

PART XIV

CEAC

Committee for European Airspace Coordination (CEAC) AC/92

A narrative description of the efforts of the Working Group on European Air Space Utilization (AC/91) and of the establishment and early years of the Committee for European Airspace Coordination (CEAC) (AC/92) from 1955 to 1958, can be found in Part XIV of our previous Report, DES(94)2, pages 1-7. Listings of the 95 documents issued by CEAC between May 1955 and December 1958 appear as Annex XIV, 1/1; the Notices and Records of Meetings of CEAC are listed in Annexes XIV, 1/2 and 1/3; and the 43 Working Papers are listed in Annex XIV, 1/4, of that same Report.

The CEAC reserved to itself wide-ranging topics of policy and procedure where the interest of all of the NATO countries--and sometimes unaffiliated countries--were affected and when the good offices of ICAO and IATA were essential to problem resolution. Decisions concerning the introduction of new technologies and equipment, the problems of military-civil aviation sharing airspace and related safety concerns were recurring topics of papers and discussions of the Committee between 1959 and 1965.

Technical subjects requiring a high degree of expertise were assigned to expert working groups for consideration and report back to the CEAC for necessary action. The rapid introduction of jet aircraft created a whole new interrelated set of problems which required a much broader approach. Both the military and the civil authorities were concerned and approached the problems involved with awareness of the need for close cooperation.

In May 1959 the Standing Group (SG) of the Military Committee submitted a memorandum to the Secretary General (SGM-301-59, 26.5.59) describing the prevailing situation and the future prospects. In NATO Europe in 1959, civil and military air traffic was generally controlled by two independent systems. Extensive cross-telling between these two systems, as well as other measures and procedures had been necessary to reconcile competing requirements in order to insure safe, efficient and economical operations. But the continued maintenance of two effective systems was proving time-consuming and expensive in personnel and in communications and was possible only because civil and military flights had, up to that time, been concentrated at different height bands.

The introduction of jet aircraft meant that civil and military air traffic were merging in space and in time. Civil air traffic was rapidly progressing to the point where it generated requirements which approximated those necessary for military air operations. The SG appreciated that action needed to be taken or two similar systems would continue to be developed at great cost when one might be sufficient. The suggestion was for the study of the possibility and desirability of some amalgamation of the civil and military area control systems as a matter of

priority since plans and programs for separate systems were advancing rapidly and it would become more difficult to effect any desired degree of amalgamation in the future.

The problems referred to by the Standing Group were closely allied to those being studied by the CEAC and fell within its terms of reference. The composition of a study group suggested by the SG resembled almost exactly the composition of CEAC. Consequently the Secretary General referred the paper to the CEAC to undertake a study to determine if they required any additional terms of reference or guidance to enable them to proceed. The SG paper and the questions posed concerning it were circulated on 10th June 1959 to the Committee (AC/92-D/106) for consideration at its meeting in late September.

When the CEAC held its 12th meeting from 29th September to 2nd October 1959 (AC/92-R/12) the SG paper was discussed along with two papers concerning an International Convention for Cooperation in Air Navigation Security (EUROCONTROL). The first of these contained the text of a communication from the Belgian Representative concerning EUROCONTROL (AC/92-D/108). The second contained an extended explanatory note on the EUROCONTROL organization prepared by the CEAC Chairman (AC/92-D/109, 25.8.59). A covering note advised the Committee members that communications similar to that submitted by Belgium had been received from representatives of France, Germany, Italy and Luxembourg.

These member states were seeking a solution to the problem raised by the organization of air traffic control in the upper air space immediately above their respective territories. CEAC had been asked to examine the proposed convention in order to advise the Council on the position it should take to the proposal.

The Chairman explained in his note that the internationalization of control of the upper air space was an imperative requirement for certain States. The coordination of any efforts which individual countries might make in this field would be quite insufficient to assure the effectiveness of the control when jet transport traffic reached its full development.

The envisioned internationalization of control raised many financial, legal, administrative and even political problems which could only be solved by the application of an international convention. Such a legal instrument needed to be signed and ratified by each country. The drafters of the convention envisioned it as a starting point for a much larger organization which would finally enable the whole of European control to be designed in accordance with the actual facts of the performance of the aircraft, the situation of traffic streams and the characteristics of navigational aids. These problems could not be solved with the artificial concept of geographical frontiers.

The convention proposed, therefore, was designed for accession by non-NATO countries. But this would be possible only if no severe restrictions were imposed for military reasons. EUROCONTROL provided for accession in circumstances

where a country (e.g., Austria and Switzerland) could not join a purely NATO organization for military reasons or because these countries might object to joining an organization otherwise composed solely of NATO countries. The projected organization provided a framework and established the institutions which would make possible the joint organization of control in the upper air space, but it would in no way prejudice details of technical organization. The organizing states specifically sought to harmonize the civil and military policies in the field of air traffic control and sought to promote to the maximum the joint use of specialized installations.

The CEAC members were very familiar with this matter as it had already approved the terms of reference of the EUROCONTROL Working Group responsible for examining the technical organization. It was composed of military and civilian representatives in liaison with SHAPE and was obligated to report regularly to CEAC on the progress achieved in its studies (AC/92-D/101, 16.3.59).

Following discussion the Committee concluded that EUROCONTROL as envisioned by the draft convention was a satisfactory first step toward European-wide traffic control but that it was necessary to have full guarantees from the states involved that military interests would be safeguarded. These guarantees should take the form of arrangements for the technical organization and any subsequent modifications to the organization should be subjected also to the agreement of the national and international military authorities. Further, that measures should be taken to ensure that information of a military character would be properly safeguarded and that any accession of non-NATO countries, or the arrangements made with such countries, should be examined from this standpoint.

A report by CEAC to the Council was drafted and approved during the course of the meeting. The report was submitted to the Council as C-M(59)89 on 13th October 1959. A copy was circulated to the Committee as AC/92-D/117 (7.11.59).

In their report the CEAC observed that the overall task proposed by the Standing Group was immense. It sought to cover upper and lower airspace over the whole of (at least) NATO Europe. Even if these problems were given high priority and if experts required were available, the task would require a very long time to complete. The most urgent need for study was in the provision of control and navigation systems for aircraft flying in the upper airspace, and most particularly, in the areas of Europe where the problems were already critical. CEAC argued that control in lower airspace was for the short term best dealt with nationally because there already existed control systems which provided adequately for aircraft safety. But it recognized that the increasing complexity of air traffic control systems would require CEAC to study these matters at a later date. The Committee argued that the immediate need required a greater concentration of available effort on particular aspects of the problem and proposed that they be given priority.

The Committee concluded by recommending to the Council that a Sub-Committee of CEAC be set up to study the upper airspace problem in that part of Europe where it was most critical, viz., in Northern and Central NATO Europe, including the United Kingdom and Italy. CEAC proposed that the Sub-Committee be manned by military and civil experts working constantly on the problems and meeting as frequently as necessary. ICAO and IATA should be invited to send observers to the meetings when desirable. The Sub-Committee was to assume that all suitable military equipment would be used provided NATO military security and operational requirements could be met and that their plans would take account as necessary of non-NATO states within the area in question. However, no consultation with such states was to take place until the implications of any plans affecting these states had been considered by the Council through CEAC. (The terms of reference of the proposed Sub-Committee are Annex I to AC/92-D/117 and C-M(59)89.)

The Council discussed the CEAC report at its meeting on 18th November 1989 (C-R(59)39). The Council approved all of the proposals, authorized the Sub-Committee to amplify its terms of reference as it saw fit and agreed to discuss this matter again when the report by the Sub-Committee on Northern and Central Europe had been submitted to and studied by CEAC.

The Sub-Committee held its first meeting on 15th and 16th January 1960. There it discussed its terms of reference and outlined its working programme. A report of the decisions taken at that meeting was provided to the CEAC by "Sub-Committee No. 1" on 19th January 1960 (AC/92-D/129). The final accepted version of the composition, terms of reference and outline of working programme for CEAC's Sub-Committee No. 1 was issued as AC/92-D/133 (19.2.60).

The report of the first meeting and a Working Paper setting out the terms of reference and working programme were discussed by CEAC at its meeting on 21st January 1960 (AC/92-R/13). In a presentation it was announced that the Sub-Committee determined that it needed some degree of coordination of its work and had established a Steering Group to consist of the Chairman and two vice-chairmen. Mr. Soward of the UK was voted Chairman. The German Representative served as one of the Vice Chairmen while Colonel Birksted, who represented SHAPE and the NATO military authorities served as the other Vice-Chairman. After discussing and noting these reports and presentations, the Committee called for coordination of the work of the Sub-Committee No. 1 with that of the EUROCONTROL Technical Group in order to avoid duplication. It urged that national administrations be represented as far as possible on both bodies by the same experts.

When the Steering Committee of the Sub-Committee met on 15th and 18th February 1960 it established three sub-groups. The first sub-group would assess whether the planned upper airspace structure is compatible with the NATO air defence requirements and to recommend how any incompatibility might be resolved. The second sub-group was to focus on the question of radars. Its assignment was to determine whether there was in NATO Europe

suitable primary or secondary radars to give radar capability for ATC purposes over the European airspace between FL 200 and 500; if this was not the case, to determine where the gaps were and whether there were any national civil, military or SHAPE radar plans to fill these gaps for which common operational requirements could be stated. The third sub-group was to study automatic data handling equipment. This sub-group was to collect information on national and SHAPE studies on the future use of automatic data handling equipment for both air/ground and ground/ground, for ATC purposes in the upper airspace and for air defence purposes, and for the purposes of determining in what fields a common civil/military requirement existed. (AC/92(SC 1)D/1, 24.2.60).

The programme of work was parceled out to these initial sub-groups and studies and reports were developed. A year later at least one of the representatives had become convinced that the organization of work within the Sub-Committee seemed to be getting too cumbersome and too many groups were being set up to study sub-sets of the same topics. The United Kingdom Representative suggested a modification of the growing structure to concentrate the work within four working groups. The Steering Group was invited to consider a reorganization of the work and to propose broad terms of reference for the working groups. At the same time it was agreed that the then existing working groups should continue without interruption as it was felt necessary that any restructuring should not delay their work (AC/92(SC 1)D/15, 9.2.61).

At the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 6th through 9th June 1961, a reorganization was approved establishing three working groups (AC/92(SC 1)D/33, 23.6.61). Working Group No. 1 was to focus on upper airspace structure and organization. Working Group No. 2 was to study air traffic control systems. And, Working Group No. 3 was to examine measures to ensure compatibility of civil and military communications plans and to avoid unwarranted duplication. The latter Group was also to examine the requirements to ensure compatibility of civil and military automatic data handling plans--also to avoid unwarranted duplication.

When the CEAC Sub-Committee No. 1 met in January 1962, it agreed to seven basic principles for coordination of civil/military airspace and air traffic control for the upper airspace of NATO Europe. The principles constituted a drastic change in air traffic control concepts as they called for joint civil/military use of the air and joint control of traffic, instead of the segregation and divided control which had been practiced. The Sub-Committee recognized that the application of this concept would require new and technically complex control systems at a considerable expense to nations, but they argued that substantial savings in equipment and personnel could be achieved through the agreed joint control concept as compared to uncoordinated civil and military requirements. To ensure compatibility of the systems throughout the area a number of detailed technical studies would have to be undertaken by Sub-Committee No. 1 (AC/92(SC 1)D/48 of 1.2.62). The proposed future work programme of the three Working Groups was annexed to the report of the decisions at the January meeting. A progress report was submitted to CEAC in time for its meeting in

December 1962 (AC/92-D/210, meeting on 6th and 7th December 1962, AC/92-R/21).

A revised version of the 1962 progress report in the format of an index to and summary of the studies of civil and military airspace organization and air traffic control in the upper airspace of NATO Europe was provided to CEAC by Sub-Committee No. 1 on 26th April 1963 (AC/92(SC 1)D/85; also AC/92-D/227). When presenting this report to the Committee at its meeting on 6th and 7th May 1963 (AC/92-R/22, Item IV), Colonel Birksted noted that the main task of the Sub-Committee was the coordination of NADGE and ATC Planning, with a view of preventing unwarranted duplication of equipment. But he also noted that little progress had been made since planning for NADGE and ATC has been delayed for various reasons. Further coordination would be possible only when the plans of the NATO military, and the national and EUROCONTROL plans were available. Some duplication seemed inevitable inasmuch as the requirements were sometime quite different. But making the plans available to the Sub-Committee was essential as a first step.

At that same meeting in May 1963, the CEAC Chairman expressed the view that Sub-Committee No. 1, as then conceived, was ill-adapted to consider broad problems of concert to CEAC as a whole. In particular he believed that the Sub-Committee was unduly hampered by the geographical restrictions to which it was subjected, and by the restriction to study the upper airspace only. He suggested the Committee might wish to consider dissolving the Sub-Committee and replacing it with a technical body capable of dealing with broad questions of interest to CEAC as a whole. Following further discussion, the Committee agreed to invite representatives to submit their views on this subject to the International Staff, which would circulate them for consideration at an early meeting (AC/92-R/22, Item XIV). A United States proposal considered at the meeting was to be expanded upon and circulated (it was circulated on 26th August 1963 as AC/92-D/243 to which the ICAO member submitted an addendum on 17th September 1963).

When this topic was discussed at the next meeting of CEAC on 19th and 20 September 1963 it was apparent that there were widely divergent views on the future of Sub-Committee No. 1, but unanimous agreement that its terms of reference should be broadened and made more flexible. A working group consisting of Representatives of Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the United States and SHAPE were tasked to study and recommend new terms of reference for Sub-Committee No. 1 (AC/92-R/23, Item II). The Italian Delegation submitted proposals (as Addendum 2 to AC/92-D/243) as did the United Kingdom (AC/92-D/249).

The Working Group met in October 1963 in Paris and prepared a paper proposing revisions to the composition, terms of reference and outline of working programs for the Sub-Committee. The Working Group also suggested the renaming of the Sub-Committee to "CEAC Technical Sub-Committee" (AC/92-D/255). The CEAC discussed the paper and proposed a number of comments and amendments at a meeting held on 20th and 21st November 1963

(Item II of AC/92-R/24). A revised version of the paper under discussion embodying the accepted terms and descriptions was issued on 26th November 1963 (AC/92-D/255 (Revised)).

At its meeting on 20th and 21st November, CEAC thanked the Chairman and the members of the Sub-Committee for the work they had accomplished. They noted with satisfaction that most of the studies undertaken had been completed or soon would be submitted (AC/92-R/24, Items III and IV).

Also at the November meeting the question of the Chairmanship of the CEAC was brought forward in conjunction with the possible appointment of a chairman of the new Technical Sub-Committee (TSC). After several exchanges of views and proposals (see AC/92-D/267, D/268, D/271 and Addendum to D/271), the Committee agreed at its meeting on 19th and 20th March 1964, that in the future the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of CEAC and the Chairman of the TSC would be designated for a period of two years with a possibility of extension for one year. At the end of their mandates, they would be replaced by individuals of a different nationality or by a member of the International Staff. At that March meeting the CEAC agreed to elect Mr. G. Glunz of the Federal Republic of Germany as Chairman. The selection of a Vice Chairman was postponed and the Chairmanship of the Technical Sub-Committee (Colonel Birksted) was unchanged (AC/92-R/25, Item I).

The United States representative to CEAC felt that a hazardous situation was arising due to the lack of resolution of the problem of the smooth transfer of operational control of air traffic between adjacent FIRS. By introducing this topic he stimulated the calling of the first meeting of an ad hoc working group under the aegis of the TSC (AC/92(TSC)D/1, 19.2.64). The Ad Hoc Working Group's report was issued on 31st March 1964 (AC/92(TSC)D/2).

A programme of work and priorities of studies for the Technical Sub-Committee was circulated by Colonel Birksted and approved at the CEAC meeting in March (AC/92-R/25, Item III; circulated subsequently as AC/92-D/277 and AC/92(TSC)D/4).

With the creation of the NADGE Organization it had become evident that national administrations had adopted new procedures for coordination of viewpoints. Coordination was being handled directly rather than through the Technical Sub-Committee (AC/92-R/28, Item III and IV, mtg. 1-2.6.65). The Chairman of the TSC submitted a progress report to the CEAC covering its activities over the course of its first year. It was appended to the Record of the CEAC meeting (Annex to AC/92-R/28). While the TSC continued to work on a variety of complex topics, the reports and studies prepared by the Technical Sub-Committee after 1964 were issued in the regular document series of CEAC papers (i.e., as AC/92-D/...) and no more separately issued record items in the TSC serial were produced.

The 97 numbered documents issued by the CEAC Sub-Committee No. 1 between 1960 and 1963 are listed in Annex XIV, 3 to this Report. The 13

documents and 3 working papers issued by its successor, the Technical Sub-Committee, in 1964 are listed in Annex XIV, 4. Unlisted record items issued by these Sub-Committees are identified in Annex XIV, 5. These record items were not refilmed when all of the record items created by CEAC were refilmed in 1973-1974. Several of the most significant items prepared by the Sub-Committee were also issued as CEAC papers. This fact is noted in the listing.

The Committee for European Airspace Coordination (CEAC) met 20 times between 1959 and 1965. In addition to considering the technical issues examined by its Sub-Committee No. 1 and the Technical Sub-Committee (and their working groups), it also examined a variety of other airspace matters which were referred to ad hoc working groups. These groups, however, did not create separate serials of formal documents. The Committee itself examined issues arising from the various military and civil exercises, technological advances affecting air traffic control and the implication of EUROCONTROL for NATO--especially the concerns of its military authorities. The 250 Documents issued by CEAC between 1959 and 1965 are listed in Annex XIV, 2/1 of this Report. The dozen Working Papers issued by the Committee are listed in Annex XIV, 2/2. The Notices and Records of Meetings not listed in the Annexes are identified in Annex XIV, 5. The roll numbers where the CEAC records were refilmed is indicated in the appropriate annex.

Most of the CEAC record items were issued as NATO UNCLASSIFIED. A number of documents relating to military matters and the military exercises were issued as NATO CONFIDENTIAL and some as NATO SECRET. We recommend that the 1959-1965 record items issued by CEAC under the AC/92 serial be regraded NATO UNCLASSIFIED and that they all be released for public research.