

Conclusions and recommendations from the meeting of the International Review Panel on DARP track 2

Participants: **Bescherming persoonlijke levenssfeer**

Documentation: Agenda + draft report by Helios on DARP Track 2.

Goal:

The international review panel convened to offer independent advice to the DARP Programme on track 2. It did so by:

1. Offering comments on the general thrust of the Helios Report;
2. Offering advice on findings of the Helios report; and
3. Making recommendations to the Steering Group

DISCUSSION

The Helios Report

The Report is helpful in providing a challenging and independent review of the DARP work - and offers some recommendations that have merit. These should be taken forward in further work. However, the panel did not think that the whole Report should be accepted; and concluded that it is not in any event necessary to do so in order to take forward helpful elements from the Report.

Although the Helios Report is in places rather critical, the Panel's unanimous view was that the DARP Programme's objectives and vision - and the deliverables sought from these - remained valid. Therefore, only those Report recommendations that support the further progress of DARP should be pursued.

Such recommendations include:

- reconfirming the objectives and aims of the Programme;
- securing agreement on high level principles on airspace use and priorities;
- considering the timeline of DARP and the delivery of intermediate results;
- further intensifying international cooperation; and
- further assessing the key "Three States" proposals.

On the other hand, any recommendations that risk backwards steps in the DARP progress; that destabilise that process; or that demand additional time and resources without generating additional solutions or added value should not be adopted.

The Panel considers that the Three States proposals are a package that may well ultimately contribute to the long-term solution. But they are complex and cannot be implemented safely in their totality in the short term. However, suitably adapted, they could help provide an intermediate solution.

The Panel considers in particular that:

- It is not helpful or effective to revisit the work of the DARP programme by reverting to a blank sheet of paper approach. This would destabilise the programme without contributing to further progress.
- Similarly, a full-scale redesign of the process is not considered helpful.
- It is not effective to develop CONOPS for all of the designs that emerge from the design sessions.
- It takes considerable time to perform a QRSA, while this does not add value to the design process or the programme progress.
- Do not assess and develop all options that are considered until at least the end of the Exploration Phase. It is, however, important to document choices properly, for example why certain options are discarded.
- Do not revisit the design process or in future undertake this work only in a small team.
- The international comparators are not considered effective or helpful for the programme.
- The recommendation to reaffirm and restate the vision and the objective of DARP is especially relevant in the current situation (COVID19). This should not amount to a reopening of the Programme objectives, but it could take account of the imminent CAPF and evolving environmental priorities.
- The Panel agrees that time is short to achieve the full scope of the DARP Programme's ambitions. The panel stressed that delivering the full programme of work in time, when it is ready, is more important than the deadline of 2023.
- However, 2023 may be a helpful year to take stock of the results of the DARP programme to date. This would help meet immediate needs and secure progress towards its final goal/outcome. (This links to progress on key related projects - iCAS, oneATM, Schiphol TMA. Will they be available in 2023?)
- DARP can only be delivered with close international cooperation; a purely national option does not exist.
- The Panel agrees that the Three States are a possible long-term solution, but complex to implement in its full extent in the short term. The Panel was clear that it was not possible to deploy the full Three States solution under current technology – and certainly not within a single day.

The Three States Concept

Overall, the Review Panel considered that the ultimate, long-term objective remains the creation of a viable CBA with Germany. This would achieve the DARP programme objectives and contribute to the optimal network-wide solution for airspace in this part of north-west Europe.

The Review Panel did not have sufficient detail nor the time available to conduct an in-depth analysis of each of the individual scenarios in the Three States proposals, however they did draw some general conclusions, as follows:

- All 3 scenarios involve considerable interaction with airspace and ANSPs in adjacent FIR/UIRs, in particular with Germany and MUAC. As such, none can be delivered as a stand-alone, national solution and each will require close collaboration and co-operation to deliver against a timeline that will have to be negotiated and agreed.
- Each of the scenarios is relatively complex and as a consequence the Panel considered that if an early implementation should be achieved, there may be a merit in selecting one of the scenarios as an interim stepping stone towards the ultimate objective of a CBA. This could also be used as a learning tool to advance to the next stage. The Panel did not determine which State this should be.
- Due to the complexity of the airspace arrangements proposed in the Three States scenarios, the Panel considered that switching between scenarios (States) on any one day would be unwise and could introduce safety concerns. Rather the selection of scenario should be done no later than D-1 in line with FUA principles.
- There may be the possibility to devise other scenarios that could fulfil the requirements of an interim solution.

In order to facilitate this outcome, the Panel considers:

- There should be high-level, national agreement on the Flexible Use of Airspace /Airspace Management policy, guiding principles and priorities for the use of any of the Three States scenarios. These should be drafted and agreed as a matter of some urgency. Examples of high-level FUA and ASM Policies from other states/nations may be helpful in this regard.
- Airspace for defence purposes remains a national obligation. Bi-lateral negotiations between States are considered the optimum way to proceed although due regard should be given to the role of the Network Manager and to the other bodies available under the aegis of Eurocontrol.
- There should be dialogue between the commanders of the Dutch and German Air Force on the objectives and design principles of any future CBA, as soon as possible. In addition, the DARP Programme might consider funding work by German experts so as to hasten progress.

I. Recommendations to DARP programme management and the Steering Group

The Panel concludes that 'do nothing' is not an option for Dutch airspace. The panel considers DARP to be a viable programme, but would stress that political support for the programme as well as the strong involvement of the DARP Steering Group, are crucial to programme delivery.

The panel recommends that the vision and purpose of DARP should now be reaffirmed and restated in the context of current circumstances (COVID19), while taking environmental aspects into account. DARP may want to be clear that the Schiphol TMA redesign is an integral part of the programme.

The panel supports the ambition, scope and goals of DARP. In order to deliver these in changing circumstances, the panel recommends that, delivering an output in 2023 should be considered simply as an important stocktake of progress on the way to the delivery of the full DARP programme in 2035. It should not be a goal in itself.

There is no easy, short-term solution for DARP. The Three States concept may be a solution to meet the combination of civil and military needs. However, due to the complexity of the issues the full delivery of the Three States concept is unlikely to be ready in 2023.

DARP may therefore wish to consider whether an incremental approach for the development of the Three States is desirable or possible.

But the panel remains clear that the best means of meeting civil and military needs remains the delivery of a CBA with Germany and that this should remain a key objective of the programme.

Finally, the panel believes that, if timelines are to be met and progress made, Ministers need to give clear guidance on the DARP Programme (clarity of purpose; high level principles and priorities). Ministers should also determine which specific responsibilities they wish to delegate to the Steering Group in order to drive the programme forward. The Steering Group should then make full use of this authority to steer the Programme and support the work of the designers.