

Events

Design Survey

Collect Responses

Analyze Results

View Summary

Default Report ▾

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Displaying 57 of 60 respondents

Response Type:
Normal ResponseCollector:
Web Link
(Web Link)Custom Value:
emptyIP Address:
195.27.17.3Response Started:
Tuesday, August 6, 2013 11:47:27 AMResponse Modified:
Tuesday, August 6, 2013 11:53:12 AM

1. Name:

2. Organisation (if applicable):

NATS

3. Email address:

4. Address:

5. In responding, it would be helpful if you could indicate whether you are responding as

a business or business representative body

6. Keeping in touch

Please keep me informed by email of the progress of this review, and other BIS Balance of Competence reviews

1. 1. Where has EU action had a positive impact for the UK on research, technological development, innovation or space? What evidence is there for this? Has EU action encouraged national action in any areas?

Action at an EU level works very well for major initiatives that have Pan-European reach. The European Geostationary Navigation Overlay Service (EGNOS) is a good example of this, as it is likely that if left to a national level, this project would never have happened. Further examples of a positive impact are: • SESAR, Episode 3, TEN-T, Framework programmes, etc. • Functional Airspace Blocks – e.g. UK-Ireland FAB High Level Sectors • European Space Agency – EGNOS enabling non precision approaches and Required Navigation Performance (RNP) • European Space Agency – IRIS Inmarsat Precursor project

2. 2. Where has EU action had a negative impact for the UK in these fields? What evidence is there for this? Has EU action prevented potentially useful national action in any areas?

EU projects are typically collaborative and thus can be subject to compromises and delays which may not affect more tightly focused national projects. The compromises required for large scale collaborative projects may reduce individual levels of innovation in some cases and potentially prevents UK companies from fully exploiting the IPR that would otherwise create market differentiation in a truly competitive environment.

3. 3. How and where has UK engagement with partner countries or international bodies, both within and outside the EU, been helped or hindered by EU involvement?

It is recognised that the Programmes listed in response to question 1 have promoted international R&D collaboration and greatly raised profile of work.

4. 4. What benefits or difficulties has the objective of a European research area (ERA) delivered for the UK?

Some of the research will be done outside of the UK and as a result may then be directed to solve a problem, slightly different to the one we need to solve in the UK.

5. 5. How has the EU sought to coordinate the policy instruments at its disposal across different policy areas to create an enabling environment for researchers and innovators? How successful has this been?

No comment

1. 6. What could the EU most helpfully do to promote scientific and technological progress and innovation (including in the space sector)? - How could the EU use its existing competence differently to deliver more in your area? - How might a greater or lesser degree of EU competence deliver more in your area? - How could improvements to existing EU activities make them more effective and efficient?

1. The EU should be encouraged to have governance related to performance. Effective governance would ensure that, unlike today, if it becomes evident that a piece of work is unlikely to deliver a benefit then a mechanism is in place to ensure that it is stopped or revised as appropriate. 2. NATS recognises that we have gone from almost all of the research being performed locally to almost all of it being performed centrally. Naturally these approaches each have their advantages and disadvantages, perhaps the ideal answer should be somewhere in between the two. The presumption would be for central research except where there is specific local expertise or a specific local issue which is best handled locally. The balance might be something like 80% central to 20% local. 3. There needs to be an increased focus on the work that gives the best outcome, rather than those that are politically driven. This should be achieved through the introduction of more effective governance, focused on delivering performance.

2. 7. Where might future EU level action be detrimental to your work in this area?

Action at EU level contains a risk of research being conducted at the behest of vested interests or political drivers as opposed to purely on the basis of commercial and operational need. It should be recognised that such research may not necessarily be in line with the UK's interests.

3. 8. Where might action at national rather than EU level be more appropriate / effective?

National level activity is more appropriate, potentially more effective and should be encouraged in instances where the problems to be resolved are purely relevant to and are restricted to the UK. To attempt to address such issues at EU level makes little sense and risks a solution that fails to fully solve the problem and possibly does so at a greater level of cost.

4. 9. How could EU and national policies and funding streams interact better?

In general NATS recognises that, through the main funding mechanisms engaged with thus far (ESA, TEN-T, SESAR) the UK Government departments and their focal points seem aligned, able to influence and are supportive. The challenge going forwards is to ensure that these remain suitably close to our business in order to remain able to influence / support us in capturing the funding we want to prioritise. To aid this it would be useful if there were a national plan / agreed position such that our industry was as supported as some of our European ATM/ANS counterparts are (e.g. Italy / ENAV).

5. 10. What impact would any future enlargement of the EU have on this area of competence?

Enlargement dilutes the research and potential product to achieve consensus amongst even more partners. It also adds to the cost though increasingly complex management and decision making process. It is recognised that future enlargement of the EU holds a risk insofar as it introduces a greater range of partners and stakeholders. This in turn dilutes the funding available as it will, out of necessity need to be spread throughout the stakeholders and potentially complicates the decision making process through there being additional partners involved.

6. 11. Are there any other points you wish to make which are not captured above?

No comment

Community: Developers · Facebook · Twitter · LinkedIn · Google+ · YouTube

About Us: Management Team · Board of Directors · Partners · Newsletter · Contact Us · Jobs · Sitemap · Help

Policies: Terms of Use · Privacy Policy · Anti-Spam Policy · Security Statement

Language: English · Español · Português · Deutsch · Nederlands · Français · Pусский · Italiano · Dansk · Svenska · Norsk · Suomi

Copyright © 1999-2013 SurveyMonkey