**Response to questions from the Tweede Kamer / SES / Arno Klare, Member of the German Bundestag**

1. The SES is without a doubt one of the key projects in European aviation policy. Direct routing is at the heart of the SES. In German airspace, the delta between the direct route and the actual route flown was 1.2% in 2015, or 3.8 km per flight. Further optimisation is all but impossible unless, not to put too fine a point on it, we could find a way to abolish all storms. That said, the equivalent figures within FABEC, i.e. Central European airspace (BE, NL, FR, CH, LU and DE), are still 3.36% and 15 km respectively. These are nonetheless good figures when compared with all FABs in Europe.
2. The SES has a key role to play in meeting climate targets. Suboptimal routing has a direct impact on greenhouse gas emissions. From a climate-policy perspective, it is therefore important to continue to advance the SES. It is questionable, however, whether the difference between the optimal direct route and the actual route flown can be brought below 1%. In addition, there are conflicting priorities regarding, for example, low-noise routing and direct routing, with low-noise routing winning out in case of doubt in order to maintain public acceptance of airports.
3. It is important to ensure optimal links at EU level between the air traffic management systems. The creation of the FABs was an important first step. Structural obstacles and factors stand in the way of a single, integrated EU air traffic management system. For example, DFS is a limited liability company under private law and as such naturally has to act in accordance with commercial law, while the French air navigation service provider is a traditional public authority. The following fundamental questions have always been considered in the context of the SES but never really fleshed out: should the ultimate goal be a pan-European air traffic management system, merging all of the national entities previously responsible for this? And: what legal form would such a supranational system have?
4. It seems clear that an integrated supranational air traffic management system would optimally implement the idea of the SES. That said, there are grounds for scepticism about whether this would allow the extra costs, currently estimated at 5 billion euros, to be eliminated entirely, and the costs associated with air navigation services – 10.5 billion euros – to be dramatically reduced. Even so, significant financial benefits are certainly possible.
5. There are no fears at DFS regarding potential job losses, and the attitude towards closer links is positive. DFS is not overstaffed, meaning that all jobs there would be needed even in an integrated system. The core of the issue is a more fundamental matter. The principle that each state has sovereignty over its airspace, enshrined in Article 1 of the ICAO Convention, would be called into question by a complete supranational integration of EU airspace. There is scepticism about this – usually subliminal, but very much present – at national level. As allaying this scepticism will be no easy task, the following key question should be addressed with sensitivity: which tasks should be situated and carried out at EU level and what remains a subsidiary obligation for the Member States?
6. DFS informs me that military-civil collaboration is relatively optimal in Germany.
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