



Single European Sky

Mandate Workshop

Impact of the draft Regulation on a common charging scheme

4 September 2006

=====
CONCLUSIONS
=====

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

0. The Chairman (Mr B. Van Houtte, European Commission), welcomed participants (list is at [Annex 1](#)) and made the following opening remarks:
- The Workshop occurred at the final stage of the process that will lead to the adoption of the Single European Sky's "*Common Charging Scheme for Air Navigation Services*";
 - the impact analysis commissioned to EUROCONTROL, whilst being rather unusual (this kind of work is usually carried out only for high-level rules), had been deemed necessary in the present case and the results would indeed be useful and important for the finalisation of the text by the European Commission before the formal opinion by the Single Sky Committee;
 - the schedule was demanding and stakeholders were thanked for having accepted to participate in this impact analysis during the summer period, and within a very tight time frame;
 - the purpose of the Workshop was to review the impact analysis carried out by EUROCONTROL / CRCO and to verify that the conclusions gave a fair and exhaustive representation of the views expressed by the stakeholders. Any additional view, any correction to the synthesis drafted by the CRCO would be welcomed and duly taken into account;
 - the adoption of the Common Charging Scheme for Air Navigation Services, normally in September or October 2006, would not mark the end of the ANS charges subject within the Single European Sky. The issue would continue being monitored closely as a "work in progress". The implementation of the adopted text would be carefully monitored, lessons would be learned from experience, and a thorough review would be carried out in due course of implementation in order to decide possible improvements to the text.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

1. The CRCO presented the salient elements of its analysis with the support of a series of slides.
2. The purpose of the analysis was to evaluate the financial impact of the introduction of harmonised Terminal Navigation Charges (TNC) calculated with a common formula: $((\text{MTOW}/50)^{0.7} \times \text{Unit Rate of Charge})$
3. The conclusions were that:
 - **System wide**, the introduction of the SES regulation on terminal charges would determine a reallocation of costs between en route and terminal with a moderate increase of the TNC. The introduction of a harmonised formula with a weight coefficient of 0.7 slightly favoured smaller aircrafts. The combination of these two factors, and the traffic pattern analysed, gave the following results expressed by *weight brackets*:
 - Aircraft below 50 metric tons would still pay more ANS charges, even with a TNC formula in their favour
 - Aircraft above 50 metric tons would pay less ANS charges as en-route would no longer subsidise TNC
 - **European scheduled** carriers would be affected negatively by the latter conclusion (AEA+ERA: +0.4%, with a particular impact on ERAA: +5.2%), the increase being caused by the reallocation of costs from en route to TNC.
 - **European Business Aviation** would see their overall level of charges decrease as they would benefit both, for route charges from the absence of cross-subsidies, and for TNC by the new formula (Impact of aircraft weight was stronger than the impact of reallocation of costs from route to TNC).
 - **Low Fare Airlines** would almost not be affected by the introduction of the new formula.
 - **IATA and IACA Members** would not be affected.
4. The conclusions were drawn system wide and therefore did not look into each State individually, where significant variations may exist, as indicated in the detailed tables.

During the discussion the following clarifications were sought:

- a. The study was based on a number of assumptions. Had a sensitivity analysis been carried out to test the robustness of the conclusions?

The CRCO explained that changes in the assumptions may only produce more important effects (such as higher increases of the TNC), but would probably not reverse the conclusions.

- b. Has the study taken into consideration the possible change of airlines' behaviour?

The CRCO explained that this had not been the case. The study focused on the mechanical impact of the implementation of the harmonised Terminal Navigation Charges (TNC) calculated with a common formula.

c. Possible changes in the exemptions of military flights:

To answer the concern expressed by several military participants, the UK confirmed that no State expressed an intention during the SSC meetings to modify their current arrangements.

d. Is there any analysis of the reasons for the difference of impact between ERA (+5.2% of ANS charges paid, of which +18.94% of TNC) and EBAA (-2.1% of ANS charges paid, of which -8.15% of TNC), when they both used rather light aircraft for a majority of short-haul flights?

The CRCO explained that this was due to different patterns of routes, schedules and frequencies (in particular airports used).

QUALITATIVE SURVEY

5. For a more efficient discussion, the questions contained in the questionnaire were grouped by themes where relevant.

Questions 1 and 2: Principles contained in the text (a common charging scheme for all phases of flight, eligible costs and rules for their calculation and allocation, rules for the calculation of unit rates) / Eligible services, facilities and activities.

- 5.1 Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 10 to 15 of the presentation.

- 5.2 Additional contributions:

- 5.3 Some participants (mainly from user organisations) asked questions about the validity and robustness of the conclusions drawn by the CRCO, as not all stakeholders had replied. There seemed to be issues where the evaluation grid did not seem to match fully with the conclusions drawn. The CRCO replied that the conclusions were taking into account not only the replies to the questionnaire but also the additional contributions collected through bilateral meetings or separate written contributions. The European Commission added that the purpose of the Workshop was precisely to verify that the conclusions drawn from the study were accurate and gave a fair and exhaustive representation of the views of all the stakeholders. Any additional opinion would be welcome.

- 5.4 A majority of participants in the workshop agreed with the CRCO's and the Chairman's assessment that stakeholders felt that the proposed text of Common ANS Charging scheme is a "prudent enhancement". This was in line with the European Commission's indication that the proposal was only a first step in the right direction, to be reviewed and enhanced in the light of experience.

States and ANSPs generally agreed that the proposed text was a modest step in the right direction, providing a degree of flexibility which would bring additional transparency of costs and cost allocation; and would allow some interesting innovations such as incentive schemes.

A minority of States/ANSPs however wondered about the interest of implementing a new system, which was likely to generate additional costs, when there were doubts about its added value.

User organisations (and in particular IATA) were in general doubtful and expressed the view that globally, the text proposed made very little change as compared to the present situation.

- 5.5 ANSPs, and user organisations referred to the comments collected in slide 15 ("risk of cost increases", "no parameters to ensure cost-effectiveness") and expressed their concern as regards the possible additional costs (and in particular the administrative costs) generated by the implementation of the system (e.g. costs of consultation, auditing, creation and operation of Charging Zones, etc.). They noted that, apart from the costs foreseen for the setting up of NSAs, no evaluation of these potential additional costs had been made. The CRCO made it clear that its quantitative study was based on the present cost bases as communicated by States. The European

Commission reminded participants that a 2004 study had led to the conclusion that the global costs of implementing the SES would be of about 30 million Euros per year for the whole industry. It also took good note of the message that major efforts should be made in the implementation phase to keep costs (and in particular regulatory costs) down.

- 5.6 Going back to the often expressed opinion that the proposed scheme brought little change to the present system and lacked ambition, the CRCO recalled that this scheme was fairly generic and that the impact would greatly depend on the detailed implementation texts adopted at a later stage (e.g. incentive schemes). For this reason, a number of stakeholders having replied to the questionnaire were at this stage still not able to ascertain whether, in their view, the impact would be positive or negative. The European Commission confirmed that it was taking due note of this rather lukewarm reception. It reiterated its opinion that the new text should be perceived as a framework providing opportunities for enhancements, and that a thorough review after two years of implementation would certainly allow to take corrective actions where needed and to envisage going further.
- 5.7 An exchange of views took place between participants to determine whether the parameters of “transparency / common application” could be prioritised vs. “cost efficiency”. The European Commission confirmed that no prioritisation had been made, all parameters being considered relevant. The EC’s difficult task was to obtain a satisfactory balance between the different parameters that would allow a maximum of stakeholders to be satisfied with the proposals. It also made the remark that stakeholders had different expectations and therefore their own prioritisations. User organisation reiterated their opinion that the lack of incentives for cost-efficiencies was one of the major weak points of the text. ANSPs expressed the view that transparency was important only in monopoly situations. UK wished to add that, in its case, it was precisely moving away from this monopoly situation. It would have therefore favoured an emphasis on the incentives for cost-efficiencies rather than on transparency, which went against fair and equal competition. A UK airports representative stated that the proposed text would represent an important step backward for UK airports, hampering all efforts to use market mechanisms to organise and provide airport services. France, on the other hand, supported the search for transparency and for a common application as the main pillars of the text. It added that, in its view, it should be recognized that there is no competition for the provision of an en route ANS and, for the majority in Europe, there is no competition at the airport level. Along this line, the CRCO referred to slide 33 where a large number of stakeholders had expressed “*little confidence in contestability test, no real competition*”.

The two differing opinions were acknowledged and duly noted by the European Commission.

Question 3: Incentive schemes.

- 6. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 16 to 20 of the presentation.
- 6.1 The Workshop agreed that the CRCO's synthesis of comments globally gave a fair view of the stakeholders' opinion.
- 6.2 Additional contributions:
- 6.3 UK wished to declare that, in its view, the possibility for States and ANSPs to set up incentive schemes was the most positive element contained in the EC's text.

Question 4, 5, 6 and 7: Cross-subsidies / Common formula for TNC / Transitional period for applying the common formula for TNC / Criteria for not applying the common formula for TNC.

- 7. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 21 to 33 of the presentation.
- 7.1 The Workshop agreed that the CRCO's synthesis of comments globally gave a fair view of the stakeholders' opinion.
- 7.2 Additional contributions:
- 7.3 A majority of participants agreed that the proposal would improve the transparency / comparability of TNC and would also improve the allocation of costs between terminal and en route services (as shown by the quantitative analysis). This was a much welcomed element of the EC's text.
- 7.4 Airport representatives drew attention to the close relation existing, in their view, between the terminal and the airport segment of flights. They mentioned the strong environmental pressure on airports and believed that this environmental element should also be considered for the terminal phase of flights.
- 7.5 Some ANSP representatives reiterated their position that transparency was going against competition and, for this reason, repeated their disagreement with the comment expressed in slide 30 ("*transparency is the base for competition*").
- 7.6 One ANSP representative sought clarification on what kind of cross-subsidies would be allowed by the new text. In his view, they would be possible between terminal and airport phases, and between different airports (creation of groups of airports), but they would remain impossible between en route and terminal as was already the case in EUROCONTROL's multilateral system.

The European Commission explained that Article 15.2(d) of the Service Provision Regulation, provided that cross subsidies would be possible between different air navigation services, "*only when justified for objective reasons, and subject to clear identification*". The European Commission however recorded that this was not welcomed by several stakeholders and agreed to convey the matter at Single Sky Committee level.

Questions 8 and 9: Principles governing the Charging Zones / Extension of Charging Zones (from ground to upper airspace / possibility to establish specific zones for complex terminal areas).

8. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 34 to 39 of the presentation.
- 8.1 The Workshop agreed that the CRCO's synthesis of comments globally gave a fair view of the stakeholders' opinion.
- 8.2 Additional contribution:
- 8.3 UK wished to express its full support to the last version of the text, making it possible to have several charging zones and therefore several unit rates in a FAB, and to create Charging Zones for "complex terminal areas". The initial principle of a single unit rate per FAB would certainly have been a deterrent for the creation of operationally sound FABs.
- 8.4 The European Commission took due note, while recording that other stakeholders had a different opinion, as outlined in the CRCO's synthesis.

Questions 10, 11 and 12: Exemption categories / Exemptions granted to VFR flights / Enforced recovery of charges due.

9. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 40 to 48 of the presentation.
- 9.1 Additional contributions:
- 9.2 Military representatives reiterated their concern against the possible revision of current arrangements regarding the exemption of military flights.
- 9.3 USAF representatives made a formal statement (see at [Annex 2](#)).
- 9.4 The European Commission reassured the USAF representatives that it was maintaining close contacts with all States on the issue of US military flights and expected that there would be no change to the current arrangements. This was also true for the other military flights. The European Commission assured that the impact of the text on military users would be notional and that dialogue between EC and military users would continue until all concerns are alleviated.

Questions 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17: Transparency / Introduction of International Accounting Standards / Consultation / Appeal procedures / Inspections and surveys.

10. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 50 to 63 of the presentation.
- 10.1 The Workshop agreed that the CRCO's synthesis of comments globally gave a fair view of the stakeholders' opinion.

10.2 Additional contribution:

- 10.3 The European Commission confirmed that it had duly noted the concern expressed by several States on the issue of the creation of their NSAs. He confirmed that the European Commission would assist the States in carrying out this task.

<p><u>Question 18:</u> Overall assessment.</p>
--

11. Conclusions drawn by the CRCO: see slides 64 to 67 of the presentation.

- 11.1 The Workshop agreed that the CRCO's synthesis of comments globally gave a fair view of the stakeholders' opinions.

11.2 Additional contributions:

- 11.3 A number of comments made under Questions 1 and 2 were reiterated (Transparency vs. competition, "prudent enhancement").

- 11.4 Some participants remarked that on several issues the CRCO's questions were drafted in an unclear manner, which did not allow to fully express an opinion. However they admitted that the general conclusions gave a globally fair view of the stakeholders' opinions.

- 11.5 France and CANSO noted that the view expressed that the charging regime should be split in 3 parts (en route, terminal and local) (see slide 67), only emanated from one stakeholder (IFATCA). IFATCA suggested to read the complete text of the proposal.

- 11.6 IATA insisted that the replies from the stakeholders should be weighted to give a fair view of the opinion of the industry as a whole, as not all stakeholders had the same interests on the issues.

- 11.7 ANSPs accepted to support the text as a starting point, to be further improved in the light of experience. They also drew particular attention to the tax issue, which was creating serious problem to a number of ANSPs. They hoped that the matter would be addressed as a matter of priority by the EC at European level in order to find a suitable and long-term solution.

- 11.8 The CRCO, representing the EUROCONTROL Agency, made a formal statement (see at Annex 3).

- 11.9 IATA reiterated that the text as proposed provided little added value to the airspace users as compared to the present system, and was in particular very weak on providing incentives for States'/ANSPs' cost-effectiveness. This was particularly disappointing for the airlines, which were financing the system and submitted on their side to fierce competition.

- 11.10 The European Commission confirmed that it would make the best use of the opinions expressed and reiterated that the text should be perceived as a first step in the right direction and as a "work in progress". It was hoping that a fruitful dialogue would continue with all the stakeholders.

CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING REMARKS

12. The Chairman thanked all participants for their active and constructive participation.
13. He explained that the European Commission had taken due note of all the additional comments expressed and would make the best use of them to finalise the text that would be submitted for the Single Sky Committee's consideration on 29 September 2006.
14. He confirmed that all EU Member States were invited to express their formal opinion on the text at the 29 September meeting of the SSC. If further work was deemed to be necessary, the final decision on the text may be postponed to the SSC meeting of 26 October 2006.

ANNEX 1

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	FUNCTION	ORGANISATION
AMENDOLA	Nicola	International Relations Manager	ENAV, Italy
ANTÓNIO	Maria da Luz	Head of Competition, Prices and Consumer Protection	INAC, Portugal
ARRIAGA	Paloma	Support to the Spanish MET NSA	SENASA
ARSHARD	Naheed	Consultant	Helios Technology Ltd.
BASU	Snehangshu	Head of Treasury & Accounts	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R5
BATTISTELLA	Guy	Director Finance	IACA
BOSKOVA	Michaela	MSc. / Senior Official	MoT, Czech Republic
BOUROUIS	Yasmina	Administrator	EC - DG Energy and Transport
CACHIA	Joseph	Assistant Director (Finance & Administration)	CAD, Malta
CALVO LUCAS	Leandro	Aeronautical technical engineer	DGCA, Spain
CAUWENBERGH	Patricia	Research Economist	EUROCONTROL/EEC
CONDIE	Stuart	Planning Director	BAA
CORNILLIE	Jan	Director	Ministry of Mobility, Belgium
DE CLIPPEL	Maurits	Director	CAA, Belgium
DESSEAUX	Marie	Director European Affairs	CANSO
DETTWILLER	Emmanuel	Head of Customer Relations Section	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R3
DOHERTY	Kevin	Associate General Counsel	US Air Force
DE VOS	Koen	Administrator	EC - DG Energy and Transport
DE WEERDT	Sylvain	EU Lobbyist	Flemish Aerospace Group
DUMITRACHE	Mihai Bogdan	Economist, Charges Department	ROMATSA, Romania
DUMITRESCU	Liliana Alexandra	Economist	ROMATSA, Romania
DURUKAN	Özcan	Air Traffic Controller	DHMI, Turkey
EGERER	Julia	Manager Trade & Social Affairs	AEA
ENRIQUEZ	Santiago	Support to the Spanish MET NSA	SENASA
FARTEK	Gilles	Officer	European Commission
FELTEN	Marcel	Vice President	European Air Sports
FERNANDEZ-ALMIÑANA	Manuel	ANS Advisor	Isdefe, Spain
FERREIRÓS	Carmen	Economic Management Division	AENA, Spain
FISCHER	Jens	Expert - Office of the Director CRCO	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/OF
FLOOD	Donal	Manager, Insurance and Route Charges	Irish Aviation Authority
FOSS	Morten	Senior Adviser	MoT & Communications, Norway
FUSCO	Massimo	Director CRCO	EUROCONTROL/CRCO
GHINCEA	Stefan	Economist	CAA, Romania

GODFREY	Ann	Head Aviation Airspace Division	Department for Transport, UK
HOFMANN	Roger	Project Manager	FOCA, Switzerland
HUBIJAR	Alvid	Senior Adviser for Route Charges	DGCA, Bosnia and Herzegovina
HUET	François	Expert - SECRETARY	EUROCONTROL/DGS/LSEC
HUMPHRIES	Brian	CEO	EBAA
JAKUBOVSKIS	Edgars	Chief of Legal Division	LGS, Latvia
JAMES	Steve	General Manager European Development	NATS, UK
JAUNTEVA	Vaira	Deputy Chief of Finance Department	LGS, Latvia
KELLY	Lawrence	Head of Billing Section, CRCO	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R3
KOBIAK	Nadezda	Senior Economist	Oro Navigacija, Lithuania
KRAPEŽ	Alojz	Head of ANS Department	Directorate Civil Aviation, Slovenia
KRUSZKA	Barbara Maria	Specialist	Polish Airports
LACHAUD	Anthony	Assistant	EUROCONTROL/DGS/LSEC
LÄHTEENMÄKI-RIISTAMA	Kirsi	Legal Adviser	CAA, Finland
LETREGUILLY	Eric	Head of System/Business Development	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R1
LOCHANSKI	Nicolas	Head of Charges office	DSNA, France
LÖNNBERG	Lars	Representative for NAVIAIR & LFV Sweden	NAVIAIR & LFV Sweden
MARTIS	Günther	General Manager Technical & Operations	AEA
MARTÍNEZ CASTAÑO	Jorge Manuel	Aeronautical technical engineer	DGCA, Spain
MAUDAL	Oddvar	Director International Relations	AVINOR, Norway
Mc DERMOTT	Una	Air Navigation Services Division	Department for Transport, Ireland
METRAK	Katarzyna	Head of Office	Civil Aviation Office, Poland
METZLER	Ulrich	Major	Bundeswehr, Germany
MÖLLER	Thomas	Head of User Charges	DFS, Germany
MONGIOI'	Giuseppe	Lt Colonel	Air Force Staff, Italy
MORENSKI	Kathleen	Transport Officer	US Mission to the EU
MOTLEY	Nicola	Charging and Economic Adviser	NATS, UK
NEERING	Paul	Liaison Officer European Union	IFATCA
NORTON	Peter	CEO	British Helicopter Advisory Board
OGRIZEK	Ziga	International Cooperation	Slovenia Control
O'NEILL	Patricia	Legal Expert	EUROCONTROL/DGS/JUR
O'TOOLE	Laurie	Assistant Director Airport & ATC Charges	IATA
PANA	Mariana		ROMATSA, Romania
PETERS	Rob	Lt Colonel - Staff Officer CNS/ATM	NATO HQ
PITTON	Edouard	Corporate Secretariat	Skyguide, Switzerland

PLANT	Alex	Head of Economic Policy & International Aviation	CAA, UK
RIEHL	Frédéric	Project Manager / Senior Economist	EUROCONTROL/DAS/AEM
RIES	Jeff	Air Traffic Controller	Aéroport de Luxembourg
RIIBER	Anders	Head of Staff	AVINOR, Norway
RIVAS VILA	Manuel	SES Programme Office - Certification	AENA, Spain
ROLVINK	Bert	Policy Advisor	Air Traffic Control Netherlands
SALVATI	Claudio	Responsible Budget and Audit	ENAV, Italy
SAMYN	Patrizia	Assistant	EUROCONTROL/DGS/LSEC
SCHALIN	Minna	Head of Air Traffic Charges Unit	FINAVIA, Finland
SCHEEL	Wolfgang	Senior Manager Aviation Charges	Deutsche Lufthansa
SCHNEIDER	Georg	Operations & Development of the System	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R1
SCHUEGRAF	Rudolf	Programme Manager	Europe Air Sports
SIGLEY	Glenn	US DoD - Liaison to the FAA	US Federal Aviation Administration
SOEHNLE	Eberhard	Head of Economic & Regulatory Affairs	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/ERA
SONDIJ	Jan	Account Manager Aviation KNMI	KNMI, Netherlands
SILOVIC	Goran	Advisor to the Director General	CAD, Serbia
SOYER	Jean-Paul	Head of Unit – MANDATE MANAGER	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R3
STOIAN	Valentin	Head of NOTAM Office	CAA, Romania
STUTZ	Claudia	Deputy Director Air Navigation Services Division	BMVBS, Germany
TORSELLO	Vittorio	Economic and International Relations	ENAV, Italy
TRYGG	Urban	Financial Manager	LFV Group/ANS, Sweden
VAN HOUTTE	Bernard	Head of ATM Unit - CHAIRMAN	EC - DG Energy and Transport
VARLOUD	Philippe	Head of IT Unit	EUROCONTROL/CRCO/R2
VERSCHUEREN	Raoul	Director General Finance	Belgocontrol
VICENTE AZUA	Pedro	Manager European Affairs	EBAA
WAIN	Stuart	Wing Commander - Staff Officer ASM	NATO HQ
ZVEGUINZOFF	Nicolas	Consultant in Aeronautics, ATM & Airport Management	Ad' Missions

Formal statement by US Air Force representatives

The draft regulation is attractive from several perspectives. As you know, we have expressed concern in the past over language in the draft regulation that appears to suggest that States may charge military or state aircraft for air navigation services. DOD is concerned that collection of fees and charges for military aircraft may impact both flight operations and the way aircraft are controlled in this region. Military aircraft may become more reliant upon OAT controllers or fly “due regard” routes as a means to avoid ANS charges, thus potentially degrading the Single European Sky concept and the safety and efficiency enhancements that are the goal of the SES. Moreover, flying under OAT control or “due regard” will not be as efficient for the military aircraft, and would result in a misallocation of scarce NATO nations’ defence funds.

Formal statement by the EUROCONTROL Agency

The (qualitative) overall assessment of the draft Regulation by the Agency/CRCO may be summarized as follows:

1. The draft Regulation is consistent with the EUROCONTROL route charges system and introduces some novelties and enhancements. It does not alter the rights and obligations on the States signatory of the Multilateral Agreement for route charges and the Revised Convention.
2. The draft Regulation defines high-level rules and creates "windows of opportunity".
3. When transposing the new elements of the Regulation into the EUROCONTROL legal framework, the provisions relating to en route charges ("Principles" etc.) will have to go into more detail.
4. The resulting requirements in terms of cost-relatedness, transparency, information disclosure and user consultation in particular and the setting of common rules for terminal navigation charges tend to create a level playing field between airspace users and ANSPs. Equity between airspace users will increase through the foreseen reinforcement of recovery measures.
5. These requirements also facilitate performance measurement, benchmarking, setting of performance objectives and may, in the future, promote cost-effectiveness of air navigation service provision.
6. Economies of scale generated by the implementation of large FABs and the provision of financial incentives to ANSPs will further enhance cost-effectiveness. States/ANSPs will however have to make use of these possibilities.
7. The opt-out clause concerning air navigation services provided at smaller airports, the option of setting a common unit rate for a group of airports and the possibility of cross-subsidy between different air navigation services constitute "weaker points" of the draft Regulation, however, as these provisions do not fully support the objectives of transparency, cost-reflectivity and non-discrimination among airspace users, respectively.

Conclusion: The draft Regulation preserves the existing EUROCONTROL route charges system and introduces some new features concerning the collection of charges for the provision of en route and terminal navigation services. States and air navigation service providers should progressively make use of the opportunities offered by the Regulation with a view to reaching the objectives of the SES Service provision regulation, in particular the safe, efficient and effective provision of air navigation services.