



NOTE DE TRAVAIL

COMITÉ JURIDIQUE — 33^e SESSION

(Montréal, 21 avril – 2 mai 2008)

Point 3 : Réparation des dommages causés aux tiers par des aéronefs suite à des actes d'intervention illicite ou à des risques généraux

AVERTISSEMENT

Faute de ressources, seule la proposition a été traduite.

**PROJET DE CONVENTION RELATIVE À LA RÉPARATION DES DOMMAGES CAUSÉS
AUX TIERS PAR DES AÉRONEFS, EN CAS D'INTERVENTION ILLICITE**

EXONÉRATION DES AUTRES FOURNISSEURS DE SERVICES

(Note présentée par l'Allemagne)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 At its 182nd session the Council has decided to submit the Draft Convention on Compensation for Damage caused by Aircraft to Third Parties, in Case of Unlawful Interference to the 33rd session of the Legal Committee and requested that the Legal Committee takes into account the concerns raised by Germany in C-WP/13087 and pays attention to possible ways of protecting the interests of victims most efficiently and ensures the ratifiability of the revised Convention and the operability of the funding mechanism. One of the issues raised by Germany in C-WP/13087 concerns the vast exoneration of other service providers.

2. THE CURRENT DRAFT: VAST EXONERATION DISREGARDS INTERESTS OF VICTIMS AND AIRCRAFT OPERATORS

2.1 The Draft provides in Article 27 that the claim against the operator under the Convention is an exclusive remedy and therefore shields other entities, which could have contributed to the damage, from their liability. Additionally, Article 25 excludes almost any recourse of the operator liable for third party damage to anybody else who contributed to the damage. This complete exclusion of liability is granted to the other entities without obliging them to contribute to the SCM and regardless of the basics of tort and contract law. In consequence victims may well remain uncompensated, e.g. if the SCM is exhausted, whereas those who have contributed to the damage are protected by the Convention and continue to operate.

2.2 This “channelling” of claims onto the operator is especially critical concerning entities that are involved in operational areas of air traffic and therefore constitute severe risks for the operators’ safety, such as air navigation service providers, airports, security providers and ground handling service providers. In cases where the other entity has acted with fault and has thus contributed to the damage it is not justifiable that it benefits from the exclusion of liability – without even having contributed to the SCM – whereas the victims risk not receiving any compensation if the resources of the SCM are exhausted. The other entity however is perfectly able to effect payments. Up to that point it has not touched its financial means since the first layer is borne by the operator’s insurance and the second layer by the passengers, who have contributed to the SCM.

Additionally, it can hardly be considered fair if the operator, who is held strictly liable in case of an incident, should not have a right of recourse against those who actually caused or contributed to the damage.

Another issue to be taken into account is that the current exoneration concept does not set incentives to improve security measures and in the worst case could prompt service providers to reduce security measures as well as the costs spent on those measures, since there would be no liability in case of damage.

Apart from that, it cannot be neglected that such a general exclusion of liability would encompass manufacturers of aircraft as well. This however contradicts European Community law on product liability and must prevent EC Member States from ratifying the Convention.

The vast exoneration of entities and persons contributing to the damage in connection with the limited liability of the airlines puts the victims at a disadvantage that is by no means justifiable, clearly contradicts the aim of the Convention and makes it impossible for policymakers to implement such a system.

3. PROPOSITION

3.1 En conséquence, l’Allemagne propose qu’une exonération ne soit accordée qu’aux entités qui n’interviennent pas dans le processus opérationnel, comme les propriétaires d’aéronefs, les loueurs et les bailleurs de fonds, mais que l’exposition à une demande de réparation soit maintenue dans le cas des entités qui participent à ce processus et qui peuvent donc contribuer aux dommages. De plus, l’Allemagne propose que le droit de recours soit accordé à l’exploitant et au MDS conformément à la législation nationale.

À cet effet, l’Allemagne recommande les modifications suivantes :

- supprimer l’article 27 ;
- ajouter le nouvel article 4 bis ci-après :

« Sans préjudice des articles 3, 4, 5 et 25, les propriétaires d’aéronefs, les loueurs et les bailleurs de fonds ne sont pas tenus de réparer les dommages visés par la présente Convention. »

- enfin, remplacer les paragraphe 1 et 2 de l’article 25 par le texte suivant :

« 1. La présente Convention ne préjuge en aucune manière la question de savoir si une personne tenue pour responsable en vertu de ses dispositions a un droit de recours contre toute personne. Le droit de recours est conditionné par le dédommagement intégral de tous les tiers.

2. La présente Convention ne préjuge en aucune manière la question de savoir si le Mécanisme de dédommagement supplémentaire a un droit de recours contre toute personne. Cependant, le Mécanisme de dédommagement supplémentaire n'a un droit de recours que contre l'exploitant, si les limites de l'article 4, paragraphe 1, ne s'appliquent pas. Le droit de recours du Mécanisme de dédommagement supplémentaire est conditionné par le dédommagement intégral de tous les tiers. »

— FIN —