1. The fifteenth meeting of the U.S.-EU Joint Committee (JC) took place in Vienna, on 10 June 2014. The list of participants is at Attachment 1. The approved agenda is at Attachment 2. The delegations agreed to take the agenda items on NAI and Wet Lease earlier on and right after the point on the Implementation of Agreement.

2. The Heads of delegation for each side informed the delegations that the official Record of Meeting of the 14th JC meeting, held at Washington, D.C., on 8 January 2014 had been signed.

3. The European delegation inquired about the U.S. delegation's feedback on the three texts (protocols) regarding accession of Croatia that had been submitted to them before the January 2014 JC meeting. It recalled that the third document (regarding the Ancillary Agreement between the EU, Norway and Iceland) had been sent to the U.S. for completeness' sake and for information only. The U.S. delegation had referred the document to the appropriate agencies for review and had concluded that they agreed with the proposed format. The U.S. side indicated that it would propose minor changes on the text which would be communicated to the EU in the coming weeks. The common intention would be to initial these documents at the next meeting of the JC.

4. The EU delegation informed the U.S. delegation that Germany, the only remaining Member State not yet to have ratified the EU-U.S. Air Transport Agreement (ATA), was now expected to complete its ratification process by October 2014. The U.S. side confirmed that it would reply as soon as it received a diplomatic note stating that the process had been completed in the EU. The delegations stated their desire to mark this achievement at the next meeting of the JC.

5. The EU delegation referred to the letter that was sent to the U.S. in January 2014 explaining the amendment of the status of Mayotte. The U.S. delegation noted that it was still reviewing this matter due to the fact that its treatment could create a precedent, and promised to reply in the coming weeks. The delegations agreed to aim towards conclusion of this topic by the next JC as well.

6. The EU delegation expressed serious concern that no decision has yet been taken by the U.S. DoT on the granting of (1) the foreign air carrier permit and (2) exemption authority
in the U.S. to the EU-established NAI airline to which an EU licence has been lawfully granted on 12 February 2014. Evoking Articles 4 and 6 bis of the ATA (referring explicitly to the minimum procedural delay requirement and reciprocal recognition of regulatory determinations), the EU delegation underlined that this delay was unprecedented and unacceptable. The absence of any formal explanation from the U.S. side as to the legal basis in the ATA to deny market access to this EU carrier was also deeply worrying. The EU side, hence, sought to be promptly advised with substantive reasons for any possible concerns that the U.S. may have. The EU delegation recalled point 33 of the 2007 MoC (on the effects of undue delay in granting authorisation on fair an equal opportunity of the airlines to compete) and urged the U.S. government to grant NAI a foreign carrier permit quickly or, at least, the exemption authority, in order to avoid any further delay that would be detrimental to the carrier itself and to transatlantic connectivity and travellers. The EU delegation reserved the right to make use of every option available under the ATA.

7. The U.S. delegation did not agree with the EU view that the delay was unprecedented; DOT could not act on the application until the carrier provided the Air Operator Certificate issued by the Irish authorities, which occurred after 12 February. The U.S. delegation referred to the substantial volume of pleadings (over 800 pages) that had to be reviewed and emphasised that the DOT took its responsibilities very seriously. The EU delegation explicitly asked two questions: 1) Are you in a position to tell us that the permit will be issued now; and 2) Are you in a position to tell us that the exemption authority would be granted? The U.S. delegation responded "no" on both counts. The EU delegation regretted that progress has not been made on the issue, and reiterated that it reserved the right to exercise the options available under the ATA.

8. The delegations then addressed developments with regard to the provision of aircraft and crew (e.g., wet leasing) whereby the U.S. DOT has begun restricting wet-lease licenses for EU carriers to two periods of 7 months in response to the requirements laid out in the EU Regulation 1008/2008 for EU carriers wet-leasing from non-EU carriers. The EU delegation recalled the history of the wet-lease related developments by making a reference to the 6-9 months duration which was already specified in paragraphs 29 and 30 of the Memorandum of Consultation of 2007, and confirmed that the EU Regulation 1008/2008 referred to a specific duration for non-EU wet leases (7 months + 7 months). The EU delegation expressed its view that the whole process has been transparent to the
United States, and noted that it failed to understand why this issue was raised now, several years after the adoption of the 2008 Regulation. In addition, The EU delegation noted that no EU rule prevented U.S. wet leased aircraft from operating within the EU (or in a Member State), whereas U.S. rules prevented EU wet-leased aircraft from flying in the domestic U.S. market. The EU delegation further indicated its view that U.S. regulatory action resulted in discrimination here as regards to the reciprocal capacity to function. Specifically, the EU side indicated that it did not find it acceptable that this limit was imposed on within-EU (and within an EU Member State) wet leases. If reciprocity must be sought, it should be limited to EU wet leases to the United States. In response, the U.S. delegation further recalled the history of wet-lease related developments and indicated that its initial regulation (which did not allow U.S. carriers to lease aircraft and crew from non-U.S. carriers for international (not domestic) operations. This approach is consistent with the U.S. regulations requiring that both the lessor and lessee hold the underlying traffic rights. EU policy, on the other hand, requires only the operator to have these rights. In this regard, the U.S. delegation noted the special provision made to the EU in Article 10 of the ATA. In U.S. delegation's view, adoption of the EU Regulation 1008/2008 made it more difficult for the U.S. companies to participate in the market for the provision of aircraft and crew for international operations. Further, the U.S. delegation clarified that this practice may not have been a commercial problem at the time (of the ATA being finalised) but it is now and also that it does not expect that its carriers would be allowed to compete for wet lease contracts for service within a given member state, and does not impose such restrictions on services within any member state. The U.S. delegation explained that it does not wish to create a more restrictive marketplace and wished to know if it would be possible to amend the EU regulation (to eliminate the 7+7 months limitation), or if some comfort could be granted to U.S. carriers that they could compete on even footing with EU carriers for wet-lease contracts for international services in excess of 14 months. The EU delegation would not exclude the possibility that a modification of the regulation could take place one day but this would not happen overnight. The delegations agreed that the discussion on this issue could not be completed at this meeting and would be continued at the next JC. Both delegations felt that the exchange of views that took place helped explore the complex issues associated with the case.
9. On environment, the EU delegation made reference to the ambitious time table associated with the development of the global MBM by 2016, mentioned its satisfaction with the progress made on the basis of the “strawman” and indicated the importance of further analysis (in close cooperation with the U.S.) under CAEP (including accommodation of the concerns of more sceptical States). The EU delegation referred to a comprehensive approach in addressing the impacts of aviation on climate and stressed the importance of global MBM as part of that approach. The EU delegation expressed the view that the environmental effectiveness of the global MBM was a fundamental element in its design and recalled that any exemptions should not be introduced at the cost of achieving the carbon neutral goal from 2020. The EU delegation also referred to the importance of support to State action plans (referring also to the 6.5 MEUR project sponsored by the European Commission). A brief update on EU ETS was also provided. On climate/global MBM, the U.S. delegation was happy to hear the EU speaking about the comprehensive approach (technology, operations, alternative fuels). Indeed, there were some “obstructive forces” in the picture but all agreed that the main concern was to ensure sustainable development of aviation. SCRC was indeed important but non-discrimination had to be ensured. The U.S. delegation noted that the exemptions and adjustments were minor and emphasized that there was no need to make things even more complicated by attributing responsibility for these emissions to others. The EU delegation emphasized the importance that the global MBM should effectively deliver emissions reductions and that the ambition level should not go below the goal of carbon-neutral growth from 2020 onwards. The U.S. did not agree with including exemptions in the overall calculation, but acknowledged that it was important to study the effects of the exemptions on achieving the CNG2020 goal. On State action plans and outreach, the U.S. delegation agreed that we could coordinate on outreach activities and that this is important in developing a consensus for 2016. On CAEP, the U.S. delegation agreed that we needed to think ahead about noise and that it was their number 1 environmental issue. Particulate Matter was a health issue and U.S. was grateful for European leadership in the measurement campaigns and good cooperation. CO2 standard was also progressing very well and it has been decided that it should be adopted by 2016 (unlike GMBM which is being "developed"). The U.S. also welcomed the significant improvements in the European modelling capability.
10. On noise, the EU delegation informed the meeting of the adoption of the Airport Noise Regulation and indicated that its publication was expected in the coming weeks. As regards to the Balanced Approach related obligations in the ATA, the EU delegation believed that they were adequately covered in the Regulation. The U.S. delegation disagreed with this view and did not believe the new European Airport Noise Regulation met the obligations of the ATA. The EU delegation proposed to have a detailed discussion on this matter at the next meeting of the JC based on a draft written note that would be delivered to the U.S. in advance of this meeting. The U.S. delegation requested some clarifications on the regulation, including the specific actions that could be taken by the European Commission, and expressed serious doubts about the text’s conformity with the Balanced Approach which they saw as an “incredibly thorough process”. Reference was also made to the term “marginally compliant” about which the U.S. delegation has very serious concerns as it sets regulatory measures outside ICAO. The EU delegation would aim to provide clear explanations in its written note. The U.S. side noted that such an explanation would be appreciated in advance of the next meeting.

11. The delegations agreed to take up the IRESA tax issue at this point in the meeting due to its relevance with the noise discussion. The U.S. delegation referred to this case as one with minimum consultations which created implications on all airlines and wished to hear an update on remedial actions being considered. According to the latest information, it was reported that Italy had initiated a study on the application of this tax by different regional authorities. If found necessary, Italy would consider a revocation of the regulation. The Italian representative referred to a recent meeting with IATA where explanations had been provided. She also stated that they had already brought down the amount of the IRESA tax and that the assessment was not expected to take a long time. She offered to provide more information at the next meeting of the JC. The U.S. delegation noted that if the tax would not be removed, it could consider action under its domestic procedures.

12. Brief updates were also provided by the U.S. delegation on Los Angeles airport and by Finland on Helsinki regarding noise issues. Finland indicated that they were conducting a very thorough process which they hoped to conclude by the end of the year. Results would be reported to the next JC. The U.S. delegation thanked Finland for the progress report and for the opportunity to comment. The U.S. delegation reported that LAX had filed an application in January but that it was dismissed as incomplete. A new application
was filed, and FAA staff are reviewing for compliance. If the application is deemed complete, the FAA has 180 days in which to decide if all requirements have been met. The U.S. delegation stated it will have an update at the next JC meeting.

13. On Portable Electronic Devices (PEDs), the EU delegation reported on the open action regarding local rules concerning telecommunications (safety rules were harmonised) and such rules would be found in the AIPs (Aeronautical Information Publication) of the Member States. The U.S. delegation asked if the EU delegation were aware of any particular Member State with such rules and sought clarity on how to reach the AIP information. The EU delegation undertook to assist.

14. On the follow up of TSA’s Foreign Repair Stations Rule, while both delegations were happy to note its publication on 13 January, 2014, reference was made to the backlog that needs to be dealt with. The U.S. delegation stated that they have completed all initial 691 audits. Of that number, 474 are in the EU; 143 have been implemented with 331 remaining. The EU delegation referred to the 32 European applications awaiting treatment and requested prompt action while linking this issue with the EU concerns on the legislative Consultation on Drug and Alcohol Testing (see below).

15. Both delegations acknowledged that the cooperation on Air Traffic Management (ATM) modernisation was progressing well through the Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) in civil aviation research and development. Satisfaction was expressed with the outcome of this cooperation, in particular in the domains of NextGen/SESAR harmonization and ATM performance management. Delegations looked forward to extending this positive experience to other fields, including remotely piloted aircraft systems (RPAS). The meeting also took note of the work initiated on ATM cyber security.

16. On aviation security, the delegations acknowledged their continuing excellent partnership, through close cooperation, which has yielded tangible results to ensure threats to global civil aviation are successfully mitigated. The delegations also affirmed that ongoing collaboration with air transport industry stakeholders is essential to ensure evolving security challenges can be met.

17. On Liquids, Aerosols and Gels (LAGs), the delegations reported on the successful commencement of the first phase of LAGs screening on January 31, 2014, and praised the
collaborative effort between regulators and industry, via the established LAGs Statement of Intent. The delegations also reported no significant negative effects on airport operations and reaffirmed their continued commitment to working towards lifting LAGs restrictions, consistent with the LAGs Statement of Intent. As such, the possibility of conducting trials for the screening of bottled water at security checkpoints was discussed and the Commission reported on its intention to approach European airports to conduct trials over the summer period. Finally, the delegations undertook to continue their close collaboration and information exchange, including with industry stakeholders.

18. On mutual recognition and commensurability of measures, the Commission highlighted longstanding views from industry with respect to additional requirements by TSA for aircraft flying from the EU into the U.S. In response, TSA re-affirmed that non-metallic threats such as liquid and plastic explosives remains among its principal concerns and that it gives consideration for the application of specific threat mitigations at Last Points of Departure (LPD) airports. DG MOVE reported on the adoption of mandatory requirements for the use of Explosive Trace Detection (ETD) systems across EU airports and the delegations agreed to continue their collaborative efforts on this and other non-metallic mitigation measures, with a view to identifying opportunities for mutual recognition. Concerning aircraft search, aircraft protection and catering requirements, TSA expressed its willingness to collaborate with the Commission and industry stakeholders to analyse respective requirements in these areas.

19. On air cargo security, the delegations reaffirmed the success of the mutual recognition program and look forward to conducting a joint review by the end of 2015.

20. The delegation agreed to proceed to the discussion on Legislative Updates before taking up the point on Airports. On Passenger Name Record (PNR), the EU delegation provided a brief update on consultations with Brazil, Russia, Mexico, and South Korea (SK). There was no news from Brazil, although the European Commission has recently contacted the mission of Brazil to the EU for a state of play. On Russia, the Commission has concerns with regard to the requirements to send passenger data 24 hours before departure and for overflights. Discussions with Mexico were ongoing to find a solution since September 2014 was the deadline for airlines to transmit the PNR data to Mexican authorities. There was not much to report on SK, but the Commission was trying to follow up the matter with the SK mission in Brussels. The U.S. delegation expressed a special interest in
developments related to Mexico (September deadline) and Brazil, and indicated that they would appreciate being kept aware of relevant developments. Regarding Russia, the U.S. delegation shared the EU's concerns on the 24-hour advance notification of the API data, as well as on the overflights. The U.S. delegation expressed concern with the EU's approach and stated that the U.S. airlines were caught between complying with the PNR requirements of such Third States and the position adopted by the EU. The EU delegation underlined the high sensitivity of personal data protection in the EU.

21. On EU Regulation 868 (the discussion of which was combined with the agenda item on Economic regulation), the EU delegation referred to the three pillars of the overall concept: fair competition clause, revision of the regulation, and the relevant ICAO work. It also offered to share the template for its fair competition clause with the U.S. and provided an update on the state of play regarding the revision of the regulation, indicating that the expected adoption of the proposal by the Commission was Q1 2015. The EU delegation also referred to the outcome of the ATRP meeting and the working groups (WGs) that were established. On the latter, it underlined the importance of bilateral cooperation before the WG meetings. The U.S. delegation acknowledged this development.

22. On EU Regulation 261, the EU delegation presented the regulation while trying to address U.S. concerns on the no-show policy and the pricing freedom. It summarised the state of play and emphasised its hope that the final wording would address the concerns raised. The U.S. delegation reiterated its view that this remained a fundamental issue, and the forward movement of the regulation through the process was disconcerting. The EU delegation also indicated that it would not expect to reach a conclusion before the end of the year.

23. The EU delegation updated the U.S. delegation on the Travel Package Directive, indicating that the legislative process was on-going and that the chef de file was DG JUST. The U.S. delegation expressed its concerns about the responsibilities that may be put on the airlines regarding the links to other travel arrangements from their web site, saying there should be a distinction regarding treatment of airlines selling a package and of airlines acting as a facilitator of information. The EU delegation indicated that such considerations were indeed part of the legislative discussions taking place, and the matter
was one of striking the right balance between the interests of the operators and the consumers. The EU delegation agreed to convey relevant messages.

24. Regarding the U.S. Legislative Consultation on Drug & Alcohol Testing, the U.S. delegation stated that it not only welcomed, but also encouraged, as many comments as possible. Reference was made to the 2012 legislation. The U.S. delegation was aware of the concerns of the European Commission and they would appreciate feedback to help them formulate a response back to Congress. The EU delegation shared some of the Commission’s main concerns, including no solid evidence to sustain this initiative, no equivalent safety issue in the EU, and the continued confidence building between the EU and the U.S. within the BASA framework, and confirmed that a formal submission would follow. The EU delegation also referred to dealing with such matters through multilateral action under the auspices of ICAO.

25. The U.S. delegation provided a brief update on expansion of existing preclearance facilities. The late January opening of the preclearance facility at Abu Dhabi International Airport (AUH) marked the first such facility outside of Canada, Ireland, and the Caribbean. The new facility immediately became controversial because, among other reasons, no U.S. carriers currently serve AUH. While the Department of Homeland Security wishes to expand the preclearance program, Congress placed limits on new preclearance facilities in November, 2013.

26. The EU delegation informed the meeting on the state of play regarding the airport package indicating that, although an agreement has been found on the noise proposal, slots and ground handling proposals still needed to be negotiated between the co-legislators. The European Commission's objective was to reach an agreement by the end of 2014/beginning of 2015. Hence, the EU delegation hoped to report on this to the next meeting of the JC. Reference was also made to the Commission’s report on the application of the directive on airport charges and its findings. The EU delegation promised to share this report with the U.S. On-going work on both sides of the Atlantic on airport capacity and delays was reviewed. The U.S. delegation especially took note of the topics to be dealt with by the three Working Groups established under the European Observatory. It also noted that many studies have been done on local, regional, and national levels regarding capacity issues; capacity plays a large role in the national plan to improve airport infrastructure. Information on the Future Airport Capacity Task (FACT)
and other studies, including "NextGen for Airports" and the Metroplex initiative, is available on the FAA web site. The delegations agreed to take this point up at the next JC and engage in a discussion on sharing experience and best practices.

27. The delegations referred to the conclusion of the 5th round of the TTIP negotiations (where the draft Terms of Reference of a possible WG on Aviation was tabled) and noted the upcoming round in July. Because negotiations were taking place in another framework, the delegations refrained from discussing any specific issues at the JC. Nevertheless, the U.S. delegation reiterated the importance of the JC as the right forum for aviation discussions, but remained committed to discuss matters with an open mind. The EU delegation continued to see a value in addressing aviation within the TTIP framework, considering a likely outcome of the agreement will be in the form of a Treaty. In addition to ownership & control, issues such as mutual recognition of certificates (i.e., going beyond the existing BASA) would still be of interest regarding the trade of aeronautical products. The U.S. delegation took note.

28. Under the first AOB point, the delegations took note of a useful teleconference that was organised on 4 June 2014 (with participants from U.S. DOS, U.S. Treasury, the European Commission, the AEA, Cargolux, and Deutsche Bank) regarding guidance sought for EU carriers and banks regarding payment of overflight charges to the government of Iran. At this teleconference, the concerns of the EU carriers had been clarified and possible courses of action were identified. Treasury was having an internal reflection on the matter and understood that DOS and the European Commission would stay in touch to follow the relevant developments. The EU delegation was happy to note that we were very close to a practical solution. It requested a written confirmation from the U.S. side summarising the conclusions of the 4 June teleconference, in view of EU airlines receiving some comfort on this issue. The U.S. delegation stated that it would convey the EU delegation’s request to Treasury and would inform the EU side accordingly.

29. Under the second AOB point, the U.S. delegation expressed its concern that the Italian authorities continued to pursue U.S. carriers for payment of taxes that were assessed in a manner inconsistent with EC regulations. The European delegation referenced the ongoing infringement procedure (led by DG TAXUD) concerning the Italian VAT. The EU delegation reported that in response to the Reasoned Opinion, Italy had recently stated its commitment to make the necessary amendments in its national law to ensure compliance.
However, more clarification was needed by TAXUD to understand when this amendment was planned to be incorporated. While the U.S. delegation was happy to take note of this development, it remained concerned about the backlog payments that Italy was requesting and cited four relevant court cases. The EU delegation took on to follow up on the developments in cooperation with DG TAXUD.

30. Under the last AOB point, the AEA and A4A confirmed that they were willing to make a presentation at the next meeting of the JC. At the request of the U.S. side, it was agreed that these organisations would submit a draft proposal on the content of the presentation in the coming months.

31. The delegations agreed to schedule the next meeting of the JC in Washington, D.C. in the second half of January 2015.

Signed on 4 June 2015

For the U.S. delegation: For the European delegation:

Thomas Engle Margus Rahuoja
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