

Union-wide targets for the second reference period (RP2, 2015-2019) of the Single European Sky Performance Scheme

Objectives of the consultation

The Performance Scheme is a key element of the Single European Sky (SES) initiative. The Scheme sets binding targets on Member States to deliver better air navigation services, leading to cheaper flights, less delays, and the saving of unnecessary costs for airlines and passengers. In addition, the environment impact of air traffic will be reduced due to more efficient and shorter flight paths.

This consultation is part of the process leading to the adoption of Union-wide targets for the second reference period (RP2, 2015-19). The Performance Review Body (PRB) will take the inputs from this written consultation into account when preparing its final report on proposed Union-wide targets for RP2, due in early-September 2013.

The Commission will then use the PRB final report for the preparation of a proposal for a Commission Decision on Union-wide performance targets for RP2 to be adopted by the end of 2013.

It is also important to note that the Commission recently adopted revised performance and charging implementing Regulations. The revised Regulations, which are setting the legal framework for the implementation of the Performance Scheme for RP2, now foresee binding performance targets in all four key performance areas (Safety, Environment, Capacity and Cost-Efficiency) resulting in a 'gate-to-gate' approach covering the entire chain of air navigation services, including terminal services.

Consultation schedule

This written consultation on the proposed Union-wide targets for RP2 takes place between 17 May and 3 July 2013 inclusive. This consultation period is intended to allow maximum possible input from stakeholders.

The PRB has published a consultation document entitled "**Union-wide targets for the second reference period of the Single European Sky Performance Scheme**". All the questions contained in this questionnaire relate to this consultation document.

The PRB's proposals in the consultation document are based on own PRB analysis and inputs received up to the publication date following the public stakeholder workshop that took place on 6 February 2013 in Brussels (details of this event are available on the **PRB website**).

Questions marked with an asterisk * require an answer to be given.

1. Respondent information

1.1. Identification

If you are speaking on behalf of an organisation, note that as part of the European Transparency Initiative, organisations are invited to use the register of interest representatives to provide the European Commission and the public at large with information about their objectives, funding and structures (http://europa.eu/transparency-register/index_en.htm).

If you are a registered organisation, your contribution will be considered as representing the views of your organisation. If your organisation is not registered, your contribution will be considered as an individual contribution. You have the opportunity to register now by clicking on the above link.

1.1.1. I speak on behalf of *

- Myself
- An individual organisation
- An association representing other organisations



1.1.2. Can you please identify which organisation or association you represent? * (maximum 100 characters)



1.1.3. Please indicate if your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission *

- Yes
- No



1.1.4. Please enter your registration number in the Transparency Register and check the validity of your entry via the search function in the Transparency Register.

Please note that invalid entries will by default be regarded as unregistered




1.1.5. Your job title (maximum 100 characters)

1.1.6. Your name and first name* (maximum 100 characters)

1.1.7. Please indicate a contact email address?* (maximum 100 characters)

1.1.8. Please select the stakeholder type?*

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Airport operator | <input type="radio"/> Military | <input type="radio"/> Functional Airspace Block (FAB) – NSA side |
| <input type="radio"/> Airport coordinator | <input type="radio"/> Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP) | <input type="radio"/> Trade union |
| <input type="radio"/> Airline | <input type="radio"/> National Supervisory Authority (NSA) | <input type="radio"/> International organisation |
| <input type="radio"/> Other civil airspace user | <input type="radio"/> Ministry | <input type="radio"/> Other |
| <input type="radio"/> Manufacturing industry | <input type="radio"/> Functional Airspace Block (FAB) – ANSP side | |

 1.1.9. Which other? (maximum 250 characters)

1.2. Confidentiality

Contributions received to this consultation, together with the identity of the contributor, may be published by the Commission, unless the contributor objects to the publication of the personal data on the grounds that such publication would harm his or her legitimate interests. In this case, the publication may be published in an anonymous form.

The contributor may also object to the publication of his contribution, but should be aware that he may later be requested to provide justification in accordance with the exceptions provided under **Regulation 1049/2001** regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/access_documents/index_en.htm).

1.2.1. Do you object the publication of your personal data and/or your contribution? *

- The contribution may be published
- I object to the publication of my personal data (publication in anonymous form)
- I object to the publication of my contribution

2. Key Performance Area Safety

2.1. Approach and methodology

To what extent do you agree that the methodology and evidence provided in the PRB consultation document supports the proposed performance targets in the key performance area of safety? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion



2.2. Please specify what additional evidence you would need. * (maximum 4000 characters)

2.3. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

2.4. Effectiveness of Safety Management (EoSM)

The PRB proposes the following Union-wide target for RP2:

- all NSAs achieve at least EoSM level 3 in all Management Objectives (MOs) and
- all ANSPs achieve EoSM level 4 in all Management Objectives (MOs).

Do you agree that the proposed target for Effectiveness of Safety Management is both sufficiently challenging and achievable by the end of 2019? *

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion



2.5. Please provide an alternative proposal and supporting rationale * (maximum 4000 characters)

2.6. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

2.7. Application of Risk Analysis Tool (RAT) methodology for Risk Severity Classification

The PRB proposes the following Union-wide target for RP2:

- all ANSPs report ATM Ground score using the RAT methodology for severity classification for all reported occurrences (i.e. 100%).
- all NSAs/States report ATM Overall score using the RAT methodology for severity classification for almost all reported occurrences (i.e. 99%).

Do you agree that the proposed target for the application of the RAT methodology for risk severity classification is both sufficiently challenging and achievable by the end of 2019? *

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion



2.8. Please provide an alternative proposal and supporting rationale. * (maximum 4000 characters)

2.9. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

3. Key Performance Area Environment

3.1. Approach and methodology

To what extent do you agree that the methodology and evidence provided in the PRB consultation document supports the proposed performance targets in the key performance area of environment? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion



3.2. Please specify what additional evidence you would need. * (maximum 4000 characters)


3.3. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

3.4. Horizontal flight efficiency of last filed flight plan (KEP)

The PRB proposes that the Union-wide KEP target range for RP2 should be between 4.1% and 4.4%.

Do you agree that the proposed range for the KEP target for RP2 is sufficiently challenging and achievable? *

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion

 3.5. Please propose an alternative target (range) and provide supporting rationale. * (maximum 4000 characters)

3.6. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

3.7. Horizontal flight efficiency of actual trajectory (KEA)

The PRB proposes that the Union-wide KEA target range for RP2 should be between 2.50% and 2.75%.

Do you agree that the proposed range for the KEA target for RP2 is sufficiently challenging and achievable? *

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion

 3.8. Please propose an alternative target (range) and provide supporting rationale. * (maximum 4000 characters)


3.9. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

4. Key Performance Area Capacity

4.1. Approach and methodology The methodology for capacity target setting considers the various aspects of determining, designing and delivering sufficient capacity to meet traffic demand. It also recognizes the influence of external factors on the ability of individual ANSPs to deliver capacity performance, whilst seeking to drive improvements for airspace users.

To what extent do you agree that the methodology and evidence provided in the PRB consultation document supports the proposed performance targets in the key performance area of capacity? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion

 **4.2. Please specify what additional evidence you would need.** * (maximum 4000 characters)

4.3. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

4.4. Minutes of en route ATFM delay per flight

The PRB proposes that the Union-wide capacity target range for RP2 should be between 0.3 and 0.6 minutes of en-route ATFM delay per flight.

Do you agree that the proposed capacity target range for RP2 is sufficiently challenging and achievable?

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion



4.5. Please propose an alternative target (range) and provide supporting rationale. * (maximum 4000 characters)

4.6. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5. Key Performance Area Cost Efficiency

5.1. Technical evidence to set the level of cost-efficiency ambition for RP2

The PRB has considered technical evidence in order to determine a range for the cost-efficiency target in RP2.

Please specify the relevance in determining the range for the cost-efficiency target:

| | High relevance | Medium relevance | Low relevance | No opinion |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 5.1.1. Analysis of cost-efficiency performance at European system level including historic analysis of the European system performance, forward looking projections until 2014, and analysis of ANSPs cost structures * | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5.1.2. High level cost-efficiency continental benchmarking with the US FAA Air Traffic Organisation (ATO) * | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5.1.3. Intra-ANSP benchmarking analysis * | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5.1.4. Exploratory econometric modelling to infer the potential level of industry-wide cost-inefficiency * | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5.1.5. Cross-industry comparisons of productivity improvements * | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

5.2. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.3. Historical trends and Union-wide targets for RP2

Do you agree with the PRB that it is appropriate to consider historic trends in en-route unit costs in developing the Union-wide cost-efficiency target for RP2? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion

5.4. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.5. Effect of cooperation between ANSPs

Please indicate to what extent you think cooperative initiatives amongst ANSPs will influence en-route unit costs leading to cost reductions during RP2? *

- A large impact
- A little impact
- Not at all
- No opinion

5.6. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.7. High level analysis of the cost structure for ANS provision

Do you agree with the PRB assumption that for RP2 the greatest scope for en-route cost reductions at Union-wide level lies within support costs? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion



5.8. Please indicate which cost area(s)/service(s) have in your view the greatest scope for potential cost reductions. * (maximum 4000 characters)

5.9. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.10. Capex envelope for RP2

Do you agree with PRB's assumption that rationalisation and prioritization of capex projects during RP2 should allow the level of capex to be kept in the same order of magnitude as spent during RP1 (circa EUR 1 billion per year) while deploying "best in class" technology and possibly new technology arising from SESAR deployment? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion

5.11. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.12. **Focus on total cost incurred**

Do you agree with the PRB approach to derive cost-efficiency targets by applying control to the cost base, i.e. the total cost incurred, then adjusting the Determined Unit Cost (DUC) to meet the traffic forecasts? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion

5.13. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.14. **Setting the assumptions for the level of en-route cost-efficiency ambition over RP2**

The PRB proposes to consider en-route cost-efficiency Determined Unit Cost (DUC) reduction for RP2 ranging between -2.5% p.a. and -5.8% p.a.

Do you agree that the proposed cost-efficiency target range for RP2 is sufficiently challenging and achievable? *

- Not acceptable because too ambitious
- Acceptable but very challenging
- Acceptable and fully supported
- Acceptable but could be more challenging
- Not acceptable because not ambitious enough
- No opinion



5.15. Please propose an alternative target (range) and provide supporting rationale. (maximum 4000 characters)

5.16. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

5.17. Terminal ANS cost-efficiency

The PRB has given an indication of the type of target that might be developed for Union-wide terminal ANS cost-efficiency. The PRB considers that the analysis and target range being developed for en-route cost efficiency should be applicable to terminal ANS cost-efficiency, or at least a continuation of constant total terminal ANS costs over the period.

Do you agree that this approach to terminal targets is appropriate? *

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Agree to some extent
- Not at all
- No opinion



5.18. What you would suggest as an approach? Provide the rationale supporting it. (maximum 4000 characters)

5.19. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

6. General comments

6.1. Do you have any further views you would like to provide on the development of the targets for RP2?

(maximum 4000 characters)

6.2. Comments (maximum 4000 characters)

Useful links

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 390/2013:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R0390:EN:NOT>

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32013R0391:EN:NOT>

Europa page about this Public Consultation:

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/2013-07-03-sesrp2_en.htm

Single European Sky: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/air/single_european_sky/index_en.htm

PRB website:

http://www.eurocontrol.int/articles/ses-performance-scheme-reference-period-2-2015-2019?tab_0_1

Background documents

Report: EU-Wide Targets for the 2nd Reference Period of the Single European Sky Performance Scheme:
<http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/doc/2013-07-03-sesrp2/report.pdf>