

General Questions and Answers for publication on the consultation website (update 17/02/2014)					
Answer ID	Category	Status	Date	Question (possibly reformulated to be generic)	Answer
A1	Process	published	08 January 2014	Is the consultation open to any participants, even citizens?	Yes. Nevertheless, due to the technical nature of the subject of the consultation, the citizens are not among the primarily targeted stakeholders.
A2	Process	published	08 January 2014	Is it possible to extend the consultation period?	Yes. The Commission announced the extension until the 14th February 2014.
A3	Process	published	08 January 2014	Can we give more input in the standardization work to be done?	Yes. It is one of the purposes of such consultation
A4	Process	published	08 January 2014	Can we provide comments on the Operational Concepts (e.g. at OSED level)?	We encourage all comments and will take them into account. Nevertheless, the concepts covered by the PCP proposals were developed with due consultation in a first step by the Joint Undertaking and comments should have been made and considered at that time.
A5	Process	published	16 January 2014	What will be the next steps for the PCP IR document on the EC side and what would be the dates associated to such steps?	After the stakeholder consultation, the Commission will review as appropriate the initial proposal for the PCP content and present the final version to the airspace users and concerned ground operational stakeholders for endorsement. On that basis, the Commission will finalise the draft legislative proposal for implementing rules on the PCP and present it to the Single Sky Committee for an opinion (April). After the positive opinion of the Committee, the Commission will adopt the legislative proposal (targeting end May).
A6	Process	published	16 January 2014	Where can the result of SJU's assessment of the potential impact on the 6 AFs of the potential 9 Centralised Services be find?	The document you refer to is the: Supplement to the Mandate to the SESAR Joint Undertaking for drafting a proposal on the content of a Pilot Common Project (SJU, 17/07/2013), which is available on the bottom of the SESAR deployment webpage under background documents.
A7	Process	published	16 January 2014	Risks, threats, opportunities. - There is no clarity on the risks or how these will be mitigated. - Risk that IDP is not in place - Standardisation needs to be mature to ensure a common baseline across states. - Risk that we may find ourselves in another 'data link' situation.	High priority risks and mitigations are discussed in Section 6 of the SJU proposal addressing those elements (see risks number 2, 5, 6). If you have any specific comments or suggestions please provide your input.
B1	Terminology	published	08 January 2014	What do you mean by "endorsement" of the PCP?	After the current consultation period, the text of the PCP will be revised according to the received comments. The Commission will then make a formal request to the operational stakeholders to validate, in writing, the revised text of the PCP before submitting it to the Single Sky Committee for formal opinion.
B2	Terminology	published	31 January 2014	What do you mean by "maturity" of ATM functionalities?	In order to be included in a common project an ATM functionality must have reached an appropriate level of industrialisation demonstrating its maturity for implementation (as referred to in Article 4(3a) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 409/2013). Whereby 'Industrialisation' comprises the activities and processes of standardisation, certification and production by the manufacturing industry (ground and airborne equipment manufacturers), 'implementation' comprises the procurement, installation and putting into service of equipment and systems, including associated operational procedures. Moreover, in accordance with Article 4(4) of the same regulation, the maturity of ATM functionalities shall be demonstrated, inter alia, on the basis of the results of validation carried out by the SESAR Joint Undertaking, the status of standardisation and certification processes and an assessment of their interoperability. Maturity in terms of validation of ATM functionalities is deemed to be achieved when V3 maturity (pre-industrialisation) level of the ATM Concept Lifecycle Model (CLM) is completed. In the specific case of the Pilot Common Project, this approach was the basis for the preliminary proposal from the SESAR JU taking into account the content of the future Releases 4 and 5. The Commission took into consideration the standardisation and regulation roadmaps revised with the standardisation and regulation organisations and SJU (as detailed in Part V, Section 1 and 2) for the maturity assessment. The maturity of preparations for industrialisation (including the development of standards and regulations) was checked against the targeted time frame for the PCP implementation, i.e. 2014-2024. Those functionalities whose deployment could not start within that time-frame (AF 5 and 6) were not proposed for inclusion in the PCP but identified as priorities for future deployment ("binding orientations").
B3	Terminology	published	17 February 2014	Consultation document page 38, section 5.3 – Could you please confirm which NOP this is referring to? We are aware that there are two distinct NOPs in existence, a paper document used for future planning and a database for operational functionality, the consultation document needs to be clear in this regard.	Both of them are covered: 'Network Operations Plan (NOP)' means the plan, including its supporting tools, developed by the Network Manager in coordination with the operational stakeholders to organise its operational activities in the short and medium term in accordance with the guiding principles of the Network Strategic Plan. For the European route network design (ERND)-specific part of the Network Operations Plan, it includes the European Route Network Improvement Plan;
C1	Governance	published	08 January 2014	Will the deployment of PCP (and future common projects) be an obligation also for the military?	Yes. PCP (and future common projects) will be published in a Commission Implementing Regulation, hence it will become legally binding for all the EU Members States and all operational stakeholders, including the military, as far as they are subject to the implementing rules.
C1bis	Governance	published	31 January 2014	Will the deployment of PCP (and future common projects) be an obligation also for the military? Additional clarification requested	Further to our response to the question C1, we would like to clarify that the PCP Regulation will not "cover military operations and training". The latter are indeed excluded from the SES regulatory framework (Article 1 of the Regulation 549/2004). In this sense we would like to draw a parallel with the Commission Regulation laying down common rules for the Flexible Use of Airspace (EC) No. 2150/2005. While there is no doubt that the implementation of FUA Regulation requires participation from the military, it does not per se regulate military operations and training. In the same way, while successful implementation of the future PCP Regulation will require some participation from the military, it will not per se regulate military operations and training.
C2	Governance	published	16 January 2014	Activity of NSAs has not been considered/investigated, i.e. activity of NSAs to verify and accept changes (regarding Safety and Security)	The role of NSA is recognised and highlighted in Regulation (EU) 409/2013 of 3 May 2013. The PCP does not add additional tasks for the NSAs who are asked to intervene in accordance with their roles and responsibilities that are defined in Regulation (EC) 549/2004 of 10 March 2004 and Regulation (EU) 691/2010 of 29 July 2010 in particular in terms of performance objectives and implementation of the ATM Master Plan. We expect the NSAs' input to this consultation will convey their reflection on detailed actions that NSAs could take with respect of the PCP and future Common Projects.
C3	Governance	published	16 January 2014	Deployment Manager not clarified in the PCP consultation paper.	The main subject of the stakeholder consultation is the content of the PCP. References to the overall deployment framework aim to raise awareness of the context and prepare stakeholders for the upcoming discussions, in particular on the setup of the Deployment Manager and the implementation projects and the related incentives. In particular, the detailed mechanisms for the setup of the Deployment Manager are currently being defined within Commission services in cooperation with groups of operational stakeholders. We will communicate on this subject at a later stage.

C4	Governance	published	27 January 2014	The suggested distribution of legal and financial responsibilities between the EC, the Deployment Manager and the Implementation Projects is a good one. Nonetheless who decides when the goals of an implementation project are met ? For sure there will be a lot of interpretation according to the “what to implement to achieve which goal” !	Implementation projects aim to deploy ATM Functionalities defined in the PCP, which defines "What" to deploy, "Where" and "When" to deploy and by "Who", with the ultimate goal to bring them into operation. The Deployment Programme defines "How" to deploy those functionalities through specific implementation projects. The Deployment Programme is developed by the Deployment Manager and approved by the Commission. The Deployment Manager is responsible for the overall coordination and monitoring of the implementation projects and reports to the Commission (Policy Level) on the implementation of the Deployment Programme. One the one hand, this reporting will indicate to the Commission the level of implementation of the PCP (deployment of the ATM functionalities), on the other hand, the benefits for the ATM Network achieved through the operation of the related ATM functionalities will be measured through the relevant Single European Sky Mechanisms (Network Manager, Performance Review Body).
C5	Governance	published	27 January 2014	Role of NSAs - Seems to be constrained to enforcement of the performance scheme with no acceptance of safety, interoperability or security requirements - If States do not deploy due to an immature safety or security argument, is the EC going to commence infringement action?	The role of NSAs does cover the verification of the compliance with interoperability requirements, including safety and security requirements in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 552/2004. If there is a lack of maturity concerning that require, for example, to postpone target implementation dates, the Commission may, through the review process, amend the PCP Regulation (section 1.9(h) of the consultation document).
C6	Governance	published	27 January 2014	What if a State does not apply for EU PCP-funding, and does not (can not) implement the part which is not co-funded from EU budget (1.11, bullet point b), page 22 of PCP proposal)	Once adopted, the PCP will be a binding Regulation prescribing the mandatory deployment of its ATM Functionalities. Applying or not applying for EU funding does not affect Member State's obligation to enforce the Regulation. In case of non-compliance, the Commission may start an infringement procedure against the non-compliant Member States.
C7	Governance	published	27 January 2014	Monitoring - Requirement to have a strategic monitoring system in place to serve Level 1, akin to the ESSIP/LSSIP process.	The draft Regulation foresees to make use of ESSIP/LSSIP process as a part of its monitoring together with other mechanisms described in the section 1.9(g) of the consultation paper.
C8	Governance	published	27 January 2014	Activity of NSAs has not been considered/investigated, i.e. activity of NSAs to verify and accept changes (regarding Safety and Security)	The PCP does not change the role of the NSAs in the SES framework and in relation to SESAR project. NSAs' competenece is not altered by the PCP. Nevertheless, if there are any concrete concerns and suggestions, the Commission welcomes to receive them in the reply to the consultation.
C9	Governance	published	31 January 2014	Given the significant levels of investment in deployment, there needs to be an independent benefits realisation authority whose purpose would be to: a. Confirm the level to which claimed benefits have been achieved through deployment b. Provide evidence for the decision on progressing to Step 2 or performing additional deployment work in relation to Step 1. he function needs to be independent of the deployment process (reporting into SJU or EC) and needs to be in place and gathering evidence before PCP deployment commences (identify the pre-deployment baseline). Is such an entity proposed?	In the Article 6(2) of the Commission Implementing Regulation 409/2013 it is provided that the Commission shall make best use of existing monitoring and reporting instruments when monitoring effectiveness of common projects with regard to performance of the EATMN. For this purpose, the Commission intends to rely i.a. on Performance Review Body, on mechanisms and reporting inherent in the performance and charging schemes and ESSIP/LSSIP process. In addition, the use of CEF funding is going to be evaluated in accordance with Article 27 of the CEF Regulation.
C11	Governance	published	10 February 2014	Is entering the SDM in the 2nd or 3rd CP still possible?	Yes. The Deployment Manager is responsible for implementing all Common Projects. Operational stakeholders can join it later, for example when calls for Implementation Projects are launched or new Common Projects are adopted
C12	Governance	published	10 February 2014	Who decides when the goals of an implementation project are met?	Please see the answer to question C4.
D1	ATM functionality	published	31 January 2014	Why are AF5 and AF6 considered only as binding orientation PCP?	Based on the proposal from the SJU, the Commission consulted EUROCAE, the ESO's (CEN, ETSI), EASA, EUROCONTROL, the SJU and ASD. This consultation asked to confirm standardisation and regulation needs and delivery times. The organisations consulted indicated that the delivery of standards and regulations for AF5 and AF6 could be later then what was assumed in the SJU's proposal (as described in Part V, Section 2). During this pre-consultation phase, the PCP proposal was analysed against the maturity criteria as laid down in Regulation (EU) No 409/2013. Regarding Article 4(3)(a) of the maturity criteria, the current information we have does not support the conclusion that AF5 and AF6 would reach the appropriate level of industrialisation in the timeframe of the PCP (2014-2024). AF5 and AF6 were therefore proposed as "binding orientations" in Section 1.2 in Part I of the Targeted stakeholder consultation document. The distinction between mandatory AFs and binding orientations made in the Targeted stakeholder consultation document represents nevertheless a starting point in the consultation process. As a result of the consultation, AF5 and AF6 or parts of them could be proposed as mandatory AFs in the PCP.
D2	ATM functionality	published	16 January 2014	Regarding 1.1.1 in the annex to the Implementing regulation CPH are a bit puzzled if this is a major change in policy. A lot of effort has been put in increasing competition through the EU regulation. We understand this as EU now is focusing on efficiency instead of competition.If arrival management is extended to 180 - 200 NM without changing the TMA size, and traffic sequencing is conducted integrated in the en-route phase, it will add a large grey-zone between en-route and APP - both regarding both responsibility and cost. And these two entities has been clearly separated in the regulation regarding common charging scheme.	The AMAN is owned and configured by the TMA and where applicable sends requests for traffic delivery conditions to the upstream en-route sector to assure that the traffic is delivered in a sequence which meets the TMA needs. Responsibility for the control of the aircraft in the en-route sector remains with the en-route sector which can choose to enact the AMAN request, or not. According to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 of 3 May 2013 laying down a common charging scheme for air navigation services Article 8 there is not contradiction with 1.1.1. annex.
D3	ATM functionality	published	31 January 2014	Whenever an implementation of AF4 without iSWIM compliant interfaced takes place, the following implementation of AF5 means a redundant development and therefore additional cost. Is there a chance to speed up at least the most important parts of AF5 the need to be defined for an Implementation of AF4 ?	A similar question is asked in the consultation. "Considering the difference in maturity between SWIM (yellow and blue) profiles in the tables in ATM functionality 5, would it be more adequate to implement them separately and, in particular, aim an earlier deployment for the yellow profile?" (Question 2.1.5.22) . This is a possible outcome of the consultation process. We would expect that stakeholders provide feedback indicating which parts of the yellow profile are relevant to AF4 and how much we can speed up the process if we separate them from other parts.
D4	ATM functionality	published	17 February 2014	where can the documentation as listed in the consultation document under “Section 1 - Supporting material for the standardisation and industrialisation phase” be located?	The documentation listed in Section 1 is already available (or will be when the deliverable is handed over and approved by the SJU) in the SJU Extranet. Access to Extranet is granted to SJU members and other Stakeholders (such as National Authorities). The wide open publication it is not foreseen as some of the deliverables might be subject to some IPR conditions. Nevethless, in most cases the documentation will be included in the technical file of the related SESAR Solutions, which will be made public soon.

D5	ATM functionality	published	31 January 2014	There are inter-dependencies between AF1 and AF5, and AF6 and AF5. In particular for the former one, AF1 is a mature AF, while AF5 is not (binding orientation). How to deal with this interaction, in view of the deployment of AF1, if AF5 is confirmed to remain not mature in the time frame of PCP deployment for AF1?	iSWIM has two parts: the data exchange models that are necessary for the implementation of interfaces and the technical infrastructure and services. Data exchange between ATS units, in particular concerning extended AMAN, are defined as part of OLDI message set and already available for implementing interfaces between ATS units. Existing message exchange infrastructure for OLDI could be used until AF5 message exchange infrastructure based on PENS is implemented. For AF1, if OLDI message exchange infrastructure is already implemented, there won't be significant redundant investments. See also related question D3.
D6	ATM functionality	published	31 January 2014	Could we have more detailed information explaining CBA?	Additional information regarding CBAs is the XLS file with the modelling and calculations. It can be found on the web site as supporting material for PCP consultation (reference to website).
D7	ATM functionality	published	17 February 2014	What can we do to speed up the standardization processes to get valid standards and definitions for the implementation of AF2 asap? We have question with the idea of the "first alternative date scenario", since we don't think that an implementation project will start as long as the standardization process has delivered a stable (final) draft.Can we give more input in this standardization work to be done?	See A3. Standardisation and regulation organisations provided a different time frame than what was assumed in the SJU's proposal. To what extent the process could be speed up was also discussed with them during the preparatory meetings. The initial alternative scenarios shorten as a result of this discussion to the extent possible. If you think that is possible to shorten further the development of some AF2 standards, please make your proposal. The first alternative scenario is 2 years shorter than the second one but present some time constraints. Please make your input indicating how you could best address such constraints.
D8	ATM functionality	published	31 January 2014	Could you clarify the options considered for the industrialisation process (section 1.5, page 17 of the PCP Proposal):1) The manufacturing industry accepts to start industrialisation in parallel with the development of standards (1 year before the standards delivered) pending the signature of the first contract with operational stakeholders;2) The manufacturing industry starts the industrialisation activities upon signature of the first contract with the operational stakeholders. It should be noted that this scenario could delay the deployment process by two years.	To accelerate the deployment process, some "manufacturing" industry suggested that the development of products and standards could be done in parallel (scenario 1). Assuming that investing stakeholders would need the delivery of standards to launch the CFT process, this would mean for the manufacturing industry to start product developments without a signed contract while the Commission cannot impose to the manufacturing industry a specific scenario, it is important to get all stakeholders commitment on the same scenario. The consultation aims to receive feedback on scenario 1 and 2 from all relevant stakeholders.
D9	ATM functionality	published	27 January 2014	Who does the PCP concern: albeit not seen an issue for the PCP proposal itself, scope of deployment to other airports might expand with future CPs	It is not excluded that the scope of deployment of some AFs may expand in future CPs. This question is nevertheless out of the scope of the PCP and the current consultation.
D10	ATM functionality	published	10 February 2014	On Page 15 it is indicated that some AFs aren't at sufficient maturity for deployment. Will there be explanations as to why these AFs have been considered not to be at sufficient maturity for deployment and what criteria will be followed by the stakeholders in deciding the priority of the activities?	Please see the answer to question B2.
E1 (upd)	Finance	published	10 February 2014	Is there available funding for AF5/AF6 in the current proposal for PCP?	If AF5 and AF6 are not ultimately not included into the PCP, they cannot be funded under the Framework Partnership Agreement, as it is only dedicated to implementation projects included in the PCP. However, on the one hand, projects deploying ATM Master plan functionalities but falling outside the scope of the PCP and of Common projects in general could be funded under the CEF following annual and multi-annual CEF calls for proposals (see last paragraph of the Section 3 in Part I of the Targeted stakeholder consultation document). On the other hand, projects aiming to develop the maturity of candidate ATM functionalities for Common projects could also be supported under the CEF instrument.
E3	Finance	published	27 January 2014	How has the PCP to be taken into account when building the Perf. Plans. How to include PCP funding if the PCP is not adopted until after RP2 consultation?	The PRB proposal for target setting in the second reference period has duly taken into account the possible contribution of SES deployment. From the Commission point of view, the PCP should be taken into account in the performance plans as if it is going to adopted with AF 1-4 binding and AF 5-6 as binding orientations
E4	Finance	published	27 January 2014	What will be the impact on Perf. Plans for RP2 if AFs today indicated as binding orientations become mature within RP2?	The major part of the implementation of AF 5 and 6 would happen after the end of RP2. For some very initial deployment of these functionalities, the Commission is of the opinion that AF 5 and 6 can be accommodated within the plans in force at that time.
E5	Finance	published	27 January 2014	Is the funding also available to MIL Authorities?	Projects supporting any of the PCP/AFs can be presented also by National Military authorities (Member States), hence grants may be awarded to them provided a grant agreement has been signed in accordance with the established requirements.
E6	Finance	published	27 January 2014	More details required on the methodology on how to apply for fundings and on criteria for eligibility	This information will be available in due time once CEF work programme is published, followed by the calls for proposals published by the INEA agency, which will contain all the detailed information on the subject.
E7	Finance	published	31 January 2014	How to ensure that smaller (private) and less financially healthy aerodromes not subject to RP2 implement CPs in the absence of incentives and penalties. There is not a level market across the EU with regard to aerodromes, with some wholly or partly state owned and many others in private hands.	Any stakeholder in the scope of the PCP may be eligible for funding. For detailed conditions, see answer to question E.6.
E8	Finance	published	27 January 2014	What for companies/stakeholders not eligible to EU fundings (e.g. Norway, Oslo airport, in applicability area of AF2).	Stakeholders outside the EU may be eligible for funding. The CEF Regulation (now adopted: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOhtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:348:SOM:EN:HTML) provides that non-EU countries and entities established in them are able to accede to the public funding as far as their participation in an implementation project is indispensable (section 6 of the consultation paper and Articles 8(3), 9(4) and 16 of the CEF Regulation).
E9	Finance	published	10 February 2014	The whole incentives framework is not clear.	The incentives immediately ready for the implementation of the PCP will be grants under the CEF. For details see the answer to the question 6 and section 8 of the consultation paper.
E10	Finance	published	31 January 2014	Could you please advise us as to where the military costs within Appendix IIII were obtained?	In setting up its proposal for the PCP, the SESAR Joint Undertaking sought Military expertise through the EDA, CMAC (Eurocontrol), and National experts. The estimated military costs related to the proposed PCP and considered within the consultation material are the result of that work and are acknowledged as our estimate based on basic assumptions requiring further refinement "with contribution by each stakeholder". The most recent assessment produced by the EDA and published together with the consultation, have not yet been incorporated within the final proposal of CBA. This estimation is being yet further refined by EDA with the contribution of its Member States.

E11	Finance	published	31 January 2014	NSA requirements within the PCP whilst the RP2 assessments are ongoing and before the Deployment Manager is in place. Page 39 Para 5.4 How can it run in parallel, when the PCP is unlikely to be in force until after RP2 is complete and well before the DM	Please see the answer to question E3.
E12	Finance	published	10 February 2014	How will the Military and Aerodromes who are outside the performance scheme be incentivised	Please see the answer to questions E7 and E5.
E13	Finance	published	31 January 2014	How will states outside of the EU28 be incentivised if they are not eligible for EU funding? Not so much of a problem with PCP but as the scope is widened, this will be a problem	Please see the answer to question E8.
E14	Finance	published	31 January 2014	Will there be a possibility for the "binding orientations" of the PCP to get CEF funding (from the EUR 3 billion earmarked for SESAR deployment)?	Please see the answer to question E1.
E15	Finance	published	17 February 2014	The SESAR R&D process is only now apportioning the SESAR benefit goals to the various operational research focus areas. For step 1, it is not clear that the SESAR validation exercises will combine to demonstrate achieve of the overall aims. Consequently, should there be more clarity on how the benefits reported in section3 of the document have been validated?	Validations were made based on the information available to the Commission, mainly the costs-benefits analysis performed by the SJU. The validation of the benefits is part of the ongoing consultation for which we expect feedback from stakeholders in case there would be correction needed based on more accurate information at their disposal
E16	Finance	published	10 February 2014	Are all PCP Implementing Projects getting funds automatically? Or only in case of a negative CBA?	All Implementation Projects deploying PCP are eligible for funding under Framework Partnership Agreement.
E17	Finance	published	10 February 2014	Are activities following 'binding orientations' for the implementation of AF5 and AF6 eligible for any kind of funding?	Please see the answer to question E1.
E18	Finance	published	10 February 2014	How should investments related with the implementation of AF5 and AF6 be dealt with along the FAB(National) Performance Plans?	Please see the answer to question E3.
E19	Finance	published	10 February 2014	Can it be assumed that projects derived from the binding orientations will become part of a 2nd or 3rd Common Project, and that funds will be made available as well?	AF5 and AF6 could become Common Projects (either through a review of the PCP IR or through future Commn Projects) and will then be subject to the same funding rules as for all Common Projects