shortfalls in revenue collection, e.g. if an airline or aircraft operator in the second category ceases to operate at the airport[19]. The national flag carrier, Lufthansa, pays approximately two-thirds of the total costs of co-ordinating German airports.

6.28 In effect, the co-ordinator fulfils the role of general manager with the second category of users acting as the financial committee. The co-ordinator's expenses are subject to a year-end audit and he is required to produce annual and mid-term business plans.

6.29 The Federal Ministry of Transport covers the salary and benefits package of the co-ordinator, thereby ensuring a degree of independence from the airlines. In addition, the Ministry is required to intervene if the financial committee fails to achieve agreement on the annual co-ordination budget (though no such action has ever been required).

6.30 At present, the co-ordinator has 19 staff under his supervision, most of whom have been seconded from Lufthansa German Airlines. The co-ordinator has a 'general' agreement with the majority of German airlines regarding the secondment of their staff. Staff salaries and benefits packages are agreed after consultation with the supporting airline's personnel department.

6.31 The current system used for schedule co-ordination purposes is due to be replaced this year, albeit two years behind schedule. The co-ordinator explicitly stated that he encountered no problems in securing the agreement of the financiers of ACG to replace the outdated system. The existing system was introduced in the mid-1980s but does not fulfil all of the reporting functions to the degree of complexity and efficiency that the co-ordinator would like.

6.32 To date, there have been no official complaints made to the German government regarding the work of the co-ordinator. Indeed, the user airlines have commented very positively on the improvement in co-ordination function following the replacement of ATC with the current 'named' co-ordinator.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

6.33 In Germany, there are local co-ordination committees for each fully co-ordinated airport and one overall, 'General Co-ordination Committee'. The Federal Ministry of Transport provides a Chairperson for the General Co-ordination Committee, a Chairperson to cover the airports of Frankfurt, Munich and Berlin and

[19] If an airline wishes to withdraw support for the co-ordination function, six months written notice is required.

another Chairperson to concentrate on the airport subject to most political debate, Düsseldorf.

6.34 The constitutions for each committee are broadly the same. The committees can discuss any of the issues defined in Article 5 (1) of the Regulation. The co-ordinator produces a summary of the slot allocation statistics at each local co-ordination committee meeting.

6.35 The key differences between the airport co-ordination committees and the General Co-ordination Committee are as follows:

- the General Co-ordination Committee deals with standard procedures, adoption of new rules and high level issues of relevance to all German airports, but does not have the legislative power over the airport co-ordination committees to ensure compliance; and
- the airport committees are responsible for issues specific to their particular airports, and are expected to operate in line with the rules of the General Co-ordination Committee.

6.36 There is only one sub-committee in Germany - a 'Technical' Sub-Committee that analyses specific capacity-related issues at Frankfurt airport.

6.37 We received notice from some users and from the co-ordinator that the development of slot performance sub-committees at all the fully co-ordinated airports in Germany would be a welcome addition to the current structure of operations.

Membership

6.38 Membership of the co-ordination committees is open to:

- the German scheduled carriers;
- the Board of Airline Representatives in Germany (BARIG), representing approximately 200 German and foreign airlines[20];
- an association of German leisure airlines, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Luftverkehrsunternehmen (ADL)[21];
- the respective State 'Land' authorities;
- the airport authority;
- the traffic manager of the airport;
- ATC; and

[20] On some occasions, local staff may also represent the individual foreign carriers.

[21] Individual charter carriers are often represented as well, in particular LTU, Condor, Air Berlin and Hapag Lloyd.

- the co-ordinator (a non-member).

6.39 In principal, all airlines having an interest in slot allocation at the airport are invited to attend. However, foreign carriers must request the permission of, and receive an invitation from BARIG.

6.40 A representative of the State government chairs each committee meeting.

Technical aspects

6.41 All committees (with the exception of the General Co-ordination Committee and the Stuttgart Co-ordination Committee[22]) meet at least twice per year and by law must conduct their discussions in German.

6.42 The time, date, location and agenda for each meeting are sent out approximately four weeks in advance. We noted two concerns raised by members of the committee regarding the content of the agendum. Firstly, we were informed of instances whereby issues were not included on the agenda and were decided upon before the relevant co-ordination committee had convened. The committees were then informed of the outcome. This has happened twice at Munich airport, where changes to the declared capacity have occurred with neither prior consultation nor supporting evidence to validate the change.

6.43 Secondly, we were informed that the agenda does not always state clearly the nature of the problems to be discussed. Potential changes to the declared capacity of the airports or the introduction of local co-ordination rulings are not always explicitly mentioned.

6.44 The lack of detail regarding the topics on the agenda in combination with the high number of co-ordination committee meetings both in Germany and the rest of the world, probably contribute to the fairly low attendance at German co-ordination committee meetings.

6.45 We also received a comment from one (non-UK) airline requesting that meetings should be conducted in English (even though this was not the individual's mother tongue), in order to improve attendance levels[23]. The airline also added that even when the turnout at committee meetings is high, the seniority of some of the representatives is often quite low.

6.46 There are defined voting procedures for the committee, though there has never been a need for a vote to take place. The Chairperson of the General Co-ordination Committee stated that the all meetings take place within a framework of trust and compromise.

---

[22] The Stuttgart and the General Committees both recently agreed to limit meetings to one per year with the possibility of additional meetings if necessary.

[23] This was a general comment applicable to all co-ordination committees throughout the EU.

6.47 Some members informed us that the reliance on achieving a general agreement on some issues through consensus has not always been effective. In particular, the Chairperson of each co-ordination committee places too strong an emphasis on the views of ATC and the airport authorities. Whereas co-ordination committees in Member States such as the UK and The Netherlands have a 'weighted' voting structure with approximately 90% of the votes distributed amongst the airlines, in Germany the users appear to be treated as one voice and with equal importance to the other members. Establishing a unique view amongst a collection of individuals so diverse can sometimes be quite difficult.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

6.48 The majority of the work of the co-ordination committees concerns the discussion of airport capacity.

6.49 The Federal Ministry of Transport believes that the co-ordination committees also play an important part in the whole process of slot allocation in Germany, including the assessment of airport capacity, albeit in a consultative capacity. The Ministry reserves the right to redefine the slot co-ordination parameters – after consultation with committee members – in accordance with Article 6 of the Regulation.

6.50 The Federal Ministry of Transport has only had to consider one formal complaint made by a carrier (Vietnam Airlines) on the allocation of slots. The complaint was subsequently rejected, as it was found that the co-ordinator had done everything within his powers to accommodate the requests of the complainant.

VII Greece

Capacity assessments and the designation process

7.1 The Greek Civil Aviation Authority (HCAA) is responsible for designating airports as either co-ordinated or fully co-ordinated.

7.2 **Athens Hellinikon** and **Thessalonika** airports were designated as fully co-ordinated airports for the whole year round, following the entry into force of the Regulation. Both airports were classified as SCR in the mid-1980s.

7.3 In addition to Athens and Thessalonika airports, there are a further 27 airports in Greece designated as fully co-ordinated (and classified as SCR) for the *Summer* season only. During the Winter, they are neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated but are classified as SMA airports.

7.4 We were informed that at the time of designation of the Greek airports, there was no consultation with interested parties. However, we did not receive any complaints over this apparent lack of transparency.

7.5 On the basis of its own annual capacity studies which follow closely the 'IATA Airport Terminal Capacity Programme' methodology, the HCAA deemed Athens and Thessalonika airports to be in need of full co-ordination. The co-ordinator and the respective airport authorities provided assistance to the HCAA during this process.

7.6 Updates to capacity assessments are carried out whenever changes occur that influence airport capacity, e.g. terminal development and apron extensions. We were informed that specific capacity assessments have been carried out for the purpose of airport designation. However, we were not provided with a capacity assessment study. The HCAA provided a list of co-ordination parameters for a selection of Greek airports, described in their written response as 'capacity assessments'. One interested party stated that they also were unable to obtain a full capacity analysis as required in Article 3 (3) of the Regulation.

7.7 We received no complaints over the current status of Athens airport, although the status of some of the smaller Greek airports was questioned.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

7.8 The HCAA determines the capacity available for slot allocation on a biannual basis, although the extent of consultation with the various interested parties, is unclear. The co-ordinator is consulted before the results are released, in order to ensure that all supply and/or demand constraints are reflected in the co-ordination parameters.

7.9 The principal constraints at Athens airport are on the runway[24], whilst in Thessalonika, the runway and the apron were classified as being areas with considerable congestion during the day. The terminal building at Thessalonika airport was recently extended. The co-ordinator cited the limited terminal and apron capacity at the Greek Island airports as justification for their fully co-ordinated stati.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

7.10 We were provided with a list of the co-ordination parameters for all the fully co-ordinated airports in Greece by the HCAA. The HCAA described the data as 'capacity assessments', but technically (i.e. according to the Regulation) the information provided is only the output from a capacity determination study.

7.11 The following co-ordination parameters were applied for the two, fully co-ordinated, Category 1 airports in Greece during the Summer 1999 season:

Airport:	**Athens[25]**	**Thessalonika[26]**
Runway:		
Max. movements/hour	32	13
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	17/15	8/6
Terminal		
Max. no. arriving passengers/hour	2,360	1,500
Max. no. departing passengers/hour	2,500	1,000
Apron		
Total number of stands	40	11

7.12 We understand that the implementation of the Schengen Treaty from the start of the Summer 2000 period will restrict departing passenger flows at both Category 1 airports[27].

7.13 We received hourly traffic data for Athens and Thessalonika airports during a peak week in August 1999.

Co-ordinators

Overview

7.14 In 1981, the HCAA appointed Olympic Airways as co-ordinator of all Greek airports. There appears to have been very little consultation with other interested

[24] This is in no small part due to the increased frequency of usage by the new Greek 'start-up' carriers.

[25] Terminal and apron co-ordination parameters combine the capacity of East Terminal A and East Terminal B. We did not receive any data on the co-ordination parameters of the West Terminal.

[26] Terminal co-ordination parameters combine international and domestic passenger capacities.

[27] In addition to Heraklion, Kerkira and Rhodes airports.

parties regarding Olympic Airways' appointment[28]. Following the designation of Greek airports, the HCAA reaffirmed the Olympic Airways' appointment. The Head of Co-ordination appears to have been appointed for an indefinite time period.

7.15 The Head of Co-ordination and his three members of staff are all employees (and appointees) of Olympic Airways. The co-ordinator stated that he needs at least double the number of current employees and more advanced IT systems in order to properly fulfil the co-ordination role. One informed party described the IT systems as 'antiquated' and potentially unable to fulfil a number of the reporting requirements described in the Regulation. We understand that the monitoring of slot usage by carriers is only done on a sample basis, as there is no system interface between the co-ordinator and the local airport authorities.

7.16 The HCAA does not directly intervene in the work of the co-ordinator or the National Co-ordination Committee. However, the co-ordinator is ultimately accountable to the HCAA regarding all issues concerning slot allocation.

7.17 The co-ordinator reports to Olympic Airways regarding all financial or administrative issues. As such, this set-up lends itself to accusations of a lack of independence on behalf of the national flag carrier. We do not regard this arrangement as best practice, indeed, it is one of the least satisfactory co-ordination structures in any of the EU Member States.

7.18 We only received the full response from the Greek co-ordinator by Mid-January 2000. The delay in sending a full response appears to be indicative of the lack of resources within Greek airport co-ordination. Indeed, the co-ordinator did point out that the only complaints he had received, regarded the speed to which he responded to enquiries, not the neutrality or transparency of his decision-making.

7.19 One concern of user airlines was the degree of control exercised by Olympic Airways across all operations at Greek airports. Olympic Airways is the sole handling agent (and slot co-ordinator) of Greek airports. Off-time performance by an airline leads to a financial penalty, levied by the handling division of Olympic Airways. This set-up adds further weight to the argument of the lack of independence within Greek airport co-ordination.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

7.20 The HCAA published an official decree in July 1995, establishing a single National Co-ordination Committee for all of Greece's fully co-ordinated airports. We did not receive a copy of this decree. A very brief constitution was drafted, in Greek, to support the status, role and membership of the committee.

[28] A principal reason for this lack of consultation was the absence at the time of other Greek carriers in competition with Olympic Airways.

7.21 We were unable to hold a telephone interview with the Chairperson or Vice-Chairperson of the Greek National Co-ordination Committee (the Deputy Governor of HCAA and the General Director of Air Transport of HCAA, respectively), despite repeated attempts.

Membership

7.22 Based on our interviews with interested parties so far, we understand that the set-up of the National Co-ordination Committees in Greece is not significantly different from the structure we reported in our 1995 study. The National Co-ordination Committee comprises:

- the Director of the Airports Division and the General Director of Air Navigation;
- the Directors of the six largest airports in Greece;
- a representative from the Board of Airline Representatives (BAR);
- representatives from IATA and IACA; and
- the co-ordinator as a (non-voting) observer.

No airlines (including Olympic Airways) are members of the Greek National Co-ordination Committee.

7.23 Representatives of IACA informed us that the opinions of the HCAA and the Directors of the Airports dominate the National Co-ordination Committee meetings. The views of the airlines are not given as much weight as those in co-ordination committees in most other European countries. This is inevitable bearing in mind the composition of the committee. We regard this absence of individual airline representation (both domestic and foreign) as not a best practice approach.

Technical aspects

7.24 The National Co-ordination Committee meets at least twice per year and undertakes the roles specified in the Regulation. Voting takes place on a one-member, one-vote basis with decisions taken by absolute majority. However, there has never been any need for a vote to take place.

7.25 All meetings are conducted in Greek, but the minutes are made available in English. We are unsure if the conduct of meetings, the issuing of minutes and the procedure for handling complaints is specified in the official decree.

7.26 We were informed that the notice provided to members in advance of each meeting is often less than one week, creating problems for the overseas members in arranging adequate representation. The standard notification period is one and half months, at which time any member may propose items to be placed on the agenda.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

7.27 Most of the work of the Greek National Co-ordination Committee involves discussion on the allocations of slots and capacity-related issues.

VIII Ireland

Capacity assessments and the designation process

8.1 The Ministry of Public Enterprise is responsible for airport designation in Ireland. The Irish government is in the process of passing a bill, to set-up an independent regulator of Irish airports. Once formed, the Ministry of Public Enterprise will pass the responsibility for airport designation to the regulator[29].

8.2 **Dublin** airport is classified as SMA according to IATA's definitions of schedule co-ordination but it is neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated according to the EU Regulation.

8.3 The airport authority, Aer Rianta, is currently in negotiations with the Irish government in order to change the status of the airport to fully co-ordinated. We believe that Aer Rianta would like to see the status changed so as to improve its ability to manage various capacity constraints. There is a possibility that Dublin airport will seek to move to a fully co-ordinated status for specific times of the year e.g. just for the Summer or for weekends only.

8.4 Aer Lingus is against any change to the co-ordination status at Dublin airport, citing a loss of scheduling flexibility as the primary reason for its resistance. We understand that many other users have written to Aer Rianta to express their objections to the proposed change of status.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

8.5 The schedule co-ordinator for Dublin airport (an employee of Aer Lingus) was unable to provide us with any data on hourly traffic levels. Despite our requests, Aer Rianta also did not send the data we required.

8.6 During the summer and at the weekends, Dublin airport experiences very high levels of congestion in its terminal building and on the runway. The current runway capacity at Dublin airport is 36 movements per hour, with the expectation that this will increase to 40 movements per hour for the next scheduling season. Terminal capacity is currently under review, to reflect the current expansion (due to be completed by mid-June 2000).

8.7 The British co-ordination company, ACL, recently conducted a review of the schedule co-ordination parameters at Dublin airport, which we understand has been passed on to the Irish government.

Co-ordinators

[29] Along with its other responsibilities such as the regulation of airport charges.

Overview

8.8 The national flag carrier, Aer Lingus, performs the duties required for a SMA airport co-ordinator. Indeed, there appears to be a higher degree of consultation and discussion between the schedule co-ordinator and the user airlines at Dublin airport, than is the case at other SMA airports.

8.9 Meetings take place involving the main airlines using the airport, at least twice a year. The schedule co-ordinator tries to persuade the airlines to re-schedule operations outside of times of peak congestion. (This action in itself is an indication that "natural" demand exceeds capacity and that designation as a fully co-ordinated airport may soon be appropriate, if airlines decline to re-time operations voluntarily.)

8.10 Aer Lingus is currently the sole financier of the schedule co-ordinator and his one assistant, despite (unofficially) requesting contributions from Aer Rianta. The co-ordinator is currently unable to monitor slot usage and performance due to the limited capabilities of its existing IT systems. A move towards full co-ordination would necessitate a significant improvement in the current systems.

8.11 The schedule co-ordinator acknowledged the perceived lack of independence in the current co-ordination set-up in Ireland.

Co-ordination committees

8.12 As Dublin is not a fully co-ordinated airport (as yet) no co-ordination committee has been set-up. A 'Scheduling Committee' exists at Dublin airport to support the work of the co-ordinator. The committee meets biannually and comprises the major airlines using the airport.

8.13 The chairmanship of the committee rotates amongst the major airlines using the airport (currently Lufthansa), with the schedule co-ordinator fulfilling the role of Vice-Chairperson.

IX Italy

Capacity assessments and the designation process

9.1 In Italy, the Ente Nazionale Aviazione Civile (ENAC) is responsible for designating airports as either fully co-ordinated or co-ordinated.

9.2 There are 10 fully co-ordinated airports and 3 co-ordinated airports in Italy (all with SCR status). Of the Category 1 airports **Milan-Bergamo**, **Milan-Malpensa**, **Rome-Ciampino** and **Rome-Fiumicino** are fully co-ordinated with **Milan-Linate** classified as co-ordinated (and SMA).

9.3 We were not provided with capacity assessment studies for any of the fully co-ordinated airports in Italy. ENAC provided a list of co-ordination parameters for a selection of Italian airports, incorrectly classified as 'capacity assessments'. In our 1995 study, we reported that the existing SCR status of Italian airports was used as a basis for designation.

9.4 ENAC stated that it consulted the user airlines, the airport authorities, the co-ordinator, customs and ATC prior to the designation of each Italian airport.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

9.5 ENAC carries out the biannual assessments of capacity. Once determined, the capacity determination studies are provided to the Italian airports co-ordinating authority (Assoclearance), and discussed within the co-ordination committee meetings.

9.6 ENAC stated that all of the Category 1 airports in Italy are runway constrained for certain times of the day and week, with the demand for slots exceeding their availability. This inevitably puts pressure on the available terminal capacity, but the congestion imposed is not believed to be a 'binding' constraint.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

9.7 The following co-ordination parameters were provided for the Category 1 airports in Italy for Winter 1999:

Airport:	Rome-Ciampino	Rome-Fiumicino	Milan-Linate	Milan-Malpensa	Milan-Bergamo
Runway:					
Max. movements/hour	18	84	20	61[30]	16
Terminal: (International)					
Max. no. arriving passengers/hour	800[31]	4,400	3,600	8,200	700
Max. no. departing passengers/hour	800	4,500	2,700	7,500	800
Terminal: (Domestic)					
Max. no. arriving passengers/hour	N/A	7,000	2,100	6,700	1,100
Max. no. departing passengers/hour	N/A	7,000[32]	1,600	6,950	1,000
Apron:					
Total number of stands	18	91	36	84	25

9.8 The Summer 2000 co-ordination parameters are mostly the same as the previous season, with the exception of an increase in the terminal passenger limits at Rome-Fiumicino and an increase in the permissible number of runway movements at Milan–Malpensa (to 70[33]) and Milan-Bergamo (to 18). The Summer 2000 co-ordination parameters for the runway at Milan-Linate are still subject to official conformation.

9.9 NAC charts were provided for all fully co-ordinated and co-ordinated airports in Italy for the Winter 1999 season. We also received a breakdown of runway movements for selected 'peak weeks' at each airport. The data provided listed runway movements (landing and take-off) for each hour in the busiest week. The week chosen for each airport ranged from the 10th-16th May at Milan Linate to the 4th-10th October at Rome-Fiumcino.

Co-ordinators

Overview

9.10 In Italy, Assoclearance is the legal entity responsible for carrying out the national co-ordination function at both the fully co-ordinated and co-ordinated

[30] 61 movements/hour possible during 2 hours of maximum peak, 58 movements/hour during 2 hours immediately before or after defined peak.

[31] Refers to **all** passengers (domestic and international).

[32] Domestic passenger limitations include Schengen passengers.

[33] We understand that environment restrictions were applied at Milan Malpensa airport following a government decree (adapted by the Minister of the Environment) in December 1999 that limited the number of allowable hourly movements.

airports, under a decree[34] issued in 1997 by the Italian Minister of Transport, taking over the role previously fulfilled by Alitalia[35].

9.11 ENAC informed us that the users, the airport handling companies and the state bodies were all consulted prior to the appointment of Assoclearance.

9.12 Assoclearance is (currently) an association of 9 Italian airlines[36] and 8 airport concession companies. The previous co-ordinator, Alitalia, was one of the seven founding members.

9.13 The costs of financing Assoclearance's activities are shared on a 50:50 basis between the airlines and the airport concession (i.e. management) companies. The airlines meet their share of the costs in proportion to the number of slots they are allocated and the airport concession companies recover their costs in proportion to the number of aircraft movements they handle.

9.14 The expected costs of financing the co-ordination function are forecast each year and advance payments are required by members based on their previous years contribution. A final settlement of costs occurs annually (usually in March/April) to reflect the actual allocation of slots and aircraft movements.

9.15 Assoclearance employs 12 staff (including the president) to fulfil the co-ordination and office management roles. The people selected from the airlines and airports were asked to resign from their previous posts and reapply to Assoclearance, thereby ensuring a degree of independence from their previous employers. Assoclearance is regularly assisted by consultants for the more complex, legal and administrative matters.

9.16 The senior co-ordinator (i.e. the assistant to the president) is elected by the Assoclearance board every three years and can hold office for no more than three terms. Unlike in France, the issue of electing the senior co-ordinator was not a concern expressed by any of the parties involved with Italian slot co-ordination – including the current, senior co-ordinator.

9.17 The co-ordinator must report to the board of Assoclearance on all issues related to the financing of the co-ordination function as well as reporting to ENAC on issues of relevance to slot allocation.

---

[34] Decree 44/t, 4 August 1997.

[35] In between Alitalia relinquishing control of the co-ordination process in October 1996 and Assoclearance taking over in December 1997, the Direzione Generale Aviazone Civile assumed all responsibility for slot co-ordination.

[36] I.e. Alitalia, Alitalia Team, Meridiana, Air One, Alpieageles, Alzura, Air Dolimiti, Aerofly and Air Europe.

9.18 Assoclearance uses the SCORE system to allocate slots and monitor their usage. No fundamental changes to its co-ordination systems are expected in the near future.

9.19 A poll was recently conducted at the fully co-ordinated Italian airports, in which the principal users of the airports were asked to compare the performance of Assoclearance with other co-ordination companies in the Community. 80% of users who responded stated that Assoclearance's performance[37] was 'near the best'[38].

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

9.20 In June 1994, the Ministry of Transport enacted legislation to establish a 'National Co-ordination Committee' and one local co-ordination committee at each co-ordinated and fully co-ordinated airport in Italy. However, in the decree passed in August 1997 establishing Assoclearance as the co-ordinator, it was decided that the National Co-ordination Committee should be disbanded whilst the local co-ordination committees were to remain in place.

9.21 There are no sub-committees at any of the airports as yet, though this situation may change in the near future.

9.22 The co-ordinator stated that the role of the local committees is exactly as specified by Article 5 of the Regulation.

9.23 We were unable to hold a telephone interview with any of the Chairpersons, although we did receive a faxed response from the CAA's Directors at Rome-Ciampino and Milan-Malpensa airports.

Membership

9.24 The local co-ordination committee meetings are open to representatives from:

- the airlines and their representatives organisations, using the airport or airport system on a regular basis;
- the airport authority;
- ATC;
- the administrative and state bodies at the airport, e.g. police, customs;
- the handling company; and
- the co-ordinator.

---

[37] The level of 'Performance' was measured against four factors i.e. timeliness of response, transparency, general co-operative attitude and approach to carrier's rotation problems.

[38] Source: Assoclearance.

9.25 The Director of the CAA at each airport is appointed (indefinitely) to chair the committee meetings.

9.26 At Milan-Malpensa airport the co-ordinator may only act as an observer at the committee meetings, whereas at Rome-Ciampino airport, the co-ordinator is a full member. Furthermore, at Milan-Malpensa airport we understand that Alitalia and two representatives from the AOC are the only airline representatives with 'member' status.

9.27 Assoclearance and the Chairperson of the Rome-Ciampino Co-ordination Committee were both satisfied with the seniority of attendees at committee meetings.

Technical aspects

9.28 There are no voting procedures in place for the co-ordination committees, agreement is reached through discussion and general consensus. All meetings are conducted in Italian unless requested otherwise and take place at the airport using facilities provided by the airport management companies.

9.29 Co-ordination committee meetings take place biannually, with additional meetings possible on request of the Chairperson, with a minimum of one week's notice provided.

9.30 There are no restrictions on what issues may be discussed at the committee meetings. However, we have not received any details on the precise nature of the agenda or on when it is distributed. We were informed that some of the committee meetings have been arranged at very short notice and very close to, if not after, the deadline for changing the forthcoming season's schedules.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

9.31 Assoclearance stated that the local co-ordination committees have never been required to handle a complaint regarding slot allocation. The committees are generally involved in discussions regarding capacity-related issues and the work of the airport companies.

9.32 We understand that the Milan-Malpensa Co-ordination Committee evaluates airport capacity following all new developments and requests. Such a debate took place before the agreement to build new airport infrastructure in 2000.

9.33 In February 2000, Austrian Airlines complained about its initial allocation of slots at Milan-Malpensa airport following the shift in operations from Milan-Linate airport. However, these issues were discussed within the committee meetings and the issue was subsequently resolved. A number of other airlines, in particular Lufthansa, Air France and BA also expressed concerns at the outcome of the rescheduling of operations from Milan-Linate to Milan-Malpensa airport. These disputes have been relayed to the European Commission.

X Luxembourg

Capacity assessments and the designation process

10.1 There is only one major airport in Luxembourg (i.e. Luxembourg airport). The airport is neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated, but it does have the SMA classification according to IATA. We were informed that there are no plans to change its co-ordination status as the airport has considerable excess capacity in all areas.

10.2 We were not provided with data to substantiate this argument, although Luxembourg is by some margin the least busy capital city airport in the Community.

XI The Netherlands

Capacity assessments and the designation process

11.1 The Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management has responsibility for airport designation in the Netherlands.

11.2 **Amsterdam-Schiphol** was designated as a fully co-ordinated airport in 1997, primarily because of the limited number of runway slots available annually due to the firm environmental noise restrictions. The airport authority, ATC and the Dutch airlines were all consulted prior to the designation of Amsterdam-Schiphol. A runway capacity study is conducted each year, although a full and detailed capacity analysis as per Article 3(3) of the Regulation, does not appear to have been completed.

11.3 We were provided with a copy of the national legislation implemented alongside Council Regulation No. 95/93 together with the ministerial decisions for designating Amsterdam-Schiphol as fully co-ordinated and for setting up the co-ordinator and co-ordination committee as per Articles 4 and 5 of the legislation.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

11.4 We were not provided with a detailed capacity determination study for Amsterdam-Schiphol airport. However each year, the airport authority assesses the capacity available and the expected level of utilisation at the airport in its 'annual operational plan'. The assessments of *runway* capacity are discussed by the co-ordinator and the co-ordination committee before being submitted to the Directorate General of Civil Aviation for approval.

11.5 Due to the tight environmental constraints at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport, there is a limit on the number of aircraft movements each year. The environmental constraints limit runway utilisation to approximately two-thirds of its physical capacity[39]. The Dutch government allows an increase of no more than 20,000 aircraft movements per year at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport. The airport authority must prove that its declared capacity is within these limits. The agreed capacity is then translated each six months into schedule co-ordination parameters.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

11.6 The approximated co-ordination parameters across all five runways for the peak hours[40] in 1999 were:

---

[39] Based on the 17-hour period between 0600 and 2300 local time.

[40] '108' movements refers to the departures peak whereas the '104' movements refers to the arrivals peak.

Airport:	Amsterdam-Schiphol
Runway:	
Max. arrivals and departures/hour[41]	104/108
Max no. of stands	158

11.7 We did not receive any data on the terminal co-ordination parameters at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport. We were informed that the terminal has a high level of excess capacity.

11.8 We received a summary of the hourly runway movements at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport for a peak week in August 1999.

Co-ordinators

Overview

11.9 The Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Management created an independent foundation, Airport Co-ordination Netherlands (SACN) to carry out slot co-ordination at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport and also appointed its Head of Co-ordination. SACN's appointment will be due for renewal on 1 November 2001.

11.10 SACN was originally owned by the four biggest airlines in the Netherlands, i.e. KLM, Air Holland, Martinair and Transavia, although Air Holland has subsequently ceased trading. KLM has substantial shareholdings in both Martinair and Transavia. The costs of operating SACN are recovered from the four owning airlines in proportion to the annual number of slots they hold at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport[42].

11.11 Originally, the Dutch government named the Head of Co-ordination as a 'natural' person. The government subsequently decided to appoint the foundation, SACN, in its own right. The current Head of Co-ordination at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport is due to retire next year. The Dutch government has asked for a proposal from SACN regarding his successor.

11.12 The regulations enforced by the Minister of Transport in the Netherlands state that the Head of Co-ordination (i.e. the Managing Director of SACN) must act in a neutral, non-discriminatory and transparent manner and report to the Minister on a biannual basis. All financial decisions are discussed with the Board of SACN.

11.13 Three other people assist the Head of Co-ordination with slot allocation at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport.

---

[41] The arriving and departing peak movements depend on the configuration and usage of the runways. As a result, there are 9 different permutations of (20-minute) co-ordination parameters.

[42] The approximate proportion of slots held by each airline is as follows: KLM 80%; Transavia 11%; Martinair 6% and Air Holland 3%.

11.14 The Head of Co-ordination uses operational data from the airport authority and ATC to assist with the allocation and monitoring of slots. The Head of Co-ordination stated that some reports are difficult to produce at certain times of the day, due to the complex set-up of the monitoring systems.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

11.15 'Co-ordination Committee Netherlands' (CCN) was set-up at Amsterdam-Schiphol airport in 1998. We were provided with the constitution underpinning the work of the CCN.

11.16 The constitution of the CCN states that it must act in a consultative capacity and fulfil the roles laid out in Article 5 (1) of the legislation, with regard given to the provisions of the IATA Scheduling Procedures Guide.

11.17 The CCN has *appointed* a sub-committee to advise on day-to-day issues related to the roles laid out in Article 5 (1). The majority of the work of the sub-committee has so far been to discuss the capacity studies produced by the airport authorities.

11.18 The CCN retains ultimate power and responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Regulation. So far the CCN has met only a few occasions and is still very much in its infancy.

Membership

11.19 CCN members elect a Chairperson (currently KLM) every three years and the Secretary must be an employee of the airport authority. Membership is open to representatives of:

- the air carriers using the airport regularly or which have expressed an interest in slot allocation at the airport;
- the organisations of air carriers whose members use the airport regularly (currently IATA and IACA);
- the airport authority; and
- ATC.

11.20 The Head of Co-ordination is permitted to attend the meetings as observer and the Chairperson is free to invite other interested parties if he/she deems it necessary.

11.21 The current Chairperson of the CCN was satisfied with the seniority of attendees at each committee meeting, although he did note that the smaller carriers are generally unable to send representatives with the same level of experience as the larger carriers.

11.22 The Executive Sub-Committee comprises a representative from 2 Dutch airlines (KLM and Martinair) and 2 foreign airlines (Lufthansa and Cityflyer) as well as the Head of Co-ordination, the Chairperson and the Secretary of CCN. The Executive Sub-Committee is able to convene at shorter notice and deal with day to day problems more efficiently than CCN despite its lower official status.

Technical aspects

11.23 CCN is required to meet at least once per year and must also convene if the Chairperson or five (or more) of its members requests an additional meeting. Meetings are conducted in either Dutch or English with the minutes available to all members of the committee.

11.24 In the event of a vote, 1,000 votes are made available of which the air carriers receive 900, the airport receives 40, with the remainder distributed evenly between ATC, IATA and IACA. If the airport, ATC and or IATA/IACA are not present at the meetings, their votes are transferred to the air carriers present. The number of votes allocated to the individual air carriers is based on the proportion of slots held at the airport, with a maximum individual holding of 360 votes (40%) permitted. In the event of an outcome of equality, the Chairperson has the casting vote.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

11.25 To date, there have been no formal complaints regarding the decisions or status of the Head of Co-ordination, although, the constitution does have a section detailing how such a complaint should be handled if it arises. The work of the CCN has so far been focussed on creating an agreed constitution and discussing capacity related issues (in co-operation with its sub-committee).

11.26 The airport authority has requested regular discussions in committee meetings on slot performance at the airport, stemming from its concerns over airline behaviour in this area.

XII Portugal

Capacity assessments and the designation process

12.1 There are no fully co-ordinated or co-ordinated airports in Portugal. However, the four largest airports (**Lisbon**, **Faro**, Oporto and Funchal) all have SCR status under the IATA regulation.

12.2 The Portuguese government is in the process of restructuring the institutional structure of civil aviation, having already set-up the National Institute of Civil Aviation (INAC). INAC is reviewing the co-ordination status of the principal Portuguese airports with the intention of changing their designation to fully co-ordinated 'as early as is possible'.

12.3 INAC is also responsible for ensuring that the capacity analyses are carried out at Portuguese airports. INAC recently sent written requests to the four SCR classified airports in Portugal asking them to carry out such an analysis.

12.4 We recently received a copy of two sections of a 'Strategic Market Study' for Oporto airport. The documents were broadly consistent with what is required from a full capacity analysis with regards to analysing the current airport capacity. Indeed, one section of the report contained a list of annexes analysing airport capacity across the runway (including minor configuration changes), the terminal and the apron/stands. However, there was very little discussion on where the principal problems/constraints exist and of equal importance, how they could be resolved. Therefore, although the analysis of existing capacity was very thorough, the document fell someway short of meriting the classification of 'capacity analysis'.

12.5 The co-ordination of Lisbon airport began in 1966, with Faro airport more recently becoming co-ordinated following the rather sudden increase of traffic during the 1970s.

12.6 Representatives of IATA and the users expressed concerns over the current non-designation of the four largest Portuguese airports.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

12.7 INAC convenes four meetings a year (one before and one after each IATA conference), attended by representatives from the local airport authorities and the co-ordination body in order to discuss current co-ordination issues and verify if slots have been correctly allocated during the current IATA conference and satisfy the capacities they have declared for each airport. In addition, any changes to declared capacity in the forthcoming schedule period are disclosed and analysed.

12.8 INAC cited the information contained in the NAC charts as evidence of the high degree of runway congestion at Lisbon and Faro airports. The runway utilisation data we were provided with reinforced these conclusions.

12.9 There is also considerable pressure on apron capacity at certain times of the day at Lisbon airport, whilst at Faro airport, terminal capacity is stretched during the summer.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

12.10 The key schedule co-ordination parameters at Lisbon and Faro airports for the Summer 1999 season were as follows:

Airport:	Lisbon	Faro
Runway:		
Max. movements/15 mins	8	5
Max. arrivals or departures/15 mins	6	3
Max. movements/hour	30	18
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	18	9
Terminal:		
Max. arriving passengers/hour	2,800	1,600
Max. departing passengers/hour	2,800	1,600
Apron:		
Total number of stands	37	19

12.11 The co-ordination parameters for Funchal and Oporto airports were also provided; the declared runway capacity was 6 movements per hour at Funchal and 14 at Oporto; the terminal capacities were 720/900 arriving/departing passengers per hour at Funchal and 1200/1200 arriving/departing passengers per hour at Oporto; with maximum stand availability limited to 9 at Funchal and 14 at Oporto.

12.12 We received the Summer 1999 NAC charts as well as peak week runway and terminal utilisation data, for the four major Portuguese airports.

Co-ordinators

Overview

12.13 INAC is currently looking into ways of restructuring the slot co-ordination process for Portuguese airports in anticipation of their designation.

12.14 INAC suggested that the responsibility for airport co-ordination might be transferred to the airport authorities or possibly to itself. INAC does not believe that the current co-ordinator can act in a fully independent manner within the existing arrangements.

12.15 The Portuguese civil aviation authorities appointed a schedule co-ordinator for Lisbon airport following the commencement of schedule co-ordination around thirty years ago and the same co-ordinator still holds office at the time of writing.

12.16 The schedule co-ordinator is currently an employee of Air Portugal and all co-ordination activities, including the salaries of his three staff, are financed entirely by the national flag carrier. The co-ordinator stated that he would require an increase in

staff, if INAC decide to declare the co-ordination status of its airports in accordance with the EU Regulation.

12.17 On instruction of the Commercial Services department, the co-ordinator must transfer responsibility for the day-to-day co-ordination process to the Ground Handling Services department, 15 days prior to the start of the new IATA season. This is primarily due to the lack of staff available to carry out the co-ordination process for the entirety of the IATA scheduling seasons. This set-up would need to be reviewed if INAC decide to designate one or more of the Portuguese airports.

12.18 The schedule co-ordinator is unable to monitor the usage of slots at each airport due to the limitations of the current systems and expressed his desire to replace the current co-ordination systems with the SCORE system, subject to the approval of INAC.

12.19 The schedule co-ordinator stated that he believes he performs his role with neutrality and transparency, citing the absence of any formal complaints to the Portuguese civil aviation authorities, as evidence of his application of these principles. Indeed, the co-ordinator must report to INAC on a number of issues, in particular regarding the transparency and neutrality of slot allocation decisions.

Co-ordination committees

12.20 There are no co-ordination committees at any of the Portuguese airports. As a result, all complaints related to the allocation of slots at Portuguese airports are directed in the first instance, to INAC. INAC then requests an explanation from the schedule co-ordinator for the decisions he made.

XIII Spain

Capacity assessments and the designation process

13.1 The body responsible for airport designation in Spain is Aena (the national airport and air traffic control authority) in consultation with the Department of Civil Aviation, DGAC. The co-ordinator informed us that to date, **no** Spanish airports have been formally designated.

13.2 We did not receive a full reply to our request for information from the Spanish government. However, in a brief letter we received in February 2000, the government informed us that the designation status of each Spanish airport is currently under review.

13.3 Aena carried out a number of capacity analyses at the time the Regulation entered into force in the Community. We did not receive any copies of these analyses. However, new capacity assessments are in the process of being finalised for the busiest airports (including Madrid-Barajas, Palma de Mallorca and Barcelona) in Spain.

13.4 The latest work involves the use of improved assessment methodologies. Runway capacity is assessed using an application called PICAP (Programme for the Analysis of Runway Capacity) and terminal/apron capacity is assessed using a dynamic simulation model called MODA (Airport Modelization) [43]. PICAP and MODA both appear to be comprehensive, professional and highly applicable analysis tools.

13.5 **Madrid-Barajas** is the busiest airport in Spain and the co-ordinator expects it to be formally declared 'fully co-ordinated' for the whole year. We received complaints from a variety of users and their representative organisations regarding the intervention of the Spanish government over the declared co-ordination parameters. We understand that the National Co-ordination Committee discussed and approved a proposed increase in slot availability at Madrid-Barajas airport following the opening of an additional runway, only to see its declaration reduced by approximately 10% by the Spanish government, due to 'environmental' and 'quality of service' concerns.

13.6 We were informed that the proposed increase in the number of movements per hour at Madrid-Barajas airport was reduced by approximately 10% following a review by the Spanish government. We did not receive a full explanation for the reasons behind the intervention and as such, we are unable to comment on the merits/demerits of their actions.

[43] PICAP and MODA were developed by a panel of experts from the Air Navigation and Airport Units of AENA.

13.7 The co-ordinator also noted how the introduction of an additional runway at Madrid-Barajas airport led to a change in the expected traffic mix of aircraft[44]. As a result, the capacity analysis and the co-ordination parameters were amended accordingly.

13.8 The co-ordinator expects **Palma de Mallorca** airport to be classified fully co-ordinated all year round[45], whilst it is likely that **Malaga** airport will be classified as fully co-ordinated for the Summer only[46].

13.9 A capacity assessment for **Las Palmas**, the only other Category 1 airport in Spain, is unlikely to be performed in the near future due to the relatively low levels of capacity utilisation at the airport. Furthermore, the co-ordinator does not expect this airport to become designated.

13.10 In general, the opinion of users and their representative organisations suggests that all of the Category 1 airports, with the exception of Las Palmas airport, should be officially designated, fully co-ordinated for the whole year round.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

13.11 Aena determines the biannual capacity co-ordination parameters at its airports and discusses the findings within the National Co-ordination Committee.

13.12 We were informed by the co-ordinator that the main capacity constraint at Madrid-Barajas airport is on the runway, whilst there are significant terminal congestion problems at Palma de Mallorca and Malaga airports. Spain has a high proportion of tourist airports, experiencing very noticeable peaks in demand for the usage of the runway and the terminal buildings

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

13.13 We were provided with the co-ordination parameters for all 42 airports under Aena's control for the Summer and Winter of 1999. The parameters of the Category 1 airports for the Summer 1999 season were as follows:

[44] There was an unexpected increase in the number of slower and smaller aircraft operating during the peak periods.

[45] In addition to Alicante, Bilbao and most of the big Canary Island airports (e.g. Lanzarote, Fuerteventura, Tenerife South and Tenerife North).

[46] In addition to Menorca, Ibiza and a few other tourist airports.

Airport:	Madrid-Barajas[47]	Malaga	Las Palmas	Palma de Mallorca
Runway:				
Max. movements/10 mins	15	6	2	10
Max. arrivals or departures/10 mins	7/8	5/5	1/1	5/5
Max. movements/hour	68	35	6	50
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	35/42	20/20	4/4	26/26
Terminal:				
Max. arriving passengers/hour	2,600	3,200[48]	600	5,300
Max. departing passengers/hour	2,600	3,400	600	6,000
Apron:				
Total number of stands	147	76	6	114

13.14 During the Winter 1999 season, due to the ongoing revisions of runway capacity at Madrid-Barajas airport, the hourly parameters were extended to 37 arrivals and 37 departures.

13.15 We were provided with the 1999 Summer and Winter NAC charts for all of Aena's airports classified as SCR and hourly statistics of slot usage across a typical week at selected airports. In addition, Aena Co-ordination provided an assessment of terminal passenger throughput for Madrid-Barajas which highlighted the high degree of capacity utilisation at the airport.

Co-ordinators

Overview

13.16 The Spanish aviation authorities designated the national airport and air traffic control authority, Aena, as responsible for slot co-ordination, taking over the role previously carried out by Iberia and DGAC. Aena was formally appointed by Royal Decree in June 1991, complemented by a second Royal Decree in September 1993.

13.17 Aena set-up the division 'Aena Co-ordination' and appointed a Head of co-ordination. Aena Co-ordination reports directly to Aeropuertos Españoles, the Airport Unit within Aena.

13.18 The co-ordinator is assisted by 14 staff plus an additional person at each of the most congested airports in Spain all of whom adhere to Aena Co-ordination's principles and criterion for the allocation of slots. The airport representatives do not intervene directly in the establishment of these principles, except within the fora of the co-ordination committees and they report only to the Director of the airport.

[47] The capacity data for Madrid-Barajas applies to daytime operations, i.e. 0500 to 2059 UTC. The parameters are slightly lower between 2100 and 0459 UTC.

[48] The maximum number of arriving passengers refers to EU arrivals - for non-EU arrivals the figure is reduced to 1,800 passengers per hour.

13.19 All of Aena Co-ordination's costs are recovered within the parent company's budget and treated as an integral service for the use of the airport infrastructure. The accounts of all the co-ordination activities (local and central) are **not** separated publicly from Aena's other activities and there is no explicit charge for the co-ordination function.

13.20 Aena Co-ordination uses the GESLOT system for the management of slots, describing the technology as 'state of the art'. The system has a direct link with the individual airport IT systems and feeds their public information systems, thereby allowing Aena to monitor the growth of traffic at congested and non-congested airports. The ability of Aena to monitor and compare slot-related data across most of the Spanish airports reduces the ability of airlines to disguise the reasons for their off-time performance.

13.21 The co-ordinator employs two Airport Data Processing (ADP) experts from the Communications Department of Aena to assist with the development of the GESLOT system.

13.22 The co-ordinator has developed one local rule, removing the claim of a carrier to a slot, if it intentionally performs 'off-time' for four consecutive movements.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

13.23 In Spain, there is a National Co-ordination Committee, two airport co-ordination committees (Madrid and Palma de Mallorca), a National (and Palma de Mallorca) Executive Sub-Committee, a National Capacity Sub-Committee and a Slot Performance Sub-Committee at Menorca airport. The committees meet annually as an assembly with the exception of the executive committees, which meet more regularly (at least four times a year or when extraordinary circumstances arise).

13.24 We were provided with the full constitution and working procedures for the National Co-ordination Committee, the National Executive Sub-Committee and the two airport co-ordination committees.

13.25 The National Co-ordination Committee operates in a consultative capacity, advising the co-ordinator on the issues outlined in Article 5(1) of the Regulation. To all intents and purposes, the committee is operating **as if** the Spanish airports were already designated.

13.26 The National Executive Sub-Committee is responsible for defining the policies of the National Co-ordination Committee, co-ordinating the day-to-day activities of the National Co-ordination Committee and providing advice and supervision to the individual airport committees. All recommendations made by the National Executive Sub-Committee must be submitted and examined by the National Co-ordination Committee.

13.27 The roles of the National Executive Sub-Committee can be more narrowly defined as:

- to direct, encourage and co-ordinate the activities of the National Co-ordination Committee;

- to periodically report to all members of the National Co-ordination Committee regarding activities carried out and discussions and decisions reached in its meetings;

- to ensure the continuity of the National Executive Sub-Committee;

- to proceed in accordance with the recommendations of the National Co-ordination Committee;

- to ensure compliance with the Bylaws and decisions of the National Co-ordination Committee;

- to ensure that motions proposed in the National Co-ordination Committee are in line with its Bylaws and spirit;

- to propose to the National Co-ordination Committee the approval of local (airport) co-ordination committee Bylaws; and

- to advise and supervise the local co-ordination committees.

13.28 In the event of exceptional circumstances and the impossibility of holding an extraordinary meeting of the National Co-ordination Committee, the National Executive Sub-Committee may execute power on some occasions. The term 'exceptional circumstances' was not defined further within the constitution. The co-ordinator stated that most of the 'essential' business is conducted within the National Executive Sub-Committee.

13.29 The role and influence of the sub-committees was not envisaged in the Regulation. However, all parties that we spoke to were satisfied with the split of responsibilities within the respective committees. Indeed, since none of the Spanish airports are officially designated, there is no immediate requirement for the provisions of Article 5 of Regulation 95/93 to be adopted.

Membership

13.30 The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the National Co-ordination Committee are elected into office when the assembly convenes each calendar year. The Head of Co-ordination acts as secretary. Membership of the committee is open to representatives from:

- the airport authority;
- airlines operating at Spanish airports;

- IATA, IACA, ALA and AECA[49];
- Air Navigation Services; and
- the handling agents.

13.31 The National Executive Sub-Committee is attended by one representative from Air Navigation Services, the airports and the handling agents. In addition, one representative is permitted from each of the airline associations (IATA, IACA, ALA and AECA) and one from each of the airlines believed to be most representative of the traffic of the airport in question (thereby ensuring that scheduled, charter, public, private, Spanish and foreign airlines have a representation).

13.32 The members and Chairperson of the Executive Sub-Committee are all members of the National Co-ordination Committee. The co-ordinator was satisfied with the turnout and seniority of the individuals at each committee meeting.

13.33 Membership of the Madrid/Palma de Mallorca Co-ordination Committees is very similar to that of the National Co-ordination Committee. All representatives on the local committees have the same fundamental obligations and rights as the National Co-ordination Committee. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson are elected from the members of the local assemblies. A local airport representative acts as Secretary.

13.34 The National Co-ordination Committee is able to disband a local committee if two-thirds of its members vote for dissolution.

Technical aspects

13.35 All members of the committee have the right to vote, with the exception of observers e.g. the co-ordinator and DGAC, and authorised guests such as the Director of the airport under discussion.

13.36 In the event of a vote, the airline members of the Committee carry 40% of the votes, the representative organisations of airlines carry 30%, the handling agents carry 10%, the airport in question carries 10% and Air Navigation Services also carry 10%. In order to be passed, a motion must obtain a simple majority of votes unless stipulated otherwise. All complaints must be noted down in the minutes.

13.37 We received notification from a charter airline that it was difficult for foreign airlines to block the voting intentions of the Spanish contingent on the committee. The number of votes attributed to each airline is based on the number of movements they operate at the airport in question and similarly the number of votes attributed to handling agents is based on the share of movements they handle. With this system, even though the voting between members is weighted, there does appear to be a dominance exerted by the Spanish users of the airports.

[49] AECA is a representative organisation for a number of Spanish carriers. ALA is the representative association of most scheduled foreign carriers operating in Spain, but it also includes Iberia.

13.38 Various sources voiced their concern over the limited period of notification[50] provided for co-ordination committee meetings in Spain. The committees discussions are mostly conducted in Spanish and it has proved difficult for some of the interested parties to find not only sufficiently experienced personnel to attend the meetings at short notice but also a trusted translator.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

13.39 The co-ordinator estimated that approximately 95% of the discussions held in the National Co-ordination Committee, concern capacity-related issues.

13.40 To date, there have been very few official complaints on the allocation of slots at Spanish airports, the majority of the work of the co-ordination committees has concerned capacity related issues and suggestions for slot re-timings.

13.41 Madrid-Barajas airport and Palma de Mallorca airport both have their own co-ordination committee. However, the majority of issues of relevance to Madrid-Barajas airport are discussed within the workings of the National Co-ordination Committee. The Chairperson of the National Co-ordination Committee envisaged a reduction in the remit of the airport committees to cover just slot performance in the future.

13.42 We were informed that a number of airlines operating at Spanish airports have expressed their concern at the degree of slot abuse. However, these matters have not reached the National Co-ordination Committee for formal discussion, they have been dealt with by the co-ordinator and the relevant parties involved. The co-ordinator stated that the threat of slot withdrawal has greatly reduced the level of slot abuse.

[50] IACA stated that the notification period provided to them was often just one week.

XIV Sweden

Capacity assessments and the designation process

14.1 In Sweden, the Civil Aviation Administration (Luftfartsverket) is responsible for airport designation, as well as for the operation of air traffic control services at the major airports.

14.2 In 1990 with congestion increasing at the airport, Luftfartsverket carried out a full capacity analysis of **Stockholm-Arlanda airport** in line with IATA's guidelines. In 1993, Luftfartsverket produced an updated capacity analysis for the purpose of designating Stockholm-Arlanda airport as fully co-ordinated. We were provided with a copy of this study in Swedish. The study is very detailed, covers all aspects of airport capacity and is well supported by operational data including assessments of the various traffic mixes.

14.3 Stockholm-Arlanda airport was designated fully co-ordinated in 1995. It also has SCR status according to IATA's schedule co-ordination definitions. We were informed that Luftfartsverket consulted the major Swedish airlines, its own airport colleagues and the co-ordinator prior to the designation of the airport.

14.4 **Stockholm-Bromma** airport is neither co-ordinated nor fully co-ordinated. There are no other designated airports in Sweden.

14.5 We received no complaints over the current designation status of Sweden's Category 1 airports.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

14.6 In Sweden, Luftfartsverket is responsible for producing the biannual capacity determination studies. Once produced, the results of the study are discussed with the airport authority, the user airlines and the co-ordinator.

14.7 We were informed that the main area of congestion at Stockholm-Arlanda airport is on the runway during the early morning and early evening peaks. A third runway is due to come into operation by the Summer of 2002, although the terminal building at Stockholm-Arlanda is currently unable to cope with the extra traffic that the additional movements may generate.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

14.8 Since 31 October 1997, the following capacity parameters have been applied at Stockholm-Arlanda airport:

Airport:	Stockholm-Arlanda (day)[51]	Stockholm-Arlanda (night)
Runway:		
Maximum movements/5 mins	9	5
Maximum arrivals or departures/5 mins	4/5	2/3
Maximum movements/15 mins	20	10
Maximum arrivals or departures/15 mins	10/12	5/6
Maximum movements/hour	70	26
Maximum arrivals or departures/hour	35/40	17/20

14.9 We were also provided with data on available and used slots for a peak week in September 1999 along with a NAC chart for Summer 1999.

Co-ordinators

Overview

14.10 The national carrier, SAS, managed the schedule co-ordination of Stockholm-Arlanda airport from 1988 to 1995. In 1995, the Swedish Civil Aviation Administration formed a new organisation, Airport Co-ordination Sweden (ACS), to take over the slot co-ordination responsibilities of SAS at Stockholm-Arlanda airport. The Swedish CAA did not receive any objections to the replacement of SAS with ACS.

14.11 ACS is a joint stock, non-profit making organisation, referred to by the Swedish CAA as an 'economical association' and a 'legal person'. The company is half-owned by the Swedish CAA and half owned by those Swedish registered airlines holding 3% or more of the total slots at Stockholm-Arlanda airport. Operating costs are recovered equally between the Swedish CAA and the Swedish airlines using the airport, the latter's share divided between carriers in proportion to the number of slots they hold at the airport.

14.12 The co-ordinator is assisted by one other staff member, although it is likely that an additional person will be hired in the near future. The Swedish CAA appointed the current slot co-ordinator for an indefinite time period and regularly reports back to the Swedish CAA regarding all aspects of the slot allocation process.

14.13 The set-up of slot co-ordination in Sweden exhibits a high degree of independence. The power of the airlines is diluted through the financial, legal and reporting arrangements in place. However, as stated in our main report government ownership is viewed by many as a retrograde step.

14.14 ACS uses the 'Airport Performance Measurement System' to assist with the co-ordination process. This system takes into account variables such as alternative traffic mixes, different aircraft separation times and the capacity of the runway across a given hour.

[51] 'Day' defined as 0600 to 2300 UTC, 'Night' defined as 2300 to 0600 UTC

14.15 The co-ordinator is generally happy with the system in place and regularly updates the supporting software in order to ensure that all the reporting requirements of the Regulation are satisfied.

Co-ordination Committees

Status and role

14.16 A co-ordination committee at Stockholm-Arlanda airport (AACC) was formed in June 1994. There are no sub-committees.

14.17 The constitution of the AACC states that the roles to be played by the committee are those as detailed in Article 5 of the Regulation. We were provided with a copy of the constitution, in Swedish.

Membership

14.18 AACC members are appointed by their respective organisations and elect the Chairperson every year. Membership of the committee is currently open to:

- a representative from all airlines using (or wishing to use) the airport in question;
- a representative from police and customs;
- various representatives from the CAA; and
- a representative from ATC.

14.19 The Chairperson of the AACC stated that the attendees at each committee meeting are sufficiently experienced to contribute to the discussions, in particular those personnel representing the larger carriers. In addition, the Chairperson of the Airline Operations Committee is invited to attend the AACC meetings. The slot co-ordinator acts as Secretary to the committee.

Technical aspects

14.20 The constitution states that the AACC must convene at least twice per year, although in reality it meets approximately four to five times per year.

14.21 Two weeks notice is provided prior to each AACC meeting and an agenda is circulated to all members. The meetings are conducted in Swedish unless a member requests otherwise.

14.22 The AACC has never been required to vote on an issue, although a voting structure is in place. Agreement is usually reached through open debate and discussion.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

14.23 The CAA Air Transport Policy Division performs the role of regulator and competent authority in Swedish slot allocation. If problems arise within the slot

allocation process, the CAA assists the AACC to achieve a resolution. An example of this happened in 1995, when the co-ordinator had a problem with a slot-transfer between a bankrupt company and another company taking over the former carrier's traffic. The co-ordinator convened the AACC and the issue was discussed with active participation from the regulator. A solution was found and the issue was settled within the framework of the AACC.

14.24 Most of the committee's work has been concentrated on reviewing the assessments of capacity performed by Luftfartsverket. Over the last two years, the committee has assisted ATC with the restructuring of its control procedures and provided advice on the introduction of a new data support system, which led to a twofold increase in the number of available slots at Stockholm-Arlanda airport. The committee also recently assisted the co-ordinator review the slot allocation procedures, resulting in greater efficiency within the co-ordination process.

14.25 The Chairperson of the AACC stated that there had been no other official complaints regarding the set-up of co-ordination or the decisions made on slot allocation.

14.26 The structure, membership and roles of the AACC are in line with the intentions of Article 5 of the Regulation.

XV UK

Capacity assessments and the designation process

15.1 In the UK, the Secretary of State at the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions is responsible for airport designation. We were provided with a copy of the national legislation implemented alongside the Regulation.

15.2 **London-Heathrow, London-Gatwick** and Manchester airports were all classified SCR airports under the IATA rules before the implementation of the Regulation. As such, they were designated as fully co-ordinated without a further capacity analysis. The government notified the airport operators and the Scheduling Committee prior to the designation of these airports.

15.3 **London-Stansted** airport became fully co-ordinated in November 1998. We were provided with a comprehensive analysis of airport capacity produced by the airport authority, for the purpose of supporting the designation. The analysis was thorough, clear, logical and well supported with factual data, making it in our opinion one of the best examples of a capacity analysis we received in accordance with Article 3 of the Regulation. The study highlighted the high level of runway demand and utilisation across each hour of a typical busy week, in particular during the early morning and early evening peak hours.

15.4 Prior to the designation of London-Stansted, the government wrote to all the users of the airport, the relevant trade associations (e.g. BAR, IATA and Business Aviation), the airport operators and ATC, requesting their views on the proposed change in status.

15.5 Manchester Airport is the only other fully co-ordinated, SCR airport, whilst Birmingham and Glasgow airports are classified as co-ordinated, SMA airports.

15.6 **London-Luton Airport** is neither fully co-ordinated nor co-ordinated, SCR or SMA. There are very few formal co-ordination constraints. The co-ordinator is responsible for gathering traffic data and identifying imbalances between supply and demand.

15.7 We did not receive any complaints over the current designation status of London-Heathrow, London-Gatwick and London-Luton airports, but some users did raise objections to the change in designation of London-Stansted airport, questioning the extent to which the runway was at full capacity during certain times of the day.

Capacity determination and utilisation

Overview

15.8 The airport operator, BAA, produces biannual updates of airport capacity as required by Article 6 of the Regulation for London-Heathrow, London-Gatwick and London-Stansted airports. The representatives on the co-ordination committees review

the subsequent declaration of capacity before being submitted to ACL, prior to the IATA Scheduling Conference.

15.9 London-Heathrow airport is subject to a number of operational constraints most noticeably on its parallel runways and at the stands for Terminal 4 and the Cargo area. In addition, there are formal passenger constraints at each of the four terminals.

15.10 The runway at London-Gatwick airport is subject to a considerable degree of congestion throughout many hours of the day. The terminal buildings also experience heavy congestion at certain times of the day during the week.

15.11 The capacity analysis study provided for London-Stansted airport highlighted the high level of runway demand and utilisation across each hour of a typical busy week, in particular during the early morning and early evening rush hours.

15.12 London-Luton airport is only subject to some light runway congestion. The terminal building was recently expanded to accommodate the significant growth in traffic over the last decade.

Provision of data and capacity utilisation information

15.13 The approximate co-ordination parameters for the UK Category 1 airports during Summer 1999 were as follows:

Airport:	**Heathrow**	**Gatwick**	**Stansted**	**Luton**
Runway:				
Max. movements/hour[52]	81	46	37	30
Max. arrivals or departures/hour	40/41	26/28	24/24	N/A
Terminal:				
Max. arriving and departing pax/hour	16,500[53]	15,890[54]	4,200	5.000[55]
Apron:				
Total number of stands	169	108	59	Unknown

15.14 We were also provided with NAC Charts and hourly runway usage data for each Category 1 airport.

[52] The maximum number of movements per hour varies across the day. The parameters listed in the tables are the averages of the hourly maximum movements.

[53] Terminals 1, 2, 3 and 4 combined.

[54] North Terminal and South Terminal combined.

[55] Across a three hour period.

Co-ordinators

Overview

15.15 In the UK, the airport operators of all co-ordinated or fully co-ordinated airports are required to appoint a co-ordinator, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State at the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. The Secretary of State may withdraw his approval of the appointment of the co-ordinator for an airport if he is not satisfied that the co-ordinator has performed its duties in an independent manner.

15.16 Airport Co-ordination Limited (ACL) is the current appointee for all fully co-ordinated and co-ordinated airports in the UK. ACL also provides data collection and schedule adjustment services for six other airports in the UK.

15.17 ACL took over the co-ordination role previously performed by British Airways. ACL is a non-profit making company formed in 1992, limited by guarantee and owned by 11[56] UK airlines. A few foreign based airlines have expressed an interest in becoming members of ACL but did not pursue this interest beyond a preliminary enquiry to the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.

15.18 ACL provides co-ordination services to airport operators under an 'open-ended' service contract. 75% of ACL's costs are recovered through the airport service contracts, 21% are recovered from the owning airlines in proportion to the slots they hold, with the remainder recovered through training, ad hoc consultancy and data sales. With the airports contributing financially to co-ordination, this has led to a very open process with all parties involved.

15.19 ACL is governed by a Board of Directors, consisting of one representative from each of the share-owning airlines and the Managing Director (who is a full-time employee of ACL). Members (i.e. the airlines but not the Managing Director) vote where necessary on issues, on a one-member one-vote basis, with a simple majority required for approval. The Board has no policy role but exists solely to provide good administrative governance of ACL.

15.20 The institutional set-up and financial structure of ACL may be regarded as conforming very closely to the notion of 'best practice' within slot co-ordination.

15.21 ACL currently employs 26 people, 20 of which are directly involved in slot co-ordination activities.

15.22 ACL has developed a sophisticated bespoke computer system for allocating and monitoring the usage of slots. The system receives actual flight record data from all of its major airport customers on a monthly basis. This data is then compared

[56] These are BA; British Midland; Virgin; Britannia Airways; Cityflyer Express; Monarch Airlines; KLM UK; Air 2000; Airtours; GB Airways; and Flying Colours/JMC.

against planned schedules for monitoring both regularity and punctuality as well as for data quality assurance purposes.

15.23 The bespoke system is able to perform all of the reporting requirements described in Article 4 (7) of the Regulation and a copy has been sold to the French co-ordination company, COHOR. ACL stated that it will replace its current co-ordination system next year.

Co-ordination committees

Status and role

15.24 The airport operator of a fully co-ordinated airport is required by law to establish and finance a co-ordination committee in conformity with Article 5 of the Regulation. Co-ordination committees have been set-up for all four of the fully co-ordinated airports in the UK. We were provided with copies of the written constitutions for all four fully co-ordinated airports.

15.25 The constitutions state that the purpose of the committees is to assist the co-ordinator by carrying out the roles listed in Article 5 (1) of the Regulation, with regard given to the provisions of the IATA Scheduling Procedures Guide[57].

15.26 The constitutions clearly define membership, voting procedures, election of officers, and procedures for dealing with complaints and problems for new entrants.

15.27 London-Gatwick and London-Stansted airports both have very similar constitutions to the London-Heathrow Co-ordination Committee. The principal difference in the set-up of each committee concerns the actual list of attendees. We were unable to interview the Chairperson of the London-Gatwick Co-ordination Committee nor did we receive a written reply or acknowledgement.

15.28 The constitutions of the main committees state that each airport co-ordination committee may appoint a sub-committee(s). The main co-ordination committees also determine the membership and decide what roles each sub-committee should fulfil. As is the case in Spain and the Netherlands, the sub-committees essentially undertake the day-to-day activities of the main co-ordination committees, since it is neither practical nor efficient for the latter to convene every time an issue arises.

15.29 For example, at London-Gatwick airport, BAA has set-up three sub-committees, i.e.

- a Slot Performance Committee (to monitor airline slot performance and apply appropriate disciplinary measures for consistent off-slot performance);
- a Utilisation Committee (to facilitate consultation to determine the forthcoming season's scheduling limits); and

[57] To be replaced with the Worldwide Scheduling Guidelines as from April 2000.

- a Runway Capacity Declaration Committee (to facilitate consultation to determine the forthcoming season's runway capacity).

15.30 At London-Heathrow airport, there is a Slot Performance Sub-Committee, a Runway Capacity Sub-Committee and a Stand Capacity Sub-Committee.

15.31 There is a consistent and close relationship between each of the sub-committees and main committees, with similar representatives appearing on each committee.

15.32 A further feature of UK airports is the presence of 'airline' scheduling committees. These committees predate the co-ordination committees and their membership is limited to the airlines using the airport, although similar representatives usually attend the co-ordination committee meetings. The airline scheduling committees are used as a forum for discussion amongst the airlines, for the resolution of problems and for achieving prior agreement on issues to be discussed in future co-ordination committee meetings.

Membership

15.33 The Secretary of each airport co-ordination committee must be an employee of the airport authority, with membership open to one authorized representative from:

- each air carrier using the airport regularly (or who have expressed an interest in doing so);
- the representative organisations of air carriers using the airport regularly;
- the airport operator; and
- ATC.

There is no role on the co-ordination committees for the Department of Transport, the Environment and the Regions.

15.34 The co-ordinator is an observer without voting rights.

15.35 The members of the committee elect a Chairperson at each Annual General Meeting. As is the case in many other co-ordination committees, the seniority of the representatives is quite variable, with the major carriers sending their most experienced schedulers whilst the smaller carriers, unable to draw on the same resources, generally send their local airport representatives. Airport and Air Traffic Control representatives are usually from senior management at Director level.

15.36 At London-Gatwick airport the Slot Performance Committee monitors slot performance and applies disciplinary measures for consistent off-slot performance. Membership is open to a representative from the airport authority, ATC, ACL and the Scheduling Committee Executive. The Utilisation Committee assists the determination of the forthcoming season's scheduling limits and consists of representatives from the airport authority, ATC, ACL, air carriers, the Scheduling Committee, handling agents and the control authorities. The Runway Capacity Declaration Committee assists with the determination of the forthcoming season's

runway capacity and consists of representatives from the airport authority, ATC, ACL and the Scheduling Committee.

15.37 We have not received official confirmation of the membership list of the London-Heathrow sub-committees, though we understand that along with the co-ordinator, most of its other members are representatives of the major air carriers operating at the airport.

Technical aspects

15.38 Co-ordination committee meetings take place at least once per year, with exceptional meetings held when necessary.

15.39 The date, time and location of the forthcoming committee meeting are sent out 10 months in advance. Six weeks before the meeting, the invitations and a draft agenda are circulated, at which time additional points for discussion may be requested[58]. If the issues raised by interested parties are deemed to be sufficiently contentious, they may be brought forward from under 'Any Other business' in the AGM, to an Extraordinary Meeting of the committee.

15.40 BAA attempt to schedule the committee meetings for London-Heathrow, London-Gatwick and London-Stansted airports in the same week each year, in order to reduce the travel time of the attendees.

15.41 In the event of a vote in a committee, 1,000 votes are made available of which the airlines present at the meeting have 900 (distributed in proportion to slots held), the airport authority has 40, ATC has 20 and all other organisations present have the remaining 40 divided equally amongst them[59]. If the outcome is split, the Chairperson must cast the deciding vote.

Comments on the work of the co-ordination committee(s)

15.42 The constitution of the London-Heathrow Co-ordination Committee clearly outlines the procedure for handling complaints, although very few official complaints have been raised. This probably reflects the overall level of satisfaction with the slot allocations of ACL.

15.43 A major concern of the co-ordinator, the London-Heathrow Co-ordination Committee Chairperson and the UK government is the increasing use of legal action to resolve 'slot-related' disputes. One recent example concerned the allocation rules governing the distribution of slots for general (and business) aviation. The co-ordinator changed the system for providing slots to these users, by declaring a 'tactical availability' of ad hoc slots, 3 weeks in advance and developing a waiting list

[58] The constitution of the Heathrow Co-ordination Committee states that members must be informed 7 days before a meeting.

[59] The distribution of the remaining 40 votes varies slightly from airport to airport.

of slot requests. This change of approach was decided following the considerable delays being generated by general aviation users turning up at London-Heathrow airport without significant prior warning. The general aviation users objected and took their case to the law courts in order to reverse the policy. However, the courts eventually rejected the case.

15.44 The Slot Performance Sub-Committee has proved an effective mechanism for reducing slot misuse at London-Heathrow airport[60]. The committee produces bi-monthly reviews of slot performance at the airport. When the co-ordinator believes that an airline has engaged in a deliberate abuse of its allocated slots, the Slot Performance Sub-Committee may request the attendance of a representative of the offending airline in order to provide an explanation for its behaviour.

15.45 In another case, the State of Guernsey challenged BA's acquisition (and subsequent redeployment) of slots previously owned by Air UK. Allegations were raised over financial inducements. Again, the case was rejected.

15.46 The London-Gatwick Co-ordination Committee has only ever had to resolve one complaint over the allocation of slots. An Extraordinary Meeting of the committee was held to hear the views of the complainant (Laker Airways). The matter was resolved amicably at the meeting.

15.47 In our 1995 study, we commented on the degree of overlap between the co-ordination committees and the scheduling committees. There still appears to be considerable overlap between the work of the two committees. When a co-ordination committee member has a slot complaint it must first refer the issue to the appropriate scheduling committee. One source referred to the co-ordination committees as being a 'rubber stamp' to the decisions made by the scheduling committees. This arrangement was not envisaged in the Regulation.

[60] A Slot Performance Sub-Committee has been set-up at London-Gatwick airport and has been equally effective.

XVI Summary of co-ordination status of the Category 1 airports and all other designated airports

Member State	Fully co-ordinated airport(s)	Co-ordinated airport(s)	Non-designated airport(s)
Austria	-	-	Vienna (SCR)
Belgium	-	-	Brussels-Zaventem
Denmark	Copenhagen-Kastrup (SCR)	-	Copenhagen-Roskilde
Finland	Helsinki-Vantaa (SCR)	-	Helsinki-Vanda
France	Paris-Charles de Gaulle (SCR) Paris-Orly (SCR)	-	Paris-Le Bourget
Germany	Berlin-Tempelhof (SCR) Berlin-Tegel (SCR) Berlin-Schönefeld (SCR) Düsseldorf (SCR) Frankfurt-Main (SCR) Munich (SCR) *Cologne/Bonn (SMA)* *Stuttgart (SCR)*	*Bremen (SMA)* *Dresden (SMA)* *Erfurt (SMA)* *Hamburg (SMA)* *Hanover (SMA)* *Leipzig/Halle (SMA)* *Münster/Osnabrück (SMA)* *Nuremburg (SMA)* *Saarbrücken (SMA)*	-
Greece	Athens-Hellinikon (SCR) Thessalonika-Macedonia (SCR) *Araxos (SCR/SMA)* *Chania (SCR/SMA)* *Chios (SCR/SMA)* *Heraklion (SCR/SMA)* *Ikaria (SCR/SMA)* *Ioannina (SCR/SMA)* *Kalamata (SCR/SMA)* *Karpathos (SCR/SMA)* *Kastoria (SCR/SMA)* *Kavala (SCR/SMA)* *Keffalinia (SCR/SMA))* *Kerkira (SCR/SMA)* *Kos (SCR/SMA)* *Kythira (SCR/SMA)* *Limnos (SCR/SMA)* *Milos (SCR/SMA)* *Mykonos (SCR/SMA))* *Mytilini (SCR/SMA)* *N. Aghialos (SCR/SMA)* *Naxos (SCR/SMA)* *Paros (SCR/SMA)* *Preveza (SCR/SMA)* *Rhodes (SCR/SMA)* *Samos (SCR/SMA)* *Santorini (SCR/SMA)* *Sitia (SCR/SMA)* *Skiathos (SCR/SMA)* *Skyros (SCR/SMA)* *Syros (SCR/SMA)* *Volos (SCR/SMA)* *Zaknythos (SCR/SMA)*	-	-
Ireland	-	-	Dublin (SMA)
Italy	Milan-Bergamo (SCR) Milan-Malpensa (SCR) Rome-Ciampino (SCR)	Milan-Linate (SCR) *Bologna (SCR)* *Pisa (SCR)*	-

Member State	Fully co-ordinated airport(s)	Co-ordinated airport(s)	Non-designated airport(s)
	Rome-Fiumcino (SCR) *Catania Fontanarossa (SCR)* *Florence (SCR)* *Naples (SCR)* *Palermo (SCR)* *Turin (SCR)* *Venice (SCR)*		
Luxembourg	-	-	-
The Netherlands	Amsterdam-Schiphol (SCR)		-
Portugal	-	-	Faro (SCR) Lisbon (SCR)
Spain**	-	-	Las Palmas Madrid-Barajas (SCR) Malaga (SCR) Palma de Mallorca (SCR)
Sweden	Stockholm-Arlanda (SCR)	-	Stockholm-Bromma
UK	London-Heathrow (SCR) London-Gatwick (SCR) London-Stansted (SCR) *Manchester (SCR)*	*Birmingham (SMA)* *Glasgow (SMA)*	London-Luton

NB ‘Non-Category 1’ co-ordinated or fully co-ordinated Community airports, shown in italics.

XVII Summary of binding capacity constraints at each Category 1 airport

Member State	Category 1 Airport	Co-ordination status	General area(s) of constraint according to opinion of co-ordinator(s)
Austria	Vienna	Neither	Runway
Belgium	Brussels-Zaventem	Neither	Runway, stand
Denmark	Copenhagen-Kastrup	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Copenhagen-Roskilde	Neither	None
Finland	Helsinki-Vantaa	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
France	Paris-Charles de Gaulle	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Paris-Orly	Fully co-ordinated	Runway (environmental)
	Paris-Le Bourget	Neither	None
Germany	Berlin-Tempelhof	Fully co-ordinated	Terminal
	Berlin-Tegel	Fully co-ordinated	Gates
	Berlin-Schönefeld	Fully co-ordinated	Terminal
	Düsseldorf	Fully co-ordinated	Runway (environmental)
	Frankfurt-Main	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Munich	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
Greece	Athens-Hellinikon	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Thessalonika-Macedonia	Fully co-ordinated	Runway, stand
Ireland	Dublin	Neither	Terminal
Italy	Milan-Bergamo	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Milan-Malpensa	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Rome-Ciampino	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Rome-Fiumcino	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Milan-Linate	Co-ordinated	Runway
Portugal	Faro	Neither	Runway, terminal
	Lisbon	Neither	Runway, stand
Spain	Las Palmas	Neither	None
	Madrid-Barajas	Neither	Runway
	Malaga	Neither	Terminal
	Palma de Mallorca	Neither	Terminal
Sweden	Stockholm-Arlanda	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	Stockholm-Bromma	Neither	None
The Netherlands	Amsterdam-Schiphol	Fully co-ordinated	Runway (environmental)
UK	London-Heathrow	Fully co-ordinated	Runway, stand
	London-Gatwick	Fully co-ordinated	Runway, terminal
	London-Stansted	Fully co-ordinated	Runway
	London-Luton	Neither	None

XVIII Summary of the approximate degree of runway utilisation at the major Category 1 airports for a 'peak week' in 1999

	Proportion of peak week hours at or above full capacity			Proportion of peak week hours at or above 90% of capacity			Proportion of peak week hours at or above 70% of capacity		
	>=25%	10-24%	1-9%	>=25%	10-24%	1-9%	>=25%	10-24%	1-9%
Vienna						✈	✈		
Brussels-Zaventem	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Copenhagen-Kastrup			✈			✈		✈	
Helsinki-Vantaa						✈		✈	
Paris-CDG			✈	✈			✈		
Paris-Orly (arrivals)		✈			✈		✈		
Berlin-Schönefeld									
Berlin-Tegel (arrivals)			✈		✈		✈		
Berlin-Tempelhof									
Düsseldorf	✈			✈			✈		
Frankfurt		✈		✈			✈		
Munich			✈		✈		✈		
Athens			✈	✈			✈		
Thessalonika		✈		✈			✈		
Dublin	N/D[61]	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D	N/D
Milan-Bergamo									✈
Milan-Linate						✈	✈		
Milan-Malpensa					✈		✈		
Rome-Ciampino									
Rome-Fiumicino									✈
Faro			✈			✈		✈	
Lisbon						✈		✈	
Madrid-Barajas			✈	✈			✈		
Malaga									✈
Palma de Mallorca			✈			✈		✈	
Stockholm-Arlanda			✈		✈		✈		
Amsterdam-Schiphol					✈		✈		
London-Gatwick	✈			✈			✈		
London-Heathrow	✈			✈			✈		
London-Stansted			✈		✈		✈		
London-Luton									

[61] N/D means 'No Data' provided.

XIX Copy of the questionnaire sent to the Swedish Civil Aviation Authority

Dear [ ]

Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 on the allocation of slots at community airports

As you may be aware, the European Commission has awarded PricewaterhouseCoopers a contract to assess the state of implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 of 18 January 1993, on the allocation of slots at community airports. The accompanying letter from the Commission confirms our appointment and requests your co-operation during the study. We will be examining various aspects of the Regulation, notably those concerning capacity analysis, the position of the co-ordinator and the role of the co-ordination committee. This work is thus more narrowly focused than our 1995 study for the Commission on this Regulation.

We understand that the only airport in Sweden designated as 'fully co-ordinated' is Stockholm Arlanda.

We are not aware of any airports designated as 'co-ordinated'. We would be most grateful if you could confirm whether or not our understanding is correct.

We would also be grateful if you could provide us with the following information for all fully co-ordinated airports in your State:

- The full capacity assessments as required under Article 3 of the Regulation for the purpose of this designation.
- Details on how often updates to the capacity assessments at these airports have been carried out and when the next update is due.
- A copy of the national legislation that implements Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93, along with any additional legal documents concerning the constitutional framework supporting the work of the co-ordinator(s) and co-ordination committee(s).
- A list of names, addresses and contact numbers of the co-ordinator(s) and members of the co-ordination committee(s).
- Identification of any occasions and descriptions of associated events when you have intervened in the work of the co-ordinator(s) or co-ordination committee(s), for example to resolve disputes or provide clarification on the implementation of the Regulation.
- A list of Swedish airports defined as SCR or SMA under the IATA schedule co-ordination classifications.

Any comments you may have on other issues of relevance to this study would be welcome.

We greatly appreciate your support and co-operation with our work, and hope that you will be able to reply in full by 18 September. We will telephone your office in the near future to ensure that you have received this letter and answer any questions which you or your colleagues may have on our requests.

Yours sincerely

[etc…]

XX Copy of the questionnaire sent to the Swedish co-ordinator

Dear [ ]

Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 on the allocation of slots at community airports

As you may be aware, the European Commission has awarded PricewaterhouseCoopers a contract to assess the state of implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 of 18 January 1993, on the allocation of slots at community airports. The accompanying letter from the Commission confirms our appointment and requests your co-operation during the study. We will be examining various aspects of the Regulation, notably those concerning capacity analysis, the position of the co-ordinator and the role of the co-ordination committee. This work is thus more narrowly focused than our 1995 study for the Commission on this Regulation.

We understand that Stockholm-Arlanda airport has been designated as 'fully co-ordinated' under the Regulation and classified 'SCR' according to the IATA definitions of schedule co-ordination. We would be most grateful if you could confirm whether or not our understanding is correct.

We would also be grateful if you could provide us with the following information for all fully co-ordinated airports under your control:

1. State whether or not the designation status is likely to change in the near future.
2. Provide a copy of the most recent, capacity determination study, required under Article 6 of the Regulation. We would be grateful if you could include a summary of the key assumptions in the study, regarding the maximum available capacity on the runway(s), at the stands and gates, and in the terminal building(s).
3. Provide hour by hour statistics for a week in the peak season, of the number of slots available and the number of slots used. (The data should relate to the element in the airport's capacity, which is considered to be at or near the binding constraint).
4. Provide a copy of the latest NAC charts.
5. State the name, address and telephone number of your employer.
6. Describe your institutional/legal status, the method of your appointment, how the slot co-ordination function is financed, the resources at your disposal (including those used for monitoring the usage of slots) and the number of staff under your supervision.
7. Describe the role played by the slot co-ordination committee(s) and list the names of their members, including their contact telephone numbers and the names of their employers.

Any comments you may have on other issues of relevance to this study would be welcome.

We greatly appreciate your support and co-operation with our work, and hope that you will be able to reply in full by [ ] September. We will telephone your office in the near future to ensure that you have received this letter and answer any questions which you or your colleagues may have on our requests. We will also use this opportunity to arrange a second telephone call, during which we can discuss the issues above, in greater depth.

Yours sincerely
[etc…]

XXI Copy of the questionnaire sent to the Swedish Co-ordination Committee Chairperson

Dear [ ]

Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 on the allocation of slots at community airports
As you may be aware, the European Commission has awarded PricewaterhouseCoopers a contract to assess the state of implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 95/93 of 18 January 1993, on the allocation of slots at community airports. The accompanying letter from the Commission confirms our appointment and requests your co-operation during the study. We will be examining various aspects of the Regulation, notably those concerning capacity analysis, the position of the co-ordinator and the role of the National Co-ordination Committee. This work is thus more narrowly focused than our 1995 study for the Commission on this Regulation.

We understand that you are the current Chairperson of the National Co-ordination Committee for Stockholm airport. We would like to arrange a telephone call in order to discuss a number of issues concerning the composition and work of the National Co-ordination Committee(s). The subjects we would like your views on are:

1. The size and membership of the National Co-ordination Committee(s), including any restrictions to membership.
2. The role of the co-ordinator in the National Co-ordination Committee(s) (e.g. full member, guest, observer without voting rights).
3. The role of the Member State in the National Co-ordination Committee(s).
4. The role of the European Commission in the National Co-ordination Committee(s).
5. The Chairmanship of the National Co-ordination Committee(s), including the procedure for selection and period of office.
6. The election of National Co-ordination Committee members.
7. The seniority of the attendee's at each National Co-ordination Committee meeting.
8. The voting rights of members.
9. Any restrictions on the issues that may be discussed, voted on or recommendations made to the co-ordinator (e.g. only those specified explicitly on a pre-circulated agenda)
10. The frequency of National Co-ordination Committee meetings.
11. The advance notice given of meetings, particularly those not regularly scheduled.
12. The language that the National Co-ordination Committee(s) uses in each meeting.
13. The relationship between the National Co-ordination Committee(s) and the (IATA) Scheduling Committee(s), if existing.
14. The relationship between the National Co-ordination Committee(s) and the various sub-(co-ordination) committees (e.g. capacity sub-committee, slot performance sub-committee).

We would also be grateful if you could comment on and provide examples of the work of the National Co-ordination Committee(s) in the 6 areas outlined in Article 5(1) of the Regulation 95/93, i.e. the experience of the National Co-ordination Committee in providing advice on:

- possibilities for increasing the capacity determined in accordance with Article 6;
- improvements to traffic conditions prevailing at the airport in question;
- complaints on the allocation of slots;
- the methods of monitoring the use of allocated slots;
- guidelines for allocation of slots, taking into account local conditions;
- serious problems for new entrants; and
- general performance and independence of the co-ordinator, particularly in relation to any complaints or recommendations made.

Any comments you may have on other issues of relevance to this study would be welcome.

We greatly appreciate your support and co-operation with our work. We will telephone your office in the near future to ensure that you have received this letter and to arrange a second telephone call, during which we can discuss the issues above, in greater depth.

Yours sincerely (etc…)
[etc…]

XXII Copy of the London-Stansted capacity analysis

Filename:	PwCEU Slots final report Annexes 20 May 2000.doc
Directory:	C:\WINDOWS\TEMP
Template:	C:\Program Files\Microsoft Office\Templates\Normal.dot
Title:	Aer Rianta: Developing revised airport charges
Subject:	
Author:	Clark
Keywords:	
Comments:	
Creation Date:	25/05/00 14:41
Change Number:	2
Last Saved On:	25/05/00 14:41
Last Saved By:	Neil A Land
Total Editing Time:	12 Minutes
Last Printed On:	26/05/00 11:23

As of Last Complete Printing

Number of Pages:	77
Number of Words:	21,718 (approx.)
Number of Characters:	119,450 (approx.)