1. The sixteenth meeting of the U.S.-EU Joint Committee (J.C.) took place in Washington, D.C. on 28-29 January 2015. The list of participants is at Attachment 1. The approved agenda is at Attachment 2.

Record of Meetings of the Vienna J.C. and the Washington Special J.C.

2. The U.S. delegation said it was ready to pass the draft Record of the meeting (ROM) of the 15th J.C. meeting, held in Vienna on 10 June 2014 to the EU delegation for its review. The EU delegation said that it had sent a draft of the ROM for the special J.C. meeting to the U.S. delegation for its review.

Implementation of Agreement

3. The U.S. delegation stated that it would provide edits to the draft Croatia Protocols before the EU delegation returned to Brussels. The U.S. delegation also stated it would provide edits to the draft exchange of letters regarding the status of Mayotte. The U.S. delegation stated that it saw Croatia as a model for future accessions, but intended to approach changes in the status of overseas territories on a case-by-case basis. The EU delegation acknowledged the U.S. delegation’s position, but stated that it hoped that future such matters would be resolved more quickly.

4. The EU delegation informed the U.S. delegation that Germany, the only remaining Member State yet to ratify the 2007 EU-U.S. Air Transport Agreement, had completed its ratification procedures. The Commission is now completing its internal procedures for ratification and intends to contact the U.S. delegation in the first half of this year regarding an exchange of diplomatic notes.

Passenger Name Record
5. The U.S. delegation expressed the U.S. government's strong support for the use of Passenger Name Record (PNR) data for air passenger prescreening, but voiced concerns that U.S. carriers face potential liability under EU law for sharing PNR data with third countries, such as Mexico, unless the EU and that third country also have an agreement on protection of personal information. The U.S. delegation asked for an update on EU talks with Mexico regarding such an agreement.

6. The EU delegation responded that it was reviewing options regarding PNR and third countries, especially in the light of the recent developments and incidents in Europe. It noted that there is high level attention on the issue, with at least one case pending before the European Court of Justice. DG HOME is responsible for PNR issues and is in close contact with the U.S. Mission to the EU and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Commission is in direct contact with the Mexican government and has adopted a parallel approach in its interface with Mexico and the EU Parliament. The EU delegation noted that EU carriers have also expressed their concerns to DG MOVE and DG HOME. It also referred to regular contacts between DG HOME and DHS on this matter.

**EU Regulation 868**

7. The U.S. delegation requested an update on EU Regulation 868. The EU delegation responded that review of EU Regulation 868 is ongoing, but that a new Commission had just taken office and the review process is expected to take time. It further stated that EU Regulation 868 is part of the larger EU Aviation Strategy and that the timeframe for publishing that Strategy is the second half of this year.

**EU Regulation 261/2004**

8. The U.S. delegation said that EU Regulation 261/2004 has been the subject of several J.C. meetings and noted that the U.S. most recently raised concerns at the June 2014 meeting in Vienna, the main concern being the proposed partial ban on no-show policies, under which passengers can be denied boarding on the return portion of a round-trip flight if the outbound ticket was not used nor a fee paid by the passenger in lieu of using the outbound portion. The U.S. delegation reiterated that it believes that there is a strong case that a
partial ban of such policies would be inconsistent with Article 13 (Pricing) of the U.S-EU Air Transport Agreement (ATA). The U.S. delegation noted that U.S. industry already shared its concerns with the Commission regarding the proposed revisions to EU Regulation 261/2004, including the proposed partial ban on no-show policies, the definition of extraordinary circumstances as it relates to mechanical shortcomings, and the 12-hour trigger for delay compensation on transatlantic flights. The U.S. delegation asked for the Commission’s views on U.S. industry’s concerns regarding the definition of extraordinary circumstances and the 12-hour trigger for delay compensation on transatlantic flights.

9. The U.S. delegation stated that the United Kingdom (UK)’s plan to implement EU Regulation 261/2004 may raise competition concerns, and that both U.S. industry and Department of Transportation (DOT) Assistant Secretary Kurland have raised concerns with the Commission. The EU delegation took note of U.S. concerns and stated that it would respond on this matter at a later date.

10. The EU delegation further noted that the new Juncker Commission is still setting priorities for transportation. The Latvian Presidency of the EU Council wants to proceed with talks between Parliament and the Commission. This issue appears to be high on Parliament’s agenda. The EU delegation stated that EU Regulation 261/2004 created uncertainty and that a number of cases related to the regulation are pending before the European Court of Justice and, further, that the Latvian Presidency wants to resolve the issue under its term and create a new balance between industry and passenger interests. The EU delegation concurred with the U.S. delegation’s concerns about the proposed partial ban on no-show policies and indicated that it was working with the Member States regarding the fine-tuning of the text to ensure that the final version would not be in conflict with the ATA. The U.S. delegation took note of this acknowledgment and emphasized the importance of transparency and balancing industry and passenger interests.

**Travel Package Directive**

11. The U.S. delegation stated that U.S. industry supported the EU review of the nearly 15 year-old Travel Package Directive (TPD) to the extent that the results of that review would meet legitimate consumer expectations and create certainty for business and
consumers alike. The U.S. delegation further stated, however, that, as discussed at the most recent J.C. meeting in Vienna, the introduction of a “linked travel arrangement” or “assisted travel arrangement” concept into the TPD appears to place an undue burden on businesses to ensure the viability of other businesses. The U.S. delegation expressed concern that there is currently no market for the kind of insurance that would be required of carriers under the TPD, and that carriers may be held financially responsible for contractual breaches committed by third parties, such as car rental businesses or hotels. Carriers may need to increase ticket prices to account for as-of-yet unknown costs.

12. The EU delegation responded that the Commission is currently setting its agenda and identifying its goals. The EU delegation said it is aware of industry concerns on both sides of the Atlantic and stated that the policy debate should proceed. The EU delegation further stated that it is interested in eliminating uncertainty. The file is led by DG JUST. DG MOVE follows the discussion and would liaise with DG JUST on the precise timetable.

**Article 21**

13. The U.S. delegation said it had received the EU’s delegation’s January 22 “Information Note – Regulation on Noise Related Operating Restrictions at EU Airports” and welcomed the opportunity to discuss Article 21 of the ATA and the issue of aircraft noise. The U.S. delegation said it was carefully reviewing the document and that it would be premature to respond at this time, but expressed its preliminary view that EU Regulation 598/2014 would not satisfy the conditions in Article 21. Specifically, it noted that the regulation did not appear to give the European Commission the authority to prevent Member States from implementing certain noise-based operating restrictions, even where the European Commission has expressed disapproval of the restrictions in question. Rather, it appears that the restrictions would go into effect and remain in effect until an infringement proceeding is successfully concluded. The EU delegation stated that it believed it had the necessary authority under the regulation to take appropriate legal action. The U.S. delegation stated that it would provide a more detailed response before the next J.C. meeting.
14. The U.S. delegation stated that it had no developments to report regarding Article 21 and that there currently appears to be no political support to change U.S. laws regarding ownership and control of airlines. The EU delegation took note and underlined both sides' commitment to the shared goal of continued liberalization expressed in Article 21.

**IRESA**

15. The Italian government's representative said that Imposta Regionale per le Emissioni Sonore degli aeromobili civili (IRESA) is a tax law that dates from 2000 and gives regional governments the authority to impose a levy deriving from noise pollution. The Italian Civil Aviation Authority is sensitive to the issue. As of 2013, six regions in Italy have decided to impose this levy. The Italian government's representative said that the application of the levy is not discriminatory; it is applied to all carriers regardless of nationality and Italian carriers are even more disadvantaged. Inter-ministerial discussions are ongoing, addressing the need for a uniform national law. The Lazio region, which applies the highest rates among the regions, has been asked by the Italian and international industry to reduce the amount by 30%. In the light of the above, the Italian authorities intervened with the law 21 February 2014 n.9 and fixed the maximum value of the parameters of IRESA at no more than €0.50 for each ton of maximum take-off weight of the aircraft. The regional authorities of Lazio appealed to the Italian constitutional court in April 2014, claiming a legitimacy judgment of the above mentioned law that they did not agree with. In present, the judgment of the constitutional court is pending, Lazio is the only region currently applying IRESA. It has not yet acknowledged the Italian law 21 February 2014 n.9, but it is moving towards a lowering of the levy, as understood from its financial budget plan for the period 2015-2017. Another case, promoted by Alitalia and Assaereo, is pending at the regional administrative tribunal (TAR) seeking a trial judgment for the withdrawal of the IRESA levy letters.

16. The U.S. delegation expressed its view that the imposition of taxes under IRESA has been inconsistent with the balanced approach. It expressed appreciation for the efforts to address the Lazio region's imposition of such taxes, but stated that it remains concerned about the impact on U.S. carriers. The issue has been going on for a while and the U.S. delegation cannot rule out that a complaint may be filed under the International Air Transportation Fair Competitive Practices Act (IATF CPA), which authorizes the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to act in cases involving unfair practices.
Crimea

17. The U.S. delegation said it was not aware of any U.S. or EU operated flights into Crimea and noted that limiting flights to Crimea is consistent with the United States’ refusal to recognize Russia’s purported annexation of Crimea. The EU delegation responded that it was closely following EU sanctions regarding Crimea and that it too did not recognize Russia’s purported annexation. The U.S. delegation asked if the EU delegation is aware of any third country carriers providing services to Crimea. The EU delegation said third country operators are aware that they may face EU sanctions if they fly to Crimea.

NAI
(Closed, government-to-government session)

18. The EU delegation said it was concerned that the U.S. delegation had not responded to its prior requests for information about the unprecedented delay in reviewing Norwegian Air International (NAI)’s application for a foreign air carrier permit. It was very much concerned that there was neither a DOT decision nor an indication on the timeline. Referencing DOT Assistant Secretary Kurland’s statement that NAI’s application presented novel and complex issues that would require time to analyze, the EU delegation asked how much time would be deemed reasonable for those issues to be considered. The U.S. delegation said that the application remains under DOT review and that it could not respond to the EU delegation’s question regarding timing.

19. The EU delegation said that fundamental principles of the ATA were being challenged and, further, that this situation created pressure for both sides and that any reasonable delay has expired.

DAY II

Wet Leasing

20. The delegations addressed developments related to arrangements for the provision of aircraft and crew (i.e., wet leasing). The U.S. delegation proposed the negotiation of an agreement that would allow U.S. carriers to be treated as “Community air carriers” for
purposes of EU Regulation 1008/2008. The agreement could be a short, stand-alone agreement that would not require amendment of the ATA. It could hopefully be applied provisionally pending entry into force. The EU delegation responded that it was interested in finding a solution and requested that the U.S. delegation send it a written proposal for review. The U.S. delegation responded that it would send a chapeau and draft text of its proposal. Although DOT has begun restricting wet lease licenses for EU carriers to two periods of 7 months in response to the limitations imposed by EU Regulation 1008/2008 on wet leases involving non-EU carriers, it would consider authorizing extensions while the proposed agreement is negotiated.

**Environment**

21. The U.S. delegation noted 2013’s International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) General Assembly Resolution on climate change and aviation emissions and expressed support for the development of a basket of measures that would include adoption of a global market-based measure (GMBM) at the General Assembly in 2016. The EU delegation also expressed support for the adoption of a GMBM, but noted that it was a difficult issue with less than two years remaining. The U.S. delegation stated that the United States has done a lot of work in technology and alternative fuels. A new alternative fuel program was announced last year and new programs should be announced later this year. The EU delegation said it was also working on developing a small alternative fuels program that would have high standards. The EU delegation also stated it hoped that a CO2 standard for aircraft would be developed in 2016 with input by the Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection (CAEP).

22. The U.S. delegation expressed concern about the tax on NOx emissions from aviation imposed by the regional Government of Catalonia in Spain and noted that Article 15 (Environment) of the ATA provides that when a Party is considering proposed environmental measures at the regional, national or local level, it should evaluate possible adverse effects on the exercise of rights contained in the ATA, and, if such measures are adopted, it should take appropriate steps to mitigate any such adverse effects. The U.S. delegation requested additional information on the Catalan NOx tax and raised concerns about the precedent set by the tax. The EU delegation acknowledged that there are local initiatives in Europe regarding NOx and other pollutants and that these measures raise concerns for the United States.
The U.S. delegation stated that it was important to raise at J.C. meetings instances where there is an apparent failure to follow the balanced approach and noted that noise was the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)'s top domestic environmental issue. The United States regularly informs the Commission when the FAA reviews noise restrictions. Most recently, the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) applied for permission to impose noise-related operating restrictions, but the FAA rejected the application. With respect to proposed noise restrictions on helicopters at Heathrow airport, the U.S. delegation raised concerns about the potential phase-out of stage 3 aircraft. The EU delegation responded that the Heathrow phase-out is voluntary and one of several options. The EU delegation said it did not see the issue as a problem and encouraged the United States to approach the UK Civil Aviation Authority directly.

23. Finland informed the meeting about the Finnish Transport Safety Agency’s decision that noise related operational restrictions, like restricting night time operations, were not considered necessary for achieving the set environmental objective for Helsinki-Vantaa Airport at this point. The United States and others had submitted comments during the decision making process. The decision is in force, however, it has been challenged in Helsinki Administrative Court.

**Drugs & Alcohol**

24. Regarding the drug and alcohol testing, the U.S. delegation stated that it had no further updates to provide. FAA is now engaged in the next stage of rule making; the U.S. delegation thanked the EU delegation for its comments, including on the economic impact of proposed testing. The EU delegation shared some of the Commission’s main concerns, including that there is no solid evidence to sustain this initiative, no equivalent safety issue in the EU, and also referred to dealing with such matters through multilateral action under the auspices of ICAO.

**Aviation Security**

25. The U.S. delegation said that on aviation security, the delegations coordinated on the U.S. delegation’s presentation and acknowledged the importance of the transatlantic aviation security partnership against a range of terrorist threats. On current threats, with the rise of
violent extremists groups, the delegations reaffirmed their intent to share methodologies, information, and techniques toward ensuring the highest levels of transatlantic aviation security without unnecessary disruptions to travelers. The delegations also noted their intention to continue their collaborative efforts with air transport industry stakeholders in this regard. The U.S. delegation also noted that threat information indicated that terrorists are intent on targeting transatlantic aviation and continue to pursue methods to conceal explosives. The delegations both stated that bolstering explosives detection capabilities and increasing vigilance are imperative countermeasures to these threats. The EU delegation reported that EU airports are now in a position to operationally test and procure explosives detection equipment and that enhanced protocols for cabin baggage screening is anticipated to commence on March 1, 2015.

26. On mutual recognition and commensurability of measures, the delegations expressed their interest in minimizing gaps in their respective polices and working toward a transatlantic aviation security system that is flexible, mobile, and dynamic in the face of an adaptive adversary. This includes ongoing cooperation in the areas of: implementation of One-Stop Security for U.S. inbound flights from the EU; DHS Preclearance efforts; and security requirements addressed to EU air carriers in the areas of aircraft search, catering, and protection. On air cargo security, the delegations expressed their ongoing satisfaction with the implementation of their mutual recognition arrangements. They also stated their interest in continuing to explore further venues for cooperation with third countries. The delegations also expressed their intention to continue to work with ICAO and the World Customs Organization (WCO) to strengthen international air cargo security standards. On liquids, aerosols, and gels, the delegations acknowledged the goal of ultimately removing liquids restrictions, highlighting that this could be best achieved by introducing advanced screening technologies at airports. The delegations stated that they intend to continue their close collaboration and information exchange in this area in close cooperation with industry stakeholders.

27. The EU delegation noted the importance of security cooperation and said it was pleased with the cooperation from TSA and other security agencies. It expressed admiration of the U.S. approach on Preclearance and stated that EU was also looking into that area as well as other solutions.
EU Carrier Ownership

28. The U.S. delegation asked for an update on the EU’s ongoing review of ownership and control of EU carriers. The EU delegation stated that it is reviewing Delta’s stake in Virgin, as well as Etihad’s ownership interests in Air Berlin, Alitalia and Air Serbia. Other reviews are also ongoing. The EU delegation stated that the Commission applies a consistent approach with respect to ownership and control. An investigation into a given carrier does not prejudge a result. Under the current process, Member States are primarily responsible for the assessment of the compliance of an EU carrier with the EU rules on ownership and control. The Commission, however, has the possibility to also make its own assessment, in case it has doubts on the compliance. The Commission’s role is to oversee the application of EU law, which requires that EU carriers be majority owned and effectively controlled by any EU Member State or its nationals or nationals of states with which the EU has agreements such as the European Free Trade Association States. The Commission has the ultimate authority to suspend the rights of an EU air carrier to operate intra-EU services when ownership and control rules are violated and corrective measures are not implemented. The EU delegation reported that the Swiss Federal Office of Civil Aviation has requested Darwin Airline to take corrective action with a view to complying with the ownership and control provisions of the EU-Switzerland Air Transport Agreement. Ownership and control is expected to be one of the key areas of the forthcoming Aviation Strategy. The EU delegation further stated that the Commission is in favor of liberalization of ownership and control on a reciprocal basis.

Iran Overflight Payments

29. The EU delegation said that its carriers and banks were worried they might be subject to legal action for violating U.S. sanctions laws related to Iran. They have raised this issue for discussion at the last two J.C. meetings and have sent the United States two letters, but there has been little progress in resolving the concerns of EU carriers and banks. The EU delegation stated that current U.S. Treasury Department guidance is insufficient for EU carriers and banks. The U.S. delegation responded that overflight payments by European or other non-U.S. air carriers would not be a sanctionable activity that is prohibited under applicable primary sanctions regulations, provided the transactions do not involve the U.S. financial system or other parties subject to those regulations (i.e., U.S. persons). Nor are
such payments generally subject to U.S. secondary sanctions, provided that the transactions do not involve designated Iranian financial institutions or other persons on the Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List. The U.S. delegation offered to continue this discussion with the Office of Foreign Assets Control in an attempt to resolve the EU delegation's concerns. The EU delegation appreciated this proposal and highlighted the importance of having the delegations and stakeholders concur on the right way forward.

**Slot Management and Transparency for LGA/JFK/EWR**

30. The U.S. delegation provided an update on the slot management situation at the three New York City area airports – La Guardia, JFK, and Newark. On 6 January 2015, the DOT/FAA published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). A series of DOT orders have imposed a cap on slots at the three airports. The current order extends through October 29, 2016. The U.S. delegation said it hoped to have the rulemaking completed before that date. In the proposal, hourly slot limits for scheduled service would remain unchanged from the existing orders. Limits to non-scheduled operations would remain the same at LaGuardia and become effective at JFK and Newark. Daily slot limits on scheduled operations would apply to all three airports. The NPRM proposes allowing airlines to buy, sell, lease, or trade slots through a secondary market. The new regulations have yet to be finalized and are open for comment, including by foreign governments.

**Next Meeting**

31. The EU delegation said that the venue was still to be determined. If the U.S. delegation is interested, the EU delegation would consider shifting the timeframe for J.C. meetings to October-March.
Signed
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