

Adrian Corcoran
Director of Economic Regulation, Consumer Affairs and Licensing
Irish Aviation Authority
The Times Building
11-12, D'Olier Street
Dublin 2

04th April 2024

Re: Coordination Parameters for Winter 24/25 Declaration

Dear Adrian,

The Irish Aviation Authority, by virtue of Section 8(1) of the Aviation Regulation Act, 2001 (as amended) is the competent authority in Ireland for the purposes of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 95/93 (as amended) on common rules for the allocation of slots at Community Airports (the "**EU Slot Regulations**"), other than the function of the coordinator. Article 6 of the EU Slot Regulations states that, at a coordinated airport, the Member State responsible shall ensure the determination of the parameters for slot allocation twice yearly, while taking account of all relevant technical, operational and environmental constraints as well as any changes thereto.

Article 5 of the EU Slot Regulations sets out the tasks of the Coordination Committee which include, *inter alia*, making proposals concerning or advising the Member State on:

- the possibilities for increasing the capacity of the coordinated airport determined in accordance with Article 3 or for improving its usage;
- the coordination parameters to be determined in accordance with Article 6; and
- all questions relating to the capacity of the coordinated airport.

The Dublin Airport Coordination Committee meeting took place on Thursday 28th March 2024, via Microsoft Teams and in person, to discuss the Winter 24/25 Coordination Parameters, and in this regard, I am writing to you in my role as secretary of the Coordination Committee, to outline the following:

- On 20th February last, an extraordinary general meeting (EGM) of the Dublin Airport Coordination Committee was called by the Chair to discuss Condition 3 of the Terminal 2 planning permission which states that the capacity of Terminal 1 and Terminal 2 shall not exceed 32 million passengers per annum. In the meeting, the Chair provided an update on the potential for a breach of Condition 3 in 2024 and suggested that a subcommittee be formed to explore possible solutions to remain compliant with the terminal limit.
- The subcommittee held four meetings between 27th February and 19th March last with the assistance of an independent facilitator, Mott MacDonald (the "Facilitator") to form suggestions and summarise the discussions that were had. The subcommittee did not reach any definitive conclusions on a solution to be adopted as part of the Winter 24/25 declaration. At the Coordination Committee Pre-meet on 26th March, the Facilitator of the subcommittee presented a summary of the key principles, and outlined the various options that had been discussed.
- The Coordination Committee met on 28th March to discuss the parameters to be adopted as part of the Winter 24/25 declaration. As there had been no definitive options presented at

61260682.2

the Committee Pre-meet, the Committee were presented with a series of five questions, with an additional (sixth) question added during the course of the meeting, following an exchange of further dialogue between committee members. Members were then asked to vote electronically on whether they (i) agree, (ii) disagree or (iii) abstain on the six questions.

- The results of the Committee voting are presented below:

Question	CCM Vote			
	Agree	Disagree	Abstain	Result
Condition 3 is ambiguous and until it is clarified, it should not be considered in the W24/25 declaration	93%	4%	3%	93% Agreed
Do you agree passenger growth should be paused for Winter 24/25 season?	5%	92%	3%	92% Disagree
To remain compliant with the adjusted terminal passenger limit of 32mppa, a new seasonal seat cap should be considered for W24/25	5%	92%	3%	92% Disagree
Should historic rights to slots be honoured in full for W24/25?	98%	-	2%	98% Agree
Additional runway slots should be considered to make use of the dual runway capacity subject to modelling and further review by the Coordination Committee?	96%	4%	-	96% Agree
If reductions in passenger numbers are required to remain compliant with the adjusted terminal passenger limit of 32mppa, Summer 24 should also be considered for action	50%	47%	3%	50% Agree

I also attach the minutes of meeting 28 March 2024 for your records.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any additional information regarding the Coordination Committee process.

Yours Sincerely,

Leon Ronan, Dublin Airport
Secretary to the Coordination Committee

W24/25 Voting Results

Question 1				
Condition 3 is ambiguous and until it is clarified, it should not be considered in the W24/25 declaration				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Agree	449		
Delta	Agree	9		
Air France	Agree	10		
KLM	Agree	15		
Aerlingus	Agree	275		
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Agree	92		
American Airlines	Agree	9		
United	Agree	10		
British Airways	Agree	19		
Air Canada	Agree	4		
City Flyer	Agree	15		
TUI	Disagree		3	
Sun Express	Abstain			1
Luxair	Abstain			3
UPS	Abstain			7
AIRNAV	Abstain			20
IATA	Agree	10		
DAA	Disagree		40	
Total		926	43	31
		93%	4%	3%
Members Comments				
<p>daa <i>While daa accepts that it could be argued that there is ambiguity in interpretation of condition 3 (see (i) daa's submissions to FCC dated 29 September 2023, 24 January 2024 and 20 March 2024; and (ii) documents released by FCC to daa on 28 March 2024 in response to daa's request for documents concerning FCC's decisions to close investigations into alleged breaches of the 32M annual terminal capacity in 2019 (ENF 20/012B) and 2023 (ENF 23/209B) (attached)), any such ambiguity is not a reason for condition 3 not to be considered in the W24/25 declaration.</i></p>				

Question 2				
Do you agree passenger growth should be paused for Winter 24/25 season?				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Disagree		449	
Delta	Disagree		9	
Air France	Disagree		10	
KLM	Disagree		15	
Aerlingus	Disagree		275	
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Disagree		92	
American Airlines	Disagree		9	
United	Disagree		10	
British Airways	Disagree		19	
Air Canada	Disagree		4	
City Flyer	Disagree		15	
TUI	Agree	3		
Sun Express	Disagree		1	
Luxair	Abstain			3
UPS	Abstain			7
AIRNAV	Abstain			20
IATA	Disagree		10	
DAA	Agree	40		
Total		51	919	29
		5%	92%	3%
Members Comments				
<p>daa daa agrees that passenger growth should be paused for Winter 24/25 season only if that is what is required to ensure compliance with the 32M annual passenger terminal capacity. It is for IAA to determine whether that is the case.</p>				

Question 3				
To remain compliant with the adjusted terminal passenger limit of 32mppa, a new seasonal seat cap should be considered for W24/25				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Disagree		449	
Delta	Disagree		9	
Air France	Disagree		10	
KLM	Disagree		15	
Aerlingus	Disagree		275	
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Disagree		92	
American Airlines	Disagree		9	
United	Disagree		10	
British Airways	Disagree		19	
Air Canada	Disagree		4	
City Flyer	Disagree		15	
TUI	Agree	3		
Sun Express	Agree	1		
Luxair	Abstain			3
UPS	Abstain			7
AIRNAV	Abstain			20
IATA	Disagree		10	
DAA	Agree	40		
Total		53	918	29
		5%	92%	3%
Members Comments				
<p>daa daa agrees that a new seasonal seat cap should be considered for W 24/25 only if that is what is required to ensure compliance with the 32M annual passenger terminal capacity. It is for IAA to determine whether that is the case.</p>				

Question 4				
Should historic rights to slots be honoured in full for W24/25?				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Agree	449		
Delta	Agree	9		
Air France	Agree	10		
KLM	Agree	15		
Aerlingus	Agree	275		
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Agree	92		
American Airlines	Agree	9		
United	Agree	10		
British Airways	Agree	19		
Air Canada	Agree	4		
City Flyer	Agree	15		
TUI	Agree	3		
Sun Express	Agree	1		
Luxair	Agree	3		
UPS	Agree	7		
AIRNAV	Abstain			20
IATA	Agree	10		
DAA	Agree	40		
Total		980	0	20
		98%	0%	2%
Members Comments				
<p>daa <i>The appropriate granting and operation of historic slots is in accordance with Slot Regulations; however, it is a matter for the IAA to determine the appropriate actions to comply with the 32m annual passenger terminal cap.</i></p>				

Question 5				
Additional runway slots should be considered to make use of the dual runway capacity subject to modelling and further review by the Coordination Committee?				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Agree	449		
Delta	Agree	9		
Air France	Agree	10		
KLM	Agree	15		
Aerlingus	Agree	275		
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Agree	92		
American Airlines	Agree	9		
United	Agree	10		
British Airways	Agree	19		
Air Canada	Agree	4		
City Flyer	Agree	15		
TUI	Disagree		3	
Sun Express	Agree	1		
Luxair	Agree	3		
UPS	Agree	7		
AIRNAV	Agree	20		
IATA	Agree	10		
DAA	Disagree		40	
Total		957	43	0
		96%	4%	0%
Airline comment				
<p><i>Swiss</i> Question 5. Additional rwy capacity should be viable for time shifts and not for pax services.</p> <p><i>daa</i> Additional runway slots should not be considered unless IAA determines that same could be implemented without causing non-compliance with the 32M annual passenger terminal capacity.</p>				

Question 6				
If reductions in passenger numbers are required to remain compliant with the adjusted terminal passenger limit of 32mppa, Summer 24 should also be considered for action?				
Member	Answer	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
Ryanair	Disagree		449	
Delta	Disagree		9	
Air France	Disagree		10	
KLM	Agree	15		
Aerlingus	Agree	275		
Swiss	Agree	8		
Emerald	Agree	92		
American Airlines	Agree	9		
United	Agree	10		
British Airways	Agree	19		
Air Canada	Agree	4		
City Flyer	Agree	15		
TUI	Agree	3		
Sun Express	Disagree		1	
Luxair	Agree	3		
UPS	Abstain			7
AIRNAV	Abstain			20
IATA	Agree	10		
DAA	Agree	40		
Total		503	470	27
		50%	47%	3%
Airline Comment				
<p><i>Regarding question 6, Aer Lingus' view is the proposal contained within it only becomes an option once all legal options have been exhausted</i></p> <p><i>daa</i> <i>daa understands that declared capacity should only be amended in exceptional circumstances. daa agrees that re-opening of Summer 24 should be considered only if that is what is required to ensure compliance with the 32M annual passenger terminal capacity. It is for IAA to determine whether that is the case.</i></p>				

END