

**COMMISSION WORKING DOCUMENT - CONSULTATION ON THE FUTURE
TRANS-EUROPEAN TRANSPORT NETWORK POLICY**

NATS RESPONSE

Q1	Are the principles and criteria for designing the core network, as set out above, adequate and practicable? What are their strengths and weaknesses, and what else could be taken into account?
A	<p>Yes - NATS is fully supportive of the principle of a "core network" and it is our belief that SESAR closely meets the aspirations as laid out for the core network, especially insofar as it aims to improve the integration of the current systems into a more coherent network. The achievement of this would go some way to meet a number of the aspirations as laid out in the Europe 2020 Strategy, in particular around growth and climate/energy targets.</p> <p>In terms of other criteria, it is NATS' belief that greater consideration should be given to develop a core network that builds upon interconnectivity across main nodes (e.g. interconnectivity across rail & airports). The achievement of this would go some way to further enabling the achievement of the Europe 2020 Strategy.</p>
Q2	To what extent do the supplementary infrastructure measures contribute to the objectives of a future-oriented transport system, and are there ways to strengthen their contribution?
A	Greater emphasis could be given to intelligent transport systems that utilise Collaborative Decision Making to increase efficiency of multi-modal transport systems (such as impact of road & rails delays / congestion on airport systems). Cross-border sharing of information would enhance the efficiency of the Air Traffic Management thread.
Q3	What specific role could TEN-T planning in general play in boosting the transport sector's contribution to the "Europe 2020" strategic objectives?
A	NATS believes that an improved coordination of available instruments will, in the long term help to ensure that scarce EU funds are directed at the key priorities and, as a result add value. It is our belief that TEN-T should also be directed towards other projects which provide supporting infrastructure upon which the "Europe 2020 strategy" will hang. From an ATM perspective it is our belief that the SESAR project is a prime example of this.
Q4	In which way can the different sources of EU expenditure be better coordinated and/or combined in order to accelerate the delivery of TEN-T projects and policy objectives?
A	NATS supports the principles of improved coordination of the various funding instruments and, whilst we have no specific suggestions on the methods through which this could be achieved, we are of the opinion that better coordination of available instruments is likely to help ensure that scarce EU funds are directed at the key priorities and so add value. We fully agree that EU funds should not 'necessarily be restricted to supporting infrastructure investments only but also projects with a high European added value, such as SESAR' which in itself represents infrastructure for Air Traffic Management.

	Given the increasing demand placed upon TEN-T funding, NATS believes that it is important that all applications for TEN-T funding demonstrate furtherance of the Europe 2020 strategic objectives and that no funding is provided to support applications that do not do so.
Q5	How can an EU funding strategy coordinate and/or combine the different sources of EU and national funding and public and private financing?
A	No comment – NATS are not competent in this field to provide a response to this question.
Q6	Would the setting up of a European funding framework adequately address the implementation gap in the completion of TEN-T projects and policy objectives?
A	. No comment – NATS are not competent in this field to provide a response to this question.
Q7	In which way can the TEN-T policy benefit from the new legal instruments and provisions as set out above?
A	No comment – NATS are not competent in this field to provide a response to this question.