



Airneth Seminar 24 October 2007

Existing and Future Relations between ACI and ICAO

Thank you for this opportunity to speak here to-day. It is a pleasure to be back in Den Haag and to meet again the many friends and colleagues that I have known over the past several years. On a personal note I would like to say a special thank you for all the support and sound advice I received from Netherlands delegations while I was a Council member for Ireland. I do not know what I would have done without it.

I have in many ways a special experience with ICAO. I have seen how it operates from inside the Council Chamber and for the last 2 years and a bit, how it interacts with industry and more specifically ACI. These are different roles.

For those of you who are not familiar with ACI, we have a large constituency. Our 573 members operate over 1640 airports. That represents about 96% of passenger traffic worldwide. ACI is a global organization with HQ in Geneva and five Regional Offices in North America, Latin America & Caribbean, Asia Pacific, Europe and Africa. In short ACI is the voice of the world's airports and their unique representative at ICAO.

ICAO, on the other hand, is a body of its member States and as a Council member you are part of the Governing body of ICAO. Issues such as the election of the President and Secretary General the appointment of the members of the Air Navigation Commission and its President are directly in the hands of the Council. The Council also submits to the Assembly its recommendations with respect to the budget for the forthcoming triennium and the drawing up of the work programmes. As a Council representative in short one has easy access to all aspects of ICAO.

In contrast industry remains somewhat at a distance. It cannot be directly involved in elections, appointments or the settling of the budget. The highest level of participation industry may achieve is that of Observer. Yet the ICAO organization draws up the Safety and Security Standards and produces guidance material across a series of disciplines within which it expects Airports Operators, Airlines, Air Navigation Services providers and personnel to enact.

However there are also different levels of presence at ICAO -- even among industry observers. IATA has acted as an Observer at the Air Navigation Commission since 1947

and IFALPA since about 1972. FAI *also* holds similar status to the other two bodies. Of course it is possible for everyone to attend open Council meetings but not to participate without the prior approval of the President and the Council. Unfortunately, ACI does not benefit from this same observer status in the commission, a situation we would like to see changed.

The ACI experience

What is ACI doing about this situation? ACI has requested to be accorded similar status as IATA, IFALPA and FAI. Our first request dates from May 1994 and we received regrets without any really justified reasoning in September 1995. Our most recent request dates from February 2006 and is still under consideration by the Commission.

Without this status, in the meantime, ACI must go through the cumbersome procedure of selecting issues from the work programme that we may wish to participate in and making a request by reply. On receipt of our reply the Secretariat prepares a working paper for the Commission's consideration and then ACI is informed of which issues the ANC approves. This difference of procedure produces an imbalance between equal aviation partners, and this in spite of Dr. Kotaite's view that there are three pillars in the aviation system, ICAO, IATA and ACI. However, I am optimistic that the Commission will shortly recommend that we be granted the required status. The advantage for the Commission of having the key industry players at the table would be perhaps a more balanced debate involving all aviation partners, not just some.

How does ACI make its views known within the ICAO system?

In more or less the same way as other non-State observers. We participate in ICAO Committees, panels and working groups such as the Aerodromes Panel, AVSEC, and Facilitation working groups, the CAEP process, the Economics Panel and others. We engage in lobbying of Council members and members of the ANC. Since panels contain specialists, this is probably the best channel to get our message across.

However, as non-State industry representatives we are most successful when we have a number of States holding similar views. This was clearly the case when we experienced the restrictions on the carriage of liquids, gels and aerosols in hand luggage in the aftermath of the foiled terrorist plot at London Heathrow. I also noted at that time a new and heightened awareness within the ICAO system concerning the positive role of the industry. This common cause between States representatives and industry representatives encouraged ICAO to react very quickly, holding a Council meeting within a couple of weeks.

To my knowledge, this was the first time, that the President of the Council has invited IATA and ACI to present their concerns to the Council. Reaching globally harmonized positions on security measures remains an on-going debate, but I note that ICAO very regularly consults with ACI on this issue, which is a positive development for the airport community.

Assembly

Another critical forum for joint ICAO and industry work becomes very evident every three years at the ICAO Assembly when the future work programme for the next triennium is established by the State delegates. In addition to security, ACI saw three other key topics in which they have a particular interest covered this year: safety, security, environment and economics.

SAFETY

ACI was pleased to see the results from this year's Assembly deliberations in three important safety areas, with agreement

- that the number of aerodromes which have been certified, and the number which have implemented safety management systems, should be increased speedily, and ACI's offer to work with ICAO to further enhance the level of implementation of aerodrome certification was well received.
- that regulators should be called on to follow the SARPs of Annex 14, Volume I, and avoid excessive and costly over-regulation.
- that States should encourage the sharing of safety lessons. ACI was also pleased to see ICAO support in the Assembly resolutions for transparent reporting and sharing of information, while respecting principles of administration of justice and freedom of information.

In addition, a revised version of the Global Aviation Safety Plan, incorporating the safety Roadmap developed by ACI, Airbus, Boeing, CANSO, Flight Safety Foundation, IATA and IFALPA in conjunction with ICAO was presented to the Assembly.

Environment

On Environment, it is proving to be somewhat more difficult to get the airport message across. Although environmental protection was one of the most important issues at the recent ICAO Assembly, noise and local air quality –some of the most significant environmental issues for airports -- were not addressed in any depth. ACI has consistently sought to have noise stringency and local air quality treated as priorities in the ICAO Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection, better known as CAEP, with limited

success. At the Assembly while we were pleased to note that UK and Netherlands recognized that noise is a major issue for airports, however, a sufficient majority of delegations opposed putting noise stringency on the CAEP Agenda.

I would like to share briefly the airport viewpoint on those key issues and progress that airports would like to see in the ACI work at ICAO.

NOISE

Noise has the most clearly identifiable impact on neighbouring communities and is the environmental issue most likely to mobilise local residents against both existing operations and any development of future infrastructure or capacity expansion. This is a key concern for airports worldwide, as they strive to meet future capacity needs and ensure good customer service in a steadily growing aviation market.

ACI's Assembly working paper on the issue of noise, requested that ICAO's aircraft noise stringency standards be updated by CAEP every six years and that minimum improvements be required at all three noise certification assessment locations. Reduction of aircraft noise at source is the most important means for reducing aviation noise at all airports worldwide. We believe that certification stringency should take the lead, and not simply follow technological advances, if we are to guarantee improvements for all communities near airports.

CLIMATE CHANGE and the ETS DEBATE

In the lead up to the Assembly, both CAEP and the ICAO Council failed to agree a wording on a Resolution on emissions trading schemes. The rift that is developing between European States and many other nations on the proposed European ETS was the issue that gained the most media coverage during the Assembly.

In contrast to what much of the industry has said on this subject, an outcome that ACI would like to see is for ICAO to work with the European proposal rather than dismiss it. ICAO could view it as an opportunity to use Europe as a testing ground for a worldwide ETS of global scope. As the proposal matures, many unanswered concerns could be addressed: how much the scheme will cost operators, if technology, operations and ATM improve emissions; would this reduce the final cost or possibly generate revenue; what de minimus thresholds might apply, and so on.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Both ICAO and ACI have forecast strong and steady industry growth over the coming years. Both recognize that this must be understood and managed to avoid serious

congestion at many hubs in the future. At the same time, the CO2 debate and aviation's impact on climate change has made the environment a third vital area for common endeavour – joining safety and security as top priorities.

Although only responsible for a very small percentage of the total aviation CO2 emissions, airports are often the party faced with negative public opinion and media pressure against aviation's Greenhouse Gas contribution. Community campaigns increasingly oppose the approval of airport applications for the construction of new airports, infrastructure expansion and building of new runways. Even in regions where airport capacity expansion is clearly required to address congestion, the planning approval process can delay, cause cost blowouts or indeed, prevent a project from proceeding. Unless the aviation industry takes action to satisfactorily address its growing contribution to emissions, the issue could further stifle many airport capacity plans.

An important and positive outcome of the ICAO Assembly and debate was the creation of a new group on International Aviation and Climate Change, composed of senior government officials, with technical support of CAEP. Its task will be to develop an "aggressive Programme of Action" by 2009, including voluntary measures, technology, operational measures, ATM, positive economic incentives and market-based measures.

ACI looks to this Programme of Action to produce decisive and effective actions; otherwise the outcome of the Assembly will do little to alleviate the environmental pressures on airport capacity expansion. I do note however that membership of this group is limited to Government Officials and it would seem that there is no facility to directly interact with industry.

What are airports doing?

The examples I have mentioned are just a small illustration of the thousands of projects underway at airports. None of these programmes are headline grabbers. But they represent small steps, and their combined contribution can make a big impact.

ACI will continue encouraging its airports to do what they can to reduce their emissions and dependence on energy. And we will continue to urge our industry partners to understand the airport realities and priorities for reducing airport congestion and thereby limiting our environmental impact.

ACI also is a funding member of the Air Transport Action Group (ATAG) and was co-sponsor of the Aviation and the Environment Summit, in 2005 and 2006. Our airports are strongly supporting and participating in the industry wide "www.enviro.aero" initiative which aims to better communicate with the public on aviation efforts, our accomplishments and our future plans.

Economics

On Economics, ACI considers that less regulation rather than more is the way forward. In this area ACI gives strong support to ICAO guidance on airports charges. It argues that direct consultations between the airport operator and users are the best way to reach agreement and regulatory mechanisms should only be actuated when agreement cannot be reached. The debate on economics was unfinished at the Assembly since all delegates had in their minds the worldwide conference on Economics in September 2008. ACI believes though that the ICAO guidance developed in conjunction with stakeholders over many years has proved its worth and should remain in place.

Training

Professional training is an area where ACI also has co-operation with ICAO. ACI and ICAO have been successfully running courses on users charges. The courses not only have the benefit of informing users but also increasing the audience for the ICAO guidance in this area. In a further initiative and following 2 years negotiations in March this year ACI and ICAO announced a jointly sponsored ACI and ICAO Airport Management Professional Accreditation Programme (AMPAP). The programme focus is on airport management needs and the result is a structured approach to airport training.

There are strong standards for safety, security and economic stability in the aviation industry. That is the bridge that ACI is building with ICAO and State representatives, to help them understand our parameters, our needs and our limitations. We are pleased to see the new emphasis on action that is growing at ICAO. All stakeholders, including States and civil aviation authorities, have to be willing to invest, innovate and change old habits. At ACI we see ICAO as a bright hope for bringing industry representatives together in this unique forum for cooperation

Conclusion

In conclusion may I just repeat ACI's view of the relationship with ICAO as recently announced by our DG Bob Aaronson "As an international association in the field of aviation, the single most important external relationship that we have is with the International Civil Aviation Organisation." You can see from that how much we value this relationship and why we want to be closer to the family.

Thank you

