

CANSO EUROPEAN WORKING PAPER

ON

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AMENDMENTS on Directive air traffic controller licence

31 March 2005



**CANSO Regional Office in Brussels, CCN (Centre Communication Nord)
Rue du Progrès 80, boîte 2, 1030 Bruxelles.**

Tel: +32 (0) 2 201 09 11 Fax: + 32 (0) 2 203 89 16 canso@skynet.be

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AMENDMENTS on Directive air traffic controller licence

31 March 2005

CANSO discussed the amendments to the Directive on Community Air Traffic Controller Licence accepted by the Transport Committee of the European Parliament. Most of the amendments are acceptable; however, two of the amendments cause concern to the ANSPs.

1. Amendment 14 – Proposal for the regulation of the Licensing and Qualification System for ATM Safety Chain Professions

This amendment inserts a requirement in the Directive that the Community should launch an initiative aimed at regulating the licensing and qualification system for ATM safety chain professions.

The ANSPs are concerned that this amendment will open the way for the licensing of all technical staff. CANSO supports that professionals who work in the ATM safety chain are well equipped and trained, as regulated by ESARR 5 part 2. However, licensing would mean that a very structured system of training would have to be developed. This system can be a big cost-driver, without necessarily adding any value to the current system.

2. Amendment 45 – Rights and Obligations Applicable to Air Traffic Controllers in the Country of the Particular Assignment.

This amendment says that Supervisory Authorities will ensure that the rights and obligations applicable to the employment relationship between the applicant and the employer are governed by the national provisions applicable to the air traffic controllers of the country where the controller performs his/her work.

This amendment would lead to a decrease of mobility. It would make it difficult for one ANSP to hire controllers of another ANSP on a temporary basis, even if the controller agreed to the terms of the arrangement. It would therefore introduce rigidity into the system.

Furthermore, the drafting of this amendment is poor and leaves the meaning open to differing interpretations. The final phrase, “the country where the controller performs his/her work” implies the country where the controller is physically sited when operating, but the justification text says “where the candidate actually exercises his/her activities”. This seems to imply the location of the airspace in which he/she is controlling, which could be quite different to the country in which they are sited.

As a consequence, this Amendment cannot be supported.

X X X