

**Question for written answer E-013361/2013
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Dominique Riquet (PPE)

Subject: Implementation of the European Air Traffic Management Master Plan and the role of EASA

In its communication 'Better governance for the single market' adopted on 8 June 2012, the Commission highlighted the importance of the transport sector. In order to improve collective air navigation infrastructure, the Commission adopted a text on 'the definition of common projects, the establishment of governance and the identification of incentives supporting the implementation of the European Air Traffic Management Master Plan', hereinafter the 'ATM Master Plan' (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 409/2013 of 3 May 2013).

Upon first analysis, the development model for the European air network incorporates all the basic features of the rail model and an even greater level of integration. In contrast with the 'good coordination between the infrastructure manager and the users of the network which are affected by his decisions' proposed for the railway sector (proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area, as regards the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail and the governance of the railway infrastructure), a single entity is charged with rolling out the ATM Master Plan.

1. The European Railway Agency (ERA) is responsible for coordinating matters relating to the safety and interoperability of the railway network. Yet the role of the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) as regards the deployment of air infrastructure is limited to 'safety aspects'. What is the reason for this difference of approach?
2. The Commission has emphasised that the industry should share some of the responsibility for rolling out the ATM Master Plan (the term 'industry' in this context refers to all entities providing services, from air control service providers through to manufacturers of technical systems). Yet the entity managing this roll-out will effectively be both involved in providing services and responsible for overall coordination. How can this potential conflict of interest be managed? How can it be ensured that 'technical' decisions guarantee fair access to infrastructure? Is the Commission planning to place EASA in the role of an independent technical expert monitoring the activities of the entity managing the roll-out, as is the case for ERA?