

MOSAIC



After the article about MOSAIC published in the last edition of INSIGHT, quite a lot of questions have been raised. INSIGHT decided to find out more details concerning the MOSAIC project and the Functional Airspace Block concept (FAB).

Indeed, it is obvious that MOSAIC will influence the FAB Europe Central in which EUROCONTROL Maastricht Upper Area Control centre is involved together with 6 other Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSP's).

Frederic Deleau, TUEM Board Member and Focal Point of the MOSAIC group, brings us some answers, but also opened questions, in order to explain the process which occupies Trade Unions and Professional organisations across Europe.

First of all, how is MOSAIC progressing and what has happened since our last interview?

FD: The MOSAIC group is growing! We have now 17 members representing ATCO's, Engineers, Technicians and Administrative staff.

SATTA, a Union representing Technicians and Engineers in Switzerland, has officially joined the MOSAIC group in March. It is again evidence that MOSAIC stands for all staff involved in the Safety chain.

The MOSAIC group organised a stand during ATC Maastricht 2007. For the first time ever Unions and Professional Organisations were present for such event. It was a real "public relation" success! People seemed to realise that MOSAIC was not only words but a real cooperation between organisations from 7 States. They could discover it with the "physical" presence of representatives from all countries involved. We had the chance to explain and develop further our ideas with visitors coming from all over Europe, among them M. Víctor M. Aguado from EUROCONTROL and MM. Kaden and Riedle from DFS.

Lately, ATCEUC has reinforced its support towards the MOSAIC project during its last Spring plenary meeting. This is of course a strong political message as ATCEUC is an important partner in the European Social Dialogue. ATCEUC represents 14.000 ATCO's.

So, we can say that MOSAIC is now known and more support is coming at every occasion.

In the meantime, practical work has started on some definition of the future General Conditions of Employment (GCE). The EUROCONTROL conditions are of course an excellent international reference and are taken as the basic model.

Why would you consider MOSAIC as a necessary step in the success of the FAB initiative?

FD: The answer is very simple: MOSAIC logical "Bottom-Up" and "Integration into one provider" approach is absolutely necessary for the success of any FAB, but especially for the FAB Europe Central.

Could you explain and maybe give us more details on the FAB Europe Central?

FD: You probably know this FAB project is an initiative of 6 States: Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Switzerland, The Netherlands, and it involves 7 ANSPs, including EUROCONTROL. This means, all members of the MOSAIC group, except our Italian colleagues, are immediately confronted with a concrete project developed by the ANSPs of their countries. We expected it, we were ready for it.

The declared goal is as follows: *"Achieve performance-oriented solutions irrespective of national boundaries as result of a joint FAB development encompassing the complex airspace of these 6 States. This FAB development shall be based on intensive and close cooperation between the 7 ANSPs, together with civil-military enhanced cooperation, in a jointly developed and operated functional airspace block (FAB) taking into consideration the interface to neighbouring States for the benefit of the entire European ATM network."*

MOSAIC subscribes to these requirements. However, behind words, there should be acceptable, logical and practical actions!

The Feasibility Study has started a few months ago and we can already foresee some major hurdles due to political, social and financial considerations.

What hurdles? Could you give some examples or concerns?

FD: A basic question: On the political aspect, what should be the institutional set-up of such initiative? Public, private or simple co-location of various systems? When should this question be solved? If we want to achieve the "intensive and close cooperation

between the 7 ANSPs, together with civil-military (...) for the benefit of the entire European ATM network" how could you expect co-location, common sharing of resources on long term basis when one partner has openly declared its willingness to expand its management model and take over airspace of neighbours? When managers of that partner are declaring that EUROCONTROL has no future? What is the international cooperative vision? A Functional Airspace Block can only be established by mutual agreement of all those States which have responsibility for a part of the airspace included in the block. Therefore, an International Convention, – type "Maastricht Upper Area Control centre"-, isn't it the only legal, most stable and most efficient way of creating a FAB? These questions remain unclear or are not enough openly discussed, or defended, especially with the process of privatisation of DFS still pending.

What about the social aspect and the official involvement of the staff representatives of the 7 providers in the Feasibility Study Working Groups?

FD: We could be very short: none – no official involvement in the working groups! It was denied so far!

Why is it so?

FD: I can not give you a logical or reasonable answer. You should ask the managers responsible of the project. I guess there is a real misunderstanding of the concept of efficient "Bottom-Up". For some, their "Bottom" is our "Ceiling"...

Isn't it counterproductive not to involve the staff right from the beginning, even in the Feasibility Study?

FD: It goes even further than you might think. Somebody should

explain why organised staff representatives, involved, motivated to develop efficient systems and with excellent records, have to be considered as a threat to a project that they also want! Why should we oppose something that we ultimately need as an integral part of our own project? We have difficulties to understand such principles unless some have in mind to drive a FAB project only as a



FAB - a human centred system

cost cutting exercise, not to look for real issues, to ignore proper Social Dialogue and propose conclusions as a "fait accompli". Then we should be aware that we most probably invest resources and time in an ill-fated FAB exercise...

To the contrary, if the buy-in is there on most of the operational and technical needs of such concept, if the project is developed as a "Bottom-up" approach, the "Bottom" being the staff in this case, which is bound to meet inevitably a certain "Top-down"; if it meets all requirements, staff is a "must have" positive energy that leads to success. It seems lessons from the recent past have not been learnt and some individual parties have many hidden interests to defend a lack of transparency. If this attitude should continue, let us be very clear and unambiguous: This does not fit the international field and certainly does not set the scene for a possible implementation of full benefits, if any! It is only a Feasibility Study but still...

What is needed then?

FD: We need a clear pragmatic vision of what we want to achieve – together - for the benefits of all. Project management can not be efficient if all parties are not ready to put all information on the table right from the start. A transparent Social Dialogue and full

hope it will be shared on most aspects but I continuously try to listen and to learn as well. We have to manage the future infrastructures for sure, but what about the influence on social and environmental issues? More efficiency does not mean necessarily more emission. More stability does not mean exponential costs. More transparency does not

Do you mean security is a base for growth and stability?

FD: Exactly! As far as ATM is concerned, a solid institutional set-up, taking already into consideration some of the operational, legal, social and financial elements, needs to be defined before we go any further in a FAB development.

Too many operational optimisations could be blocked due to individual financial considerations. Are we looking solely for individual quick gains? Once you take the decision to invest extensively in a common system, you need to consider partners on equal terms and define basic principles (even if not all partners would join at the same speed). You need to consider full Integration Conditions and on what basis? If you join to pull the blanket solely towards your short

term interests, you fail. The institutional statute – public, private - is a basic pillar. Trans-national cooperation can only work if it is led by an International Agency and one responsible leader supported by States acting as involved, accountable and motivated stakeholders. The issues in the core area of Europe will have immediate consequences for all. Competing against each other can only delay solutions or create further problems. We need a real practical, acceptable and sustainable solution NOW!

We know already that you promote MOSAIC as an integration or merger into one provider with a common international public based statute for the staff. Why?

involvement of parties representing the majority of staff in the area is needed to achieve efficient results. What shall take precedent: Operational and Flight efficiency benefits or short-term route charges collection? Individual gains or gains for all? Competition or Cooperation? The vast majority of Social Partners involved in the FAB Europe Central are already aligned on the same principles for their area. It should be made best use of it.

You seem to ask more questions than you are giving answers.

FD: Well, indeed! A real debate on FAB's consequences is needed, and therefore, the MOSAIC project shall be recognised as a real alternative at the highest levels. I have my opinion and I

mean more "threats". MOSAIC is a credible and viable alternative.

Why do we need a "vision" on institutional set-up for a FAB? Why should we decide as early as a Feasibility Study? Why can we just co-locate different institutional set-ups and see later, once the operational concepts are implemented?

FD: An institutional set-up is the body, the roof, the walls, the soul of a house. Continuous instability brings doubts, oppositions, hidden agenda's, failure...Co-location is not the ideal, nor a stable design in this context. Depending of what design you choose, it can lead to full partnership or future competition, stability or instability. Legal aspects and possibilities have to be considered immediately.



FD: Because it is the most stable and efficient scenario. The house, the family objectives, the stability, the soul...do you think co-location answers your problems? Do you think competition, or privatisation, solves your real issues? For integration, we have to learn from other experiences. We have to make sure not to reproduce mistakes and build around our basic priorities: SAFETY-CONTINUITY-EFFICIENCY. Just for info, I always travel with the PRC report.

I will also remind you of the 3 MOSAIC "building" steps: The first stage focuses on technical harmonisation and operational enhancements. It will initiate a rationalization process and bring concrete results in terms of air traffic management. Very similar to what is described above for the objectives of the FAB Europe Central.

During the second step, some services will be partially integrated in an International (public based) Agency for air navigation services, created to that end. Its first mission will be to establish a global strategy, shared by all the relevant providers and to prepare the financial integration of the various partners.

In the third and last phase, the providers and their staff will be completely integrated in the Agency. It will therefore provide all air traffic services. Staff coming from the national providers will be employed as officials of an International (public based) Agency.

So you can clearly see that the FAB Europe Central is to be considered as step one and part of step two, if we talk about a future public international entity.

Why can't we stop half way of step two?

FD: What is our core business? Why do we exist? Again, why would you put in place a system that could not implement the full benefits? Why stay apart when we know together we will be stronger? To eventually try to obtain selfish benefits but not solve the real

issues? Do we aim to let passengers and aircraft strand on the ground because we could not solve individual financial issues or conflicts? Are we working for a service of general public interest or for private investors' interests? We have seen this before and we know the consequences! Do we want to experience it again? Didn't we learn anything? We have the duty to do our utmost to make people travel in the highest Safety and most efficient standards. Why would you invest in a system that does not guarantee long term Safety, Stability and Efficiency? A real seamless airspace with full operational benefits can only be sustained when all partners or stakeholders are buying in the process, and that

Agency. Opposition of blocks can only bring instability in the system, and lost of benefits for all. The users need a seamless, reliable, cost-efficient and continuous service in order to grow and make their business. That's what MOSAIC will provide. The conditions have been made clear and unambiguous. We do not want to wait another 25 years, and experience all the negative consequences for users, and staff, of competition and consolidation, to eventually suffer some kind of private monopoly! We all know too well where it leads to and who really pays for the stock options. We have a duty: to ensure an efficient service of general public interest. We are committed to deliver!



MM Kaden and Riedle, DFS and Klaus Berchtold, GDF President with Frederic Deleau explaining the MOSAIC argumentation

includes the staff of course. 3 steps – One service of excellence!

Could you not envisage a transfer from public ownership to private investment, even with minority of shares in private hands? Can we consider partial transfer of services to private investors?

FD: To be straight: members of MOSAIC have expressed a clear negative answer to privatisation and a willingness to be integrated (or detached) into an International public based

To conclude, would you say that, at least at the moment, the FAB Europe Central initiative does not go far enough?

FD: Indeed, it does not go far enough. Even if it is still a feasibility study, it should already be clear in everyone's mind that investing millions simply for an intellectual exercise is as inefficient as building a house with cheap materials and bad standards. Certain aspects need to be corrected immediately, like Staff



send me a mail: focal-point@project-mosaic.eu. I will be glad to provide, and receive, any information. All feed-back is highly appreciated.

Frédéric Deleau
interviewed by
INSIGHT

representatives involvement in the working groups, but MOSAIC has to be taken into account as a real opportunity for the future institutional set-up of the FAB Europe Central. It has to be considered at the early stage of the Feasibility study.

The goals need to be clear.

Only a global and integrated approach, supported by involved, accountable and motivated stakeholders will lead to success and maximum benefits for the users.

MOSAIC takes into account so many parameters in its development. We tried to look at all aspects to build an efficient platform. This platform has to be designed as to be readily compliant to implement on a large scale the technical changes foreseen for the future. (SESAR for i.e.) and ensure best and most efficient use of the airspace for all (Civil and Military).

Further, as I explained before, MOSAIC is promoting a partnership and a collaborative approach. It is a model. It means that, depending of the willingness of other States to join the "model", it could remain regional but could also develop into a Pan-European vision, maybe a step to ensure the "functional" integration of all aspects into a real European network.

As long as these aspects are not discussed, the FAB will not take off and "quick wins" will surely remain marginal compared to the real potential of improvement we could all achieve through the integration into an International Public based Agency.

We have the possibility to make real the vision of our peers. Let's not miss the opportunity this time.

Thank you. Where could we find more information on the MOSAIC Project?

FD: Anyone can of course check the website: www.project-mosaic.eu or

