

Monitoring Report 2020

Poland

Third Reference Period (2020-2024)

Structure and Purpose

The annual monitoring report should cover the monitoring of achieving the targets set, as well as reporting on the progress on performance indicators without targets.

Any other complementary information can be added as attachment, if deemed necessary.

This report should be prepared according to the principle of "reporting by exception", meaning that minimum clarifications are sufficient when performance is on target.

More substantive explanations of the situation may be given when performance lags behind targets and a description of the mitigation and corrective measures planned and/or already undertaken is provided.

Furthermore, to reduce the administrative burden on Member States the template is already prefilled to the maximum extent possible. Information taken from the RP2 Performance Plans is identified by the terminology "Value from PP".


In light of this, different field categories have been identified and colour-coded to facilitate the reporting:

Legend:
information to be provided by Member States
pre-filled information (if cell is marked <TBU>, information will be provided at a later stage)
optional reporting
dynamic selection

Tips and tricks


- Guidance text is provided as embedded comments and will appear by hovering above the marked cells.
- Do not add lines/columns to avoid erasing the prefilled or pre-calculated areas.
- Manually adapt height of cell if necessary, in particular for text or description boxes.
- Within a cell, press ALT+ENTER to jump to the next line.

Additional comments	This performance plan has been reviewed by all signatories. It has been signed in the margins of our FAB coordination meeting held on 29 Feb. 2014.
---------------------	--

- For existing text from another source, copy and paste into the formula bar will ensure that all text remains within a single cell.

- In order to **print** your performance plan, please click on the "print pdf" button in section "Signatories".

Signatories

Monitoring report details	
Name	Poland
Version number	
Date of issue	
Date of adoption	

NSA names	Name, title and signature of representative
Polish Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	Director General of Civil Aviation Piotr SAMSON 

Additional comments	
---------------------	--

Table of Contents

SIGNATORIES

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 SCOPE
- 1.2 AIRPORTS
- 1.3 OVERVIEW
- 1.4 TRAFFIC FIGURE
- 1.5 OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION

2 PERFORMANCE AT LOCAL LEVEL

2.1 SAFETY

2.1.1 KPI

- 2.1.1.(a) Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management

2.1.2 PIs

- 2.1.2.(a) Safety PI #1: Rate of runway incursions
- 2.1.2.(b) Safety PI #2: Rate of minima infringements
- 2.1.2.(c) Safety PI #3: Rate of runway incursions at an airport
- 2.1.2.(d) Safety PI #4: Rate of minima infringements at ANSP
- 2.1.2.(e) Safety PI #5: Application of automated safety data recording systems

2.1.3 Additional Safety Indicators

2.2 ENVIRONMENT

2.2.1 KPIs

- 2.2.1.(a) Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency (KEA)

2.2.2 PIs

- 2.2.2.(a) Environment PI #1: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency of last filed flight plan trajectory at local level
- 2.2.2.(b) Environment PI #2: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency of shortest constrained trajectory at local level
- 2.2.2.(c) Environment PI #3: Additional time in taxi-out phase at local level
- 2.2.2.(d) Environment PI #4: Additional time in terminal airspace at local level
- 2.2.2.(e) Environment PI #5: Share of arrivals applying continuous descent operation at local level
- 2.2.2.(f) Environment PI #6: Effective use of reserved or segregated local airspace
- 2.2.2.(g) Environment PI #7: Rate of planning via available local airspace structures
- 2.2.2.(h) Environment PI #8: Rate of using available local airspace structures

2.2.3 Additional Environment Indicators

2.3 CAPACITY

2.3.1 KPIs

- 2.3.1.(a) Capacity KPI #1: En-route ATFM delay per flight
- 2.3.1.(b) Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight

2.3.2 PIs

- 2.3.2.(a) Capacity PI #1: Adherence to ATFM slots
- 2.3.2.(b) Capacity PI #2: Air traffic control pre-departure delay
- 2.3.2.(c) Capacity PI #3: Average departure delay from all causes per flight

2.3.3 Additional Capacity Indicators

2.4 COST-EFFICIENCY

2.4.1 KPIs

- 2.4.1.(a) Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en-route ANS
- 2.4.1.(b) Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

2.4.2 PIs

- 2.4.2.(a) Cost efficiency PI #1: Actual unit cost incurred by users for en route ANS
- 2.4.2.(b) Cost efficiency PI #2: Actual unit cost incurred by users for terminal ANS

2.4.3 Additional Cost-efficiency Indicators

3 INCENTIVE SCHEMES (not applicable in 2020-2021)

4 INVESTMENTS

5 MILITARY DIMENSION

6 ANNEXES

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope

1.1.1 Background

Period covered by the monitoring report	01 Jan. 2020 - 31 Dec. 2020
NSAs responsible for drawing up the monitoring report	Polish Civil Aviation Authority acting as NSA
Adoption date of final performance plan (or, if not yet adopted, of the most recent draft performance plan)	18-09-2019
Additional comments	

1.1.2 ANSPs

Number of ANSPs	5
-----------------	---

ANSP name	Polish Air Navigation Services Agency (PANSA)
Services	ANSP (ATS, CNS, AIS, SAR coordination)
Geographical scope	Flight Information Region Warszawa, All Airports concerned

ANSP name	Institute of Meteorology and Water Management - National Research Institute (IMWM)
Services	METEO
Geographical scope	Flight Information Region Warszawa (excluding EPRA TMA and CTR/ATZ, EPSY TMA and CTR/ATZ, EPBY TMA and CTR/ATZ)

ANSP name	Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A.
Services	ATS (AFIS), METEO
Geographical scope	EPBY METEO: TMA, CTR and ATZ, AFIS: ATZ

ANSP name	Radom Meteo sp. z o.o.
Services	METEO
Geographical scope	EPRA TMA and CTR

ANSP name	Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o.
Services	ATS (AFIS), CNS (COM), METEO
Geographical scope	EPSY METEO: TMA, CTR and ATZ, AFIS: ATZ

1.1.3 Other entities

Number of other entities	2
--------------------------	---

Entity name	Civil Aviation Authority of the Republic of Poland (NSA)
Domain of activity	Supervision

Entity name	EUROCONTROL
Domain of activity	Other/Network

1.1.4 Charging zones

En route:

Number of en route charging zones	1
-----------------------------------	---

En route charging zone	Poland
------------------------	--------

Terminal:

Number of terminal charging zones	2
-----------------------------------	---

Terminal charging zone	Poland zone 1
------------------------	---------------

Terminal charging zone	Poland zone 2
------------------------	---------------

1.1.5 Additional information

No changes were reported during 2020.

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.2 List of Airports

1.2.1 Airports

Number of airports	15
Airport name	Warszawa - Chopina
ICAO code	EPWA
Charging zone	Poland zone 1
Airport name	Bydgoszcz
ICAO code	EPBY
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Gdansk
ICAO code	EPGD
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Krakow - Balice
ICAO code	EPKK
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Katowice - Pyrzowice
ICAO code	EPKT
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Lublin
ICAO code	EPLB
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Lodz - Lublinek
ICAO code	EPLL
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Warszawa - Modlin
ICAO code	EPMO
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Poznan - Lawica
ICAO code	EPPO
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Radom
ICAO code	EPRA
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Rzeszow - Jasionka
ICAO code	EPRZ
Charging zone	Poland zone 2
Airport name	Szczecin - Goleniów
ICAO code	EPSC
Charging zone	Poland zone 2

Airport name	Olsztyn-Mazury
ICAO code	EPSY
Charging zone	Poland zone 2

Airport name	Wroclaw - Strachowice
ICAO code	EPWR
Charging zone	Poland zone 2

Airport name	Zielona Gora - Babimost
ICAO code	EPZG
Charging zone	Poland zone 2

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.3 Overview

1.3.1 Economic and operational context and impact on the provisions of ANS

The aviation sector is currently facing the biggest challenge caused by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the crisis caused by COVID-19, Polish ANSPs were put in a difficult situation in 2020. It was caused both by a significantly lower level of air traffic and existing obligations to provide uninterrupted air navigation services. As a consequence ANSPs faced the problems in several areas of their functioning, including operational, personal and economic.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic ANSPs were taking measures leading to a significant reduction in the scope of current and planned activities related to the provision of ATM/ANS.

ANSPs were operating in a limited configuration due to the significant decrease in air traffic demand. The duty hours of the operational and engineering staff were reduced respectively. Many of staff training and equipment maintenance plans were postponed due to the introduced physical distancing rules. Some facilities were put in 'sleep' mode due to absence of operational need and/or of staff availability.

The biggest challenge for next years of the RP3 is to return air traffic to pre-COVID-19 levels. As indicated in the latest STADFOR forecast (May 2021) achievement of air traffic volumes recorded before 2019 will be possible in the latest years of RP3, assuming that the range of COVID-19 remains low and passengers will regain confidence in use of air transport.

1.3.2 NSA key observations and highlight per KPA

Please provide the key observations from the monitoring for each KPA :

Safety

COVID-19 pandemic situation did not affect dramatically the safety level of the services provided by the ANSP. ANSP successfully implemented a set of measures to achieve goals established for 2020 in the KPA SAFETY. The data indicate that safety has remained at a very high level without any indication that it was affected by consequences caused by COVID-19. The management system proof the ability to be sufficiently robust and adequately efficient to manage the impact of the changed conditions.

Environment

In KPA Environment - an improvement in the en-route horizontal flight efficiency indicator (KEA), was reported in 2020. In Poland the value of KEA was achieved at the level 1.67% with the planned target value of 1.85%.

In relations to terminal traffic, an improvement has also been reported – mainly do to shorter waiting times of aircraft in the holding zones. Another factor improving the situation was use of Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) and Continuous Descent Operations (CDO).

However, these positive results were mainly caused.../There positive results were, nevertheless, caused by a significant reduction of the air traffic volume.

Capacity

The results in the CAPACITY KPA in 2020 should be divided into two periods: before COVID, covering the period from January to mid-March 2020, and the time of COVID pandemic in the remaining months of the year. During the first period a high level of delays was noted, while during the second – a significant reduction in the number of the operations was reported, which significantly improved the situation in this KPA. As a result, the delay at the end of the year in Poland was 0 minutes/flight with a target of 0.30 minutes/flight.

Similarly, good results in terminal traffic delays were recorded. In case of Poland, the national target was 0.45 minutes/flight, while the actual result was 0.02 minutes flight.

Waszczuk Zdzisław

Od: Waszczuk Zdzisław
Wysłano: piątek, 4 czerwca 2021 08:28
Do: 'PRB Support'
DW: Wojtasik Dariusz
Temat: Correct version of the Section 1.3 Overview of Polish Monitoring Report 2020
Załączniki: Correct version of the Section 1.3 Overview.xlsm

Good Morning,

Thank you very much for support during preparation of the Monitoring Report 2020. It was very helpful and allowed us timely preparation of Polish report that was sent on 1 June. Unfortunately, after sending the document, we discovered that version sent to you, was with editorial error.

In the Section 1.3.2 NSA key observations and highlight per KPA, in the part Cost-efficiency the text concerning Safety was included.

Please advise, how to correct this mistake. Is it possible to open the ESSKY page for Poland and upload the correct version of the report?

I attached correct version of the Section 1.3 Overview, for your information/action.

Please let me know what could be done in this matter. Please keep informed also Mr Dariusz Wojtasik (dwojtasik@ulc.gov.pl).

Kind Regards,

Zdzisław Waszczuk
Główny Specjalista/Chief Specialist
Departament Żeglugi Powietrznej/ Air Navigation Department
tel. +48(22)520 7210 fax. +48 (22)520 7226
e-mail zwaszczuk@ulc.gov.pl



Urząd
Lotnictwa
Cywilnego

Urząd Lotnictwa Cywilnego/ Civil Aviation Authority
ul. M. Flisa 2, 02-247 Warszawa
tel.: + 48 (22) 520 72 00, fax.: + 48 (22) 520 74 38



1 - INTRODUCTION

1.3 Overview

1.3.1 Economic and operational context and impact on the provisions of ANS

The aviation sector is currently facing the biggest challenge caused by the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the crisis caused by COVID-19, Polish ANSPs were put in a difficult situation in 2020. It was caused both by a significantly lower level of air traffic and existing obligations to provide uninterrupted air navigation services. As a consequence ANSPs faced the problems in several areas of their functioning, including operational, personal and economic.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic ANSPs were taking measures leading to a significant reduction in the scope of current and planned activities related to the provision of ATM/ANS.

ANSPs were operating in a limited configuration due to the significant decrease in air traffic demand. The duty hours of the operational and engineering staff were reduced respectively. Many of staff training and equipment maintenance plans were postponed due to the introduced physical distancing rules. Some facilities were put in 'sleep' mode due to absence of operational need and/or of staff availability.

The biggest challenge for next years of the RP3 is to return air traffic to pre-COVID-19 levels. As indicated in the latest STATFOR forecast (May 2021) achievement of air traffic volumes recorded before 2019 will be possible in the latest years of RP3, assuming that the range of COVID-19 remains low and passengers will regain confidence in use of air transport.

1.3.2 NSA key observations and highlight per KPA

Please provide the key observations from the monitoring for each KPA :

Safety

COVID-19 pandemic situation did not affect dramatically the safety level of the services provided by the ANSP. ANSP successfully implemented a set of measures to achieve goals established for 2020 in the KPA SAFETY. The data indicate that safety has remained at a very high level without any indication that it was affected by consequences caused by COVID-19. The management system proof the ability to be sufficiently robust and adequately efficient to manage the impact of the changed conditions.

Environment

In KPA Environment - an improvement in the en-route horizontal flight efficiency indicator (KEA), was reported in 2020. In Poland the value of KEA was achieved at the level 1.67% with the planned target value of 1.85%. In case of terminal traffic it was also reported an improvement, mainly due to shorter waiting times of aircraft in the holding zones. Another factor improving the situation was use of Continuous Descent Approach (CDA) and Continuous Descent Operations (CDO).

These positive results, however, were mainly caused by a significant reduction of the air traffic volume.

Capacity

The results in the CAPACITY KPA in 2020 should be divided into two periods: before COVID, covering the period from January to mid-March 2020, and the time of COVID pandemic in the remaining months of the year. During the first period it was observed a high level of delays, while the second period of the year it was reported a significant reduction in the number of operations which significantly improved the situation in this KPA. As a result, the delay at the end of the year in Poland was 0 minutes/flight with a target of 0.30 minutes/flight.

Similarly, good results in terminal traffic delays were recorded. In case of Poland, the national target was 0.45 minutes/flight, while the actual result was 0.02 minutes flight.

Cost-efficiency

In the area of cost-efficiency, both in terms of route and terminal charges, the 2020 targets for the COVID-19 pandemic reason have not been achieved.

In the area of en route charges, the total number of service units (TSU) decreased in 2020 compared to 2019 by 56.8%, i.e. from 4,971,806 in 2019 to 2,145,811 in 2020 with a nominal decrease in total ANSP's costs in 2020 by 3.7%, and in constant prices from 2017 by 6.0%.

Similarly, in the area of terminal charges at EPWA airport, i.e. in the first zone of terminal charges, the number of TSUs decreased in 2020 compared to 2019 by 59.5%, i.e. from 107,857 in 2019 to 43,367 in 2020, with a nominal decrease total costs in this area in 2020 by 22.2%, and in constant prices from 2017 by 24.3%.

On the other hand, in the area of terminal charges in the second zone, the number of TSUs decreased in 2020 compared to 2019 by 55.0%, i.e. from 138,516 in 2019 to 62,352 in 2020, with a nominal decrease in total costs in 2020 by 3.4%, and in constant 2017 prices by 5.9%.

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.4 Traffic figures

1.4.1 En route

En route charging zone	Poland			
	2019 in M2	Coefficient M2/M3	2019 in M3	2020A
IFR movements (thousands)	912			377
IFR movements (variation compared to the previous year)				-59%
En route service units (thousands)	4 972	-0,25%	4 959	2 146
En route service units (variation compared to the previous year)				-57%

1.4.2 Terminal

Terminal charging zone	Poland zone 1	
	2019A	2020A
IFR movements (thousands)	97	40
IFR movements (variation compared to the previous year)		-59%
Terminal service units (thousands)	107	44
Terminal service units (variation compared to the previous year)		-59%

Terminal charging zone	Poland zone 2	
	2019A	2020A
IFR movements (thousands)	124	56
IFR movements (variation compared to the previous year)		-55%
Terminal service units (thousands)	137	62
Terminal service units (variation compared to the previous year)		-55%

Cost-efficiency

COVID-19 pandemic situation did not affect dramatically the safety level of the services provided by the ANSP. ANSP successfully implemented a set of measures to achieve goals established for 2020 in the KPA SAFETY. The data indicate that safety has remained at a very high level without any indication that it was affected by consequences caused by COVID-19. The management system proof the ability to be sufficiently robust and adequately efficient to manage the impact of the changed conditions.

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.5 Other general information

1.5.1 Cross-border cooperation initiatives

Within the frame of Baltic FAB cooperation PANSAs is working together with Lithuania on the cross-border FRA implementation project (Baltic FRA). Current plan assumes implementation date on 24th of FEB 2022. The scope of the project also includes introduction of cross-border operations between Baltic FAB (Poland) and Slovakia which also could be translated into the merge of cross-border FRA operation between Baltic FRA and SEE FRA.

1.5.2 Description of the process and activities implemented by the NSA for the monitoring of performance

The monitoring process was affected by impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Direct contacts with ANSPs representatives were reduced to minimum and were maintained mainly using electronic communication tools.

The process of continuous oversight of all ANSPs was conducted based on the Regulation (EU) 2019/317 and Regulation 2017/373 including the ANSP's business and annual plans and their consistency with the Performance Plan for RP3.

The monitoring activities were covering the following areas:

- investment plan (CAPEX) execution
- execution of planned costs
- use of public funding, including EU funding
- execution of employment plan
- execution of staff training plan
- ATCO productivity
- implementation of major projects aimed at increasing capacity and enhancing flight efficiency
- implementation of corrective measures in the safety area.

The monitoring of progress in achieving performance targets set in Performance Plan for RP3 was performed also by dedicated Polish NSA inspectors during routine inspections.

Important part of the monitoring was preparation of data for the Interim Monitoring Report executed in accordance with the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1627 of 3 November 2020 on exceptional measures for the third reference period (2020-2024) of the single European sky performance and charging scheme due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

SECTION 2: PERFORMANCE

SECTION 2.1: SAFETY KPA

2 - PERFORMANCE AT LOCAL LEVEL

2.1 - Safety

2.1.1 - Key Performance Indicators

2.1.1.(a) - Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management

PANSA

Effectiveness of Safety Management		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
(a) safety policy and objectives	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(b) safety risk management	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	D				
(c) safety assurance	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(d) safety promotion	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	D				
(e) safety culture	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	D				

Assessment of the achieved level of actual performance

At the end of 2020 PANSA achieved level D in three of the five EoSM areas (safety risk management, safety promotion, safety culture), thereby exceeding the targets set for 2020. In the remaining two areas (safety policy and objectives, safety assurance) 2020 actual performance was at the target level C. This result was possible due to measures implemented aimed at further strengthening the safety management processes in PANSA (listed below).

Main measures put in place to achieve the safety performance targets

Over 2020 PANSA continued implementation of improvements initiated in RP2 and consequently implemented measures listed in internal "SMS development roadmap".

The measures implemented in 2020 included:

- review and mapping of processes,
- safety culture review (results of which were implemented in the above mentioned SMS development roadmap),
- update of safety training modules for managerial level and continuation of safety trainings for PANSA employees,
- safety promotion (including quarterly publication of Safe Sky bulletin, information campaign preceding implementation of eTOKAI reporting system, publication of safety reports for FIR Warszawa),
- update of safety recommendations register to include new functionalities, implementation of new system for monitoring execution of safety requirements following from implementation of changes in functional system, initiation of works aimed at implementation of new Safety Assessment Information Tool,
- continuation of best practices exchanges with national and international organisations and entities.

If the targets have not been achieved, please explain the underlying causes or circumstances that led to this situation.

N/A

Is the NSA aware of any circumstances that may cause the SAF performance targets not to be met, either this year or in future years in the reference period?

No

Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A.

Effectiveness of Safety Management		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
(a) safety policy and objectives	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(b) safety risk management	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(c) safety assurance	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(d) safety promotion	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(e) safety culture	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				

Assessment of the achieved level of actual performance

2020 was the first year, in which Bydgoszcz Airport was assessed in the field of Effectiveness of Safety Management. For 2020 Bydgoszcz Airport scored highly in Safety KPI, assessing its advancement and progress in SMS development at level D in the area of Safety risk management and level C in four remaining areas. Polish NSA have questioned Bydgoszcz Airport self-assessment in a few cases, justifying its opinion with the lack of sufficient evidence and thus suggesting lowering the proposed level (mostly from level D to level C in the area of Safety risk management). Therefore, the above levels reflect the assessment made by the NSA.

Main measures put in place to achieve the safety performance targets

In 2020 – in order to achieve assumed goals – Bydgoszcz Airport (EPBY) undertook numerous measures, among others:

- implementation of SMS related requirements, documents and procedures, compliant with national and international law, including development and maintenance of Safety Policy and Just Culture Policy,
- ensuring SMS training for all staff and contractors,
- appointment of Safety Manager, Safety Committee and Safety Review Board,
- regular organisation of Local Safety Meetings,
- development of safety management indicators,
- promotion of proactive attitude of the employees regarding safety in the organisation,
- conducting internal audit of the SMS and regular safety surveys,
- development of annual business plan containing information on safety related investments,
- sharing best practices, e.g. via SMS Data Exchange Forum etc.

If the targets have not been achieved, please explain the underlying causes or circumstances that led to this situation.

N/A

Is the NSA aware of any circumstances that may cause the SAF performance targets not to be met, either this year or in future years in the reference period?

No

Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o.

Effectiveness of Safety Management		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
(a) safety policy and objectives	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(b) safety risk management	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(c) safety assurance	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(d) safety promotion	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				
(e) safety culture	Values from PP	C				
	Actual values	C				

Assessment of the achieved level of actual performance
<p>2020 was the first year, in which Warmia i Mazury Airport was assessed in the field of Effectiveness of Safety Management. For 2020 Warmia i Mazury Airport scored highly in Safety KPI, assessing its advancement and progress in SMS development at level D in the area of Safety risk management and level C in four remaining areas.</p> <p>However, Polish NSA have questioned Warmia i Mazury Airport self-assessment in a few cases, justifying its opinion with the lack of sufficient evidence and thus suggesting lowering the proposed level – mostly with regard to the level D in the area of Safety risk management. Therefore, the above levels reflect the assessment made by the NSA.</p>

Main measures put in place to achieve the safety performance targets
<p>In 2020 – in order to achieve assumed goals – Warmia i Mazury Airport (EPSY) undertook numerous measures, among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - implementation of SMS related requirements, documents and procedures, compliant with national and international law, including development and maintenance of Safety Policy and Just Culture Policy, - ensuring SMS training for all staff and contractors, - appointment of Safety Manager, Safety Committee and Safety Review Board, - regular organisation of Local Safety Meetings, - development of safety management indicators, - promotion of proactive attitude of the employees regarding safety in the organisation, - conducting internal audit of the SMS and regular safety surveys, - development of annual business plan containing information on safety related investments, - sharing best practices, e.g. via SMS Data Exchange Forum etc.

If the targets have not been achieved, please explain the underlying causes or circumstances that led to this situation.
N/A

Is the NSA aware of any circumstances that may cause the SAF performance targets not to be met, either this year or in future years in the reference period?	No
--	----

2.1.2 - Performance Indicators

2.1.2.(a) and (b) - Safety PI: rate of runway incursions and rate of separation minima infringements (Member State level)

Poland

Runway Incursions	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with a safety impact	10				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	194 403				
Rate of Runway Incursions at Airports Located in the Member State	0,51440				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

Separation minima	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of separation minima infringements with a safety impact that occurred in the airspace	21				
Total number of controlled flight hours within the airspace	217 134				
Rate of separation minima infringements within the airspace of all controlling air traffic services units in the Member State	0,96714				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend to monitor their effectiveness?

2.1.2.(c) - Safety PI: rate of runway incursions (Airport level)

EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	4				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	79 844				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0,500976905				

EPBY (Bydgoszcz)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	2				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	2 109				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	9,483167378				

EPGD (Gdansk)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	21 607				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPKK (Krakow - Balice)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	2				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	27 087				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0,738361576				

EPKT (Katowice - Pyrzowice)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	1				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	17 318				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0,577433884				

EPLB (Lublin)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	1 684				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPPL (Lodz - Lublinek)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	2 345				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPMO (Warszawa - Modlin)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	8 614				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPPO (Poznan - Lawica)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	1				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	10 833				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0,923105326				

EPRA (Radom)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	1				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPRZ (Rzeszow - Jasionka)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	4 011				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPSC (Szczecin - Goleniów)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	3 236				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPSY (Olsztyn-Mazury)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	1 023				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPWR (Wroclaw - Strachowice)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	13 661				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

EPZG (Zielona Gora - Babimost)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of runway incursions with any contribution from air traffic services or CNS services with a safety impact that occurred at the airport	0				
Total number of IFR and VFR movements at the airports	1 030				
Rate of Runway Incursions at the airport	0				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness ?
NSA monitors the effectiveness of PANSAs performance using EoSM and safety oversight programme.

source:<https://ansperformance.eu/data/>

2.1.2.(d) - Safety PI: rate of separation minima infringements (ANSP level)

PANSA	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of separation minima infringements with any contribution from air traffic services, or CNS services with a safety impact	8				
Total number of controlled flight hours within the airspace	217 134				
Rate of separation minima infringements within the airspace where the air navigation service provider provides air traffic services	0,36844				

Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A.	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of separation minima infringements with any contribution from air traffic services, or CNS services with a safety impact	0				
Total number of controlled flight hours within the airspace	0				
Rate of separation minima infringements within the airspace where the air navigation service provider provides air traffic services					

Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o.	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Total number of separation minima infringements with any contribution from air traffic services, or CNS services with a safety impact	0				
Total number of controlled flight hours within the airspace	0				
Rate of separation minima infringements within the airspace where the air navigation service provider provides air traffic services					

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?
<p>Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A. and Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. provide AFIS services in airports not TWR/ APP. They conduct regular risk assessment, which consists in identifying the actual and potential effects of the hazard in question, assessing the severity of the effects and severity of an event, including its frequency in accordance with the risk assessment matrix. Risk assessment is performed by the Safety Managers, and if necessary – risk assessments are subject to discussion during the Local Safety Meeting, tasked, among others, with verification and monitoring of the effectiveness of implemented corrective actions and monitoring the effectiveness of safety activities.</p> <p>The occurrence reporting process includes measures aimed at reporting occurrences or situations identified as a potential threat to safety.</p> <p>The incident reporting process is part of the overall monitoring system. The aim of the incident reporting system is detecting deficiencies and introducing preventive measures.</p> <p>The results describing the effectiveness of the SMS are developed and presented by the Safety Manager to the Accountable Manager and during the Local Safety Meetings.</p> <p>NSA monitors their effectiveness by EoS questionnaires and safety oversight programmes.</p>

2.1.3 - Additional Safety Indicators

Number of additional Safety Indicators

[Click to select number of additional Indicators](#)

SECTION 2.2: ENVIRONMENT KPA



2.2 - Environment

2.2.1 - Key Performance Indicators

2.2.1.(a) - Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency (KEA)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Targets as shown in PP	1,85%				
Actual values	1,67%				
Difference	-0,18%				

Assessment of the achieved level of actual performance – please analyse the achieved actual performance in the environment KPA in light of the substantial reduction of traffic stemming from the COVID-19 crisis in respect of calendar year 2020

The goal concerning the performance in the environment KPA was achieved by PANSa in 2020. It is assessed as a positive fact. However the success was reported together with significant reduction of the air traffic value. In CAA assessment it would be not possible or very difficult to achieve the goal in pre-COVID traffic conditions.

Has the ANSP implemented any major operational or structural changes (incl. any new fixed assets put into operation) during the calendar year impacting performance in this key performance area? Please outline the relevant changes and their estimated impact

Following implementation of FRA (POLFRA, from FL095, 24H) in February 2019 in Warszawa FIR, over 2020 PANSa implemented the following further changes aimed at offering the shortest possible routes to the airspace users:

- implementation of new FRA point LAJQU in POLFRA to allow shorter circumnavigation of military area D24Z (accommodating requests received from airspace users),
- implementation of new FRA (Exit/Entry) coordination point (POZUM) at PL/DE border in cooperation with DE/DFS - initially in 2020 made available for arrivals to EPWA and EPMO, over 2021 the use extended to other traffic,
- development of AFUA concept in Warszawa FIR, including implementation of reduced size of FBZ/Flight buffer zones from 5NM to 2.5 NM and reduced required tactical distance between segregated areas and GAT in en-route controlled airspace from 3.5 NM to 2.5NM.

On top of the above, traffic drop allowed for RAD relaxation in Warsaw FIR. Majority of RAD restrictions applicable to FRA were suspended (currently suspended until 11.2021).

Despite the above and low traffic levels, after low HFE indicator values recorded until May 2020, since June 2020 the indicator started to increase. Analysis of causes for this increase proved that it was due to non-ATC reasons (reasons beyond PANSa control). The reasons included the following:

- MIL/State flights avoiding Kaliningrad airspace,
- flights avoiding Ukrainian airspace.

Despite limited number of such operations, due to low traffic levels in general, share of such flights increased. It needs to be underlined that for the above traffic flows the trajectory inside Poland is almost straight, the additional distance is coming from the overall trajectory inefficiency.

Other factors impacting KEA values include:

- weather phenomena,
- diverted flights (KEA for diverted flights is currently calculated against the great circle in the initial plan, which can also increase significantly the additional distance for such flights).

Implementation of published flight efficiency plans (ERNIP)

ERNIP 2020-2024 (published July 2020) - progress over 2020/status of implementation end 2020 is as follows:

- TMA re-organisation Warszawa FIR - Step 1 (Gdańsk TMA - CDA operations for more directions) - completed - implemented 23 April 2020
- ongoing implementation of 2021-2022 plans, including Warszawa TMA improvements (implementation April 2021), Kraków TMA reorganisation (implementation April 2021), Poznań TMA improvement (implementation April 2021), Baltic FAB cross border FRA

operations with Lithuania and Slovakia (planned implementation 2022), AMC Poland - FMP Warszawa coordination procedures (planned implementation 2021/2022), Expansion Radom/ EPRA airport (planned 2022/2023 - depending on airport opening date)
- ACC Warszawa sector configuration re-organisation (3-layer division) - Step 1 - postponed to 2022/2023 due to traffic drop
- Kraków airport new runway - postponed due to airport plans (currently planned to be implemented 2023/2024 at the earliest)

2.2.2 - Performance Indicators

2.2.2.(a) - Environment PI #1: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency of last filed flight plan (KEP)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Actual values	3,07%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

In February 2019 PANSAs implemented FRA (POLFRA) in Warszawa FIR from FL95, H24. Changes implemented over 2020 are listed in chapter 2.2.1.A (new points added in POLFRA, reduced size of FBZ/Flight buffer zones and reduced required tactical distance between segregated areas and GAT in en-route controlled airspace, RAD relaxation following traffic drop).

Further development of FRA is pursued, including cross border FRA operations planned with Lithuania (Baltic FAB project) and Slovakia (planned implementation 2022), as well as other States - e.g. Sweden (planned implementation 2023+). Further improvements in coordination procedures between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa are also being implemented.

Planned vertical split of Warszawa FIR into three layers will reduce risk of negative impact of possible congestion in ACC sectors on KEP.

The continuous monitoring process of the KPA Environment was based on the data derived from Pan-European ANS Performance data repository (<http://ansperformance.eu/data/>) and information provided by Polish Air Navigation Services Agency (PANSAs).

2.2.2.(b) - Environment PI #2: Horizontal en-route flight efficiency of shortest constrained route (KES)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Actual values	2,42%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

In February 2019 PANSa implemented FRA (POLFRA) in Warszawa FIR from FL95. Changes implemented over 2020 are listed in chapter 2.2.1.A (new points added in POLFRA, reduced size of FBZ/Flight buffer zones and reduced required tactical distance between segregated areas and GAT in en-route controlled airspace, RAD relaxation following traffic drop). Further development of FRA is pursued, including cross border FRA operations planned with Lithuania (Baltic FAB project) and Slovakia (planned implementation 2022) as well as other States - e.g. Sweden (planned implementation 2023+). Further improvements in coordination procedures between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa are also being implemented. Planned vertical split of Warszawa FIR into three layers will reduce risk of negative impact of possible congestion in ACC sectors on KES.

The continuous monitoring process of the KPA Environment should be based on the data derived from Pan-European ANS Performance data repository (<http://ansperformance.eu/data/>) and information provided by Polish Air Navigation Services Agency (PANSa).

2.2.2.(c) - Environment PI #3: Additional taxi-out time (>80K movements)

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
<i>only airports > 80k movements (2016-18)</i>					

EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	Actual	1,99			
----------------------------------	--------	------	--	--	--

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

Implemented: A-CDM (2020).

Planned:

- Traffic Complexity Tool (2021),
- A-SMGCS (2024)

If the data at airport level are not available, please explain the reasons why data is missing and describe the measures planned to resolve the situation

Not applicable.

2.2.2.(d) - Environment PI #4: Additional time in terminal airspace (>80K movements)

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
<i>only airports > 80k movements (2016-18)</i>					

EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	Actual	1,21				
----------------------------------	--------	------	--	--	--	--

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

Implemented: Arrival Manager (AMAN) (2019).

Planned:

- EPWA TMA Reconfiguration & resectorization (2021)
- New SID/STAR Procedures (2021)

If the data at airport level are not available, please explain the reasons why data is missing and describe the measures planned to resolve the situation

Not applicable.

2.2.2.(e) - Environment PI #5: Share of arrivals applying continuous descent operation

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
<i>all airports included in the SES PS</i>					

EPBY (Bydgoszcz)	Actual	0,43			
EPGD (Gdansk)	Actual	0,58			
EPKK (Krakow - Balice)	Actual	0,53			
EPKT (Katowice - Pyrzowice)	Actual	0,49			
EPLB (Lublin)	Actual	0,36			
EPLL (Lodz - Lublinek)	Actual	0,42			
EPMO (Warszawa - Modlin)	Actual	0,66			
EPPO (Poznan - Lawica)	Actual	0,41			
EPRA (Radom)	Actual	n/a			
EPRZ (Rzeszow - Jasionka)	Actual	0,52			
EPSC (Szczecin - Goleniów)	Actual	0,53			
EPSY (Olsztyn-Mazury)	Actual	n/a			
EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	Actual	0,51			
EPWR (Wroclaw - Strachowice)	Actual	0,43			
EPZG (Zielona Gora - Babimost)	Actual	0,68			

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

Implemented: Arrival Manager (2019) for EPWA.

Planned:

- New STAR improved procedures for EPWA and EPKK (2021)
- EPWA, EPKK, EPPO TMA's Reconfiguration & resectorization (2021-22)

2.2.2.(f) - Environment PI #6: Effective use of reserved or segregated airspace (per ACC)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
--------	------	------	------	------	------

Total number of hours allocated & notified to NM	176 507				
Total number of hours used	64 424				
Ratio	36%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

See the text below for ACC.

Warsaw (EPWW ACC)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
-------------------	------	------	------	------	------

Total number of hours allocated & notified to NM	176 507				
Total number of hours used	64 424				
Ratio	36%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

On strategic airspace management level all significant exercises and permanent areas are evaluated and analyzed taking into account historic civil traffic flows and civil traffic predictions.

The impact, depending on scale, is consulted with the key stakeholders including neighboring states, aerodrome operators, aircraft operators, ATS, military, EUROCONTROL NM.

The lateral and vertical limits of the airspace elements published are designated considering the actual needs of users and nature of activities. All airspace elements shall be planned only for the time period necessary to perform the intended task. The user is obliged to specify precisely the period of activity of a selected element and all timely suspensions of activity between these periods

The locations of the activities are designed not to affect the main traffic flows, ATC routes, DCTs and POLFRA connectivity. Segmentation, time and level restrictions are imposed when needed to mitigate the impact in location in heavy traffic periods of day. If possible class C TRA airspace is implemented to minimize the impact on civil routing.

When the areas exceed the set scale they are always divided into smaller modules/segments. Each of these segments is designed in order to fit particular activities without necessity to activate the whole area to perform specific assignments. The shape of these segments is always aligned with main civil traffic flows to minimize the horizontal flight inefficiency.

Further measures planned to be implemented include:

- improvement/automation of exchange of information about military activity in segregated areas, especially on tactical level.

Update of coordination procedures and local ASM support tool/system which will reduce time required to release segregated areas back to civil traffic.

- implementation of closer cooperation between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa in order to reduce as much as possible negative influence of segregated areas on civil traffic. Implementation of new coordination procedures taking into account forecasted demand of civil traffic on segregated airspace allocation in time on day of the operations.

Annual review of the efficiency of airspace utilization is conducted.

2.2.2.(g) - Environment PI #7: Rate of planning via available airspace structures (per ACC)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of aircraft filing flight plans via reserved or segregated airspace and CDRs	130 396				
Number of aircraft that could have planned through those airspace structures	216 861				
Ratio of planning via available airspace structures	166%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

See the text below for ACC.

Warsaw (EPWW ACC)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of aircraft filing flight plans via reserved or segregated airspace and CDRs	130 369				
Number of aircraft that could have planned through those airspace structures	216 861				
Ratio of planning via available airspace structures	166%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

The available flight planning options are constantly updated to allow Aircraft Operator (AO) to plan the most horizontally effective trajectory, even when the areas are active. Except ATS network and DCTs, the AOs have the possibility to plan in Free Route Airspace environment (POLFRA). Implementation of cross-border free route airspace operations within Lithuanian and Polish airspace (BALTIC FRA) and the cross border operations between BALTIC FRA and South East Europe FRA are planned for 1Q 2022 which will further increase the planning opportunities.

The lateral and vertical limits of the airspace elements published are designated considering the actual needs of users and nature of activities. All airspace elements shall be planned only for the time period necessary to perform the intended task. The user is obliged to specify precisely the period of activity of a selected element and all timely suspensions of activity between these periods. Segmentation, time and level restrictions are imposed when needed to mitigate the impact in location in heavy traffic periods of day. If possible class C TRA airspace is implemented to minimize the impact on civil routing.

Special procedures are prepared including dynamic change of level or segment and creation of new temporary routings for avoidance of military traffic.

Further measures planned to be implemented include:

- improvement/automation of exchange of information about military activity in segregated areas, especially on tactical level. Update of coordination procedures and local ASM support tool/system which will reduce time required to release segregated areas back to civil traffic.
- implementation of closer cooperation between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa in order to reduce as much as possible negative influence of segregated areas on civil traffic. Implementation of new coordination procedures taking into account forecasted demand of civil traffic on segregated airspace allocation in time on day of the operations.

2.2.2.(h) - Environment PI #8: Rate of using available airspace structures (per ACC)

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of aircraft flying via reserved or segregated airspace and CDRs	261 904				
Number of aircraft that could have planned through those airspace structures	216 861				
Ratio of using available airspace structures	83%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

See the text below for ACC.

Warsaw (EPWW ACC)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of aircraft flying via reserved or segregated airspace and CDRs	261 904				
Number of aircraft that could have planned through those airspace structures	216 861				
Ratio of using available airspace structures	83%				

What initiatives were implemented or are planned that will improve this PI and how does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance?

The lateral and vertical limits of the airspace elements published are designated considering the actual needs of users and nature of activities. All airspace elements shall be planned only for the period necessary to perform the intended task. The user is obliged to specify precisely the period of activity of a selected element and all timely suspensions of activity between these periods. Segmentation, time and level restrictions are imposed when needed to mitigate the impact in location in heavy traffic periods of day. If possible class C TRA airspace is implemented to minimize the impact on civil routing. Special procedures are prepared including dynamic change of level or area segment. Further improvements planned to be implemented include:

- improvement/automation of exchange of information about military activity in segregated areas, especially on tactical level. Update of coordination procedures and local ASM support tool/system which will reduce time required to release segregated areas back to civil traffic.
- implementation of closer cooperation between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa in order to reduce as much as possible negative influence of segregated areas on civil traffic. Implementation of new coordination procedures taking into account forecasted demand of civil traffic on segregated airspace allocation in time on day of the operations.

2.2.3 - Additional Environment Indicators

Number of additional Environment Indicators

[Click to select number of additional Indicators](#)

Does the Member State use internal metrics for measuring environmental performance that are not subject to Commission Implementing Regulation?

SECTION 2.3: CAPACITY KPA

2.3 - Capacity

2.3.1 - Key Performance Indicators

2.3.1.(a) - Capacity KPI #1: En-route ATFM delay per flight

Poland (PANSa)	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Targets as shown in PP	0,30				
Actual values	0,00				
Difference	-0,30				

Assessment of the achieved level of actual performance – in respect of calendar year 2020, please analyze the achieved actual performance in the capacity KPA in light of the substantial reduction of traffic stemming from the COVID-19 crisis.

Over 2020 delays in the Polish airspace were minimal (1 404 minutes in total) and were recorded in large majority in Q1 2020 (Jan-Feb, before the pandemic, when the traffic was higher compared to the same period in 2019: Jan +5,5%, Feb +7,2% according to PRU data). They were attributed to ATC Capacity. Since mid-March 2020, following the traffic drop, en-route delays were noted only on a single day in July and were related to approach to Kraków airport (demand exceeding the declared capacity).

The extraordinary traffic reduction related to COVID-19 pandemic and actions undertaken by PANSa to mitigate risks related to possible infection spread among employees as well as flexible roster planning responding to expected traffic evolution under the rolling NOP planning allowed for achieving the value of delays close to 0 minutes per flight.

Monitoring process

The process of continuous monitoring of ANSPs was conducted based on the Regulation (EU) 2019/317 and Regulation 2017/373. The monitoring process in 2020 was conducted based on the information received from ANSPs. Including ANSP's business and annual plans and their consistency with the PP.

Despite the fact that the monitoring process was affected by COVID-19 pandemic, the monitoring activities of KPA CAPACITY were conducted systematically and were covering, among the others, the following areas:

- implementation of major projects aimed at increasing capacity and enhancing flight efficiency,
- execution of employment plan, especially operational personnel,
- execution of training plan,
- ATCO productivity.

The scope of the selected areas was chosen taking into account airspace users' remarks, as well as CAA own assessment. All the above supervision exercise was providing the CAA the knowledge on the ANSPs Performance.

The monitoring of progress in achieving performance targets set in Performance Plan for RP3 was performed also by dedicated Polish NSA inspectors during routine inspections .

Important part of the monitoring was preparation of data for the Interim Monitoring Report executed in accordance with the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1627 of 3 November 2020 on exceptional measures for the third reference period (2020-2024) of the single European sky performance and charging scheme due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Capacity planning

Due to COVID-19 pandemic and related traffic drop, year 2020 was exceptional - also in terms of capacity planning. Capacity planning focused on mid and long-term planning based on Statfor forecasts, NM data, PANSa simulations and internal recovery plan prepared by PANSa as well as short term planning (up to 4-6 weeks) under the NOP rolling planning initiative coordinated by the Network Manager. Rostering at PANSa also had to consider implementation of measures aimed at limiting the risk of virus spread among ATCOs.

Despite the traffic drop and along with the above mentioned flexible rolling short-term capacity planning, PANSa continued to implement initiatives aimed at improving capacity in Warsaw FIR to meet challenges related to traffic increase after the crisis as well as potential changes in traffic flows. These included the following:

- continuation of new ATCOs training (continued training process for trainees employed before the pandemic breakout, while plans for additional recruitments to start 2020+ were suspended/ revised, considering lower traffic levels expected by end of RP3 as well as difficulties related to training caused by low levels of traffic and COVID restrictions),
- continued adaptation of the air traffic management system (Pegasus_21) to operational needs and modernisation of the ATM

system,

- development of tools supporting ATCOs and flow management optimisation (including Traffic Complexity Tool and update of CAT system),
- continued investments in infrastructure (CNS) and technology allowing for optimisation of airspace structures and optimisation of coverage in the Polish airspace as well as supporting contingency (although due to COVID pandemic and related liquidity issues investment plan had to be reviewed - see the chapter on Investments),
- finalisation of A-CDM implementation at EPWA airport as well as continued improvement of AMAN in Warsaw TMA.

Plans for the following years of RP3 include, among others:

- reorganisation of TMA Warszawa in 2021 – new sectors, new SID/STAR procedures,
- reorganisation of ACC Warszawa sector configuration - three layer vertical division - to be implemented under staged approach with the start in 2022/2023 (implementation postponed as compared to earlier plans due to traffic reduction following COVID-19 pandemic),
- reorganisation of TMA Kraków in 2022 – new sectors, new SID/STAR procedures,
- continuation of training process for new ATCOs (required increase in ATCO numbers as a result of planned airspace changes),
- refreshment training for current ATCOs to maintain their competence following the 2020-2021 significant traffic drop,
- continued investments in infrastructure (CNS) and technology allowing for optimisation of airspace structures and optimisation of coverage in the Polish airspace as well as supporting resilience, scalability and flexibility of service provision,
- continuation of flexible rostering,
- evolving ACC sector configurations and management to cope with updated traffic forecasts,
- continued FMP dynamic management,
- improvement of comprehensive airspace management.

ATCOs in OPS

Warsaw (EPWW ACC)	Actual		Planning
	2019	2020	2020
Number of additional ATCOs in OPS who have started working in the OPS room (FTEs)	6	1,25	21
Number of ATCOs in OPS who have stopped working in the OPS room (FTEs)	2	4	2
Number of ATCOs in OPS operational at year-end (FTEs)	174,75	172	185,25

Additional comments

Data presented in table above include SUP ATM. COVID-19 pandemic and related traffic drop resulted in delay in the planned increase of ATCO as compared to initial 2019 draft RP3 PP (low traffic levels led to prolonged OJT training process). Moreover, over 2020 3 ATCOs were moved to other duties (due to internal needs) and are now disclosed under PRU category 2 (ATCOs on other duties), although they continue to support OPS working part-time on duty (not included in the FTEs numbers in the table above).

2.3.1.(b) - Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National level <i>(all airports included in the SES PS)</i>	PP values	0,45				
	Actual	0,02				
	Diff.	-0,43				

Airport level		PP values	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
		Actual					
EPBY (Bydgoszcz)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPGD (Gdansk)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPKK (Krakow - Balice)	PP values	0,06					
	Actual	0,04					
EPKT (Katowice - Pyrzowice)	PP values	0,02					
	Actual	0,00					
EPLB (Lublin)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPLL (Lodz - Lublinek)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPMO (Warszawa - Modlin)	PP values	0,24					
	Actual	0,01					
EPPO (Poznan - Lawica)	PP values	0,08					
	Actual	0,00					
EPRA (Radom)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPRZ (Rzeszow - Jasionka)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPSC (Szczecin - Goleniów)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPSY (Olsztyn-Mazury)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	PP values	0,95					
	Actual	0,04					
EPWR (Wroclaw - Strachowice)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					
EPZG (Zielona Gora - Babimost)	PP values	0,00					
	Actual	0,00					

Additional comments

2.3.2 - Performance Indicators

2.3.2.(a) - Capacity PI #1: Adherence to ATFM slots

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National level	Actual	95,3%				
<i>EPBY (Bydgoszcz)</i>	Actual	94,0%				
<i>EPGD (Gdansk)</i>	Actual	93,3%				
<i>EPKK (Krakow - Balice)</i>	Actual	95,9%				
<i>EPKT (Katowice - Pyrzowice)</i>	Actual	89,6%				
<i>EPLB (Lublin)</i>	Actual	91,7%				
<i>EPLL (Lodz - Lublinek)</i>	Actual	100,0%				
<i>EPMO (Warszawa - Modlin)</i>	Actual	96,4%				
<i>EPPO (Poznan - Lawica)</i>	Actual	97,9%				
<i>EPRA (Radom)</i>	Actual	n/a				
<i>EPRZ (Rzeszow - Jasionka)</i>	Actual	93,3%				
<i>EPSC (Szczecin - Goleniów)</i>	Actual	95,7%				
<i>EPSY (Olsztyn-Mazury)</i>	Actual	88,9%				
<i>EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)</i>	Actual	97,5%				
<i>EPWR (Wroclaw - Strachowice)</i>	Actual	88,9%				
<i>EPZG (Zielona Gora - Babimost)</i>	Actual	100,0%				

Please provide background information on the actual performance:

- If performance improved compared to previous years, please describe the measures that were implemented (if any),
- If performance deteriorated compared to previous years, please explain the reasons which lead to the deterioration, and describe the improvement measures which are planned to improve performance. How does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance

Performance achieved in 2020 should not be compared to previous years. Due to COVID-19 pandemic and related traffic drop, data for 2020 is not reliable and not comparable to previous periods.

For EPWA the following measures were/will be implemented:

- implemented: A-CDM (2020)
- planned: Traffic Complexity Tool (2021), A-SMGCS (2024)

If the data at airport level are not available, please explain the reasons why data is missing and describe the measures planned to resolve the situation

Not applicable

Additional comments

2.3.2.(b) - Capacity PI #2: Air traffic control pre-departure delay (>80k movements)

Important note:

If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
<i>only airports > 80k movements (2016-18)</i>					

EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	Actual	n/a				
----------------------------------	--------	-----	--	--	--	--

Please provide background information on the actual performance:

- If performance improved compared to previous years, please describe the measures that were implemented (if any),
- If performance deteriorated compared to previous years, please explain the reasons which lead to the deterioration, and describe the improvement measures which are planned to improve performance. How does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance

Data for 2020 is available only for the period Jan-Feb - therefore 2020 performance cannot be fully assessed. However, it needs to be stressed that performance achieved in 2020 should not be compared to previous years. Due to COVID-19 pandemic and related traffic reduction, data for 2020 is not reliable and not comparable to previous periods.

Measures implemented: A-CDM (2020).

Measures planned to be implemented 2021+:

- Traffic Complexity Tool (2021)
- A-SMGCS (2024)

If the data at airport level are not available, please explain the reasons why data is missing and describe the measures planned to resolve the situation

Not applicable

Additional comments

2.3.2.(c) - Capacity PI #3: Average time of all cause departure delay per flight (>80K movements)

Important note:
If the data at airport level are not available, the field will show "N/A"

Poland	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
<i>only airports > 80k movements (2016-18)</i>					

EPWA (Warszawa - Chopina)	Actual	9,36				
----------------------------------	--------	------	--	--	--	--

Please provide background information on the actual performance:

- If performance improved compared to previous years, please describe the measures that were implemented (if any),
- If performance deteriorated compared to previous years, please explain the reasons which lead to the deterioration, and describe the improvement measures which are planned to improve performance. How does the NSA intend on monitoring their effectiveness on performance

Due to COVID-19 pandemic and related traffic drop, performance achieved in 2020 should not be directly compared to previous year.
 Measures implemented: A-CDM (2020).
 Measures planned to be implemented 2021+:
 - Traffic Complexity Tool (2021)
 - A-SMGCS (2024)

If the data at airport level are not available, please explain the reasons why data is missing and describe the measures planned to resolve the situation

Not applicable.

Additional comments

2.3.3 - Additional Capacity Indicators

Number of additional Capacity Indicators

Click to select number of additional Indicators

SECTION 2.4: COST-EFFICIENCY KPA

2.4 - Cost-efficiency

2.4.1 - Key Performance Indicators

List of En-Route Charging Zones and ETNA data references

	Reporting Tables ETNA Reference	Additional Information ETNA Reference
Poland		

List of Terminal Charging Zones and ETNA data references

	Reporting Tables ETNA Reference	Additional Information ETNA Reference
Poland zone 1		
Poland zone 2		

4. Monitoring of actual 2020 performance

Poland	2019 A	2020 A	Difference in value	Difference in %
Total en route costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	836 485 578	805 392 508	-31 093 070	-3,7%
Total en route costs in real terms (in national currency at 2017 prices)	814 956 767	766 383 853	-48 572 914	-6,0%
Total en route Service Units (TSU)	4 971 806	2 145 811	-2 825 995	-56,8%
Real en route unit costs (in national currency at 2017 prices) - DUC	163,92	357,15	193	117,9%

Analysis of the evolution of the actual costs for 2020 in comparison with the actual costs of 2019 and evaluation of the measures undertaken by the ANSP(s) to address and mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 crisis in the cost-efficiency KPI

As concerns PANSA:

- 1) staff costs: the actual staff costs for 2020 are lower by 10.6% than 2019 costs, mainly due to implementation of one-off cost containment measures taken in order to respond to traffic decrease and liquidity issues. Such decrease in staff costs is a result of temporary suspension of hiring new employees (including courses for ATCO), temporary suspension of contributions to the occupational pension scheme and group insurance, limited number of working hours on weekends and night hours, reduction of bonuses and rewards and overtimes as well as use of furloughs/downtime. All these drivers led to reduction of basic as well as non-obligatory remuneration components comparing to pre-pandemic period.
- 2) other operating costs: the actual 2020 other operating cost are lower by 28.0% than in 2019 due to work reorganization (remote work), temporary business travelling restrictions as well as temporary training suspension and lower cost of accommodation (cancellation of new recruitments for ATCO courses, use of furloughs/downtime for current students). Extraordinary measures undertaken following COVID-19 crisis, including revision of investment plan, had impact on temporary change in the level of energy and materials consumption, level of taxes and charges as well as temporary reduction in use of external services and limitations in the provision of some air navigation services. Optimisation (including cancellation/postponement) of repair schedules where possible, using own staff for some repairs instead of external contractors led to temporary reductions in repair services costs. It should be noted that some unexpected costs related to purchase of additional materials and external services needed to minimise possible spreading of COVID among employees have been incurred in 2020.
- 3) depreciation: the 9.9% increase in the level of depreciation costs in 2020 is mainly impacted by investments executed before the COVID pandemic, especially in previous years and in 1Q 2020 which were put into operation. Starting from the outbreak of the pandemic PANSA has undertaken a complete review of CAPEX plan looking for possible savings in the level of expenditures, especially for the rest of 2020. It should be noted that 2020 actual depreciation presented in the charges' reporting tables does not include effects of implementation of IFRS16 – costs related to leasing are still disclosed under other operating costs.
- 4) cost of capital: a material increase in cost of capital comparing to 2019 is a result of different WACC rates applied in 2020 and 2019. It should be emphasized that the WACC for 2019 adopted in the revised RP2 PP was established artificially at the level not reflecting financial risk of running an ANSP business – the rate of 1.38% was much below the risk-free rate for Poland in 2019. The artificial lowering of the rate for 2019 was done solely in order to achieve negative ER DUC trend over RP2. Therefore the 2019 WACC rate and related cost of capital level cannot be considered as a reference point for any comparisons/analyses. 2020 actual WACC rate has been calculated taking into account CAPM assumptions reflecting financial risk of PANSA, current market condition and the actual capital structure with extraordinary debt financing usage. The increase in net current assets base is mainly the result of longer than in 2019 average credit period associated to the payment of en-route invoices.

As concerns IMWM:

Analysis of the actual costs for 2020 compared to the actual costs of 2019.

The costs of 2020 in nominal terms increased by 1.8% compared to the costs incurred in 2019, while in real terms they occur to be 1.6% lower.

The increase of costs in nominal terms, among others, resulted from the following points:

*the increase in the inflation rate from 2.10% in 2019 to 3.70% in 2020, this, despite savings introduced by IMWM due to Covid-19, led to an increase in the cost of materials and services

*in March 2020, an agreement was signed to amend the IMWM Collective Labor Agreement, as a result of which wages in IMWM were regulated and equalized

*in 2020 IMWM continued to implement new products for PANSA - we developed a manual for VENTO application

*in December 2019 the following investment purchases were made - sensors for AWOS systems and a truck for the AWOS systems service team, this resulted in an increase of depreciation costs in 2020

*the increase in the cost of capital was due to the increase in receivables at the end of 2020. This was the result of an annex to the contract concluded with the Polish Air Navigation Services Agency, under which, due to the aviation situation related to COVID-19, the partial payment for 2020 was postponed in the amount of PLN 35.4 million until April 2021.

IMWM took the following measures in order to address and mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 crisis. This resulted in 2020 costs decrease and had a positive impact on cost-effectiveness:

5. Major operational or structural changes

Has the ANSP implemented any major operational or structural changes (incl. any new fixed assets put into operation) during the calendar year enabling current or future cost-efficiency gains? Please outline the relevant changes and their estimated impact on performance.

As concerns PANSA:

PANSA has been implementing a number of projects aimed at increasing efficiency and effectiveness of its operations and use of resources, which should allow for limiting further increase in e.g. staff numbers in certain areas (e.g. tools supporting ATCO work or tools supporting efficiency of financial management processes). These projects constitute continuation of measures initiated already in RP2 and are taken into consideration during financial planning for RP3.

As concerns IMWM:

1. In December 2019 the following were purchased: sensors for AWOS systems and a car for AWOS service team. In 2020, network switches were purchased.

2. IMWM implemented changes within AWOS system connections with the infrastructure of airports and PANSA - we launched smartMET function to 5 AWOS systems at the following airports: EPSC, EPWR, EPKT, EPRZ, EPKK. The changes concerned the extension of the ATIS system functionality due to the needs reported by PANSA and the unification of MET / OPS / NAV data presentation at all communication airports in FIR Warsaw.

3. Reconfiguration of the IMWM-PANSA connection in order to increase the isolation of the IMWM and PANSA networks and to increase its reliability.

4. IMWM launched a new website, awiacja.imgw.pl, adapted to mobile phones and tablets display.

5. A number of measures were taken to improve the efficiency of the management and operation within IT infrastructure (details included in the Annual activity report of meteorological services for civil aviation for 2020).

6. All points from the Meteorological Services for Civil Aviation Operational Activity Plan for 2020 as well from the ATSEP Training Plan were completed in 100%.

As concerns PL Bydgoszcz (PLB):

PLB was planning to hire the external company for performing MET services. Due to the lack of agreement, PLB decided to hire its own staff, which resulted in higher certainty of provided services and larger impact on the staff's competences development which will result in the next years in its effectiveness and quality.

PLB is also participating with PANSA on the implementation of the SmartMET/NAV system at EPBY airport, which will support the MET staff in their duties.

As concerns Warmia i Mazury (WIM):

Due to COVID-19 pandemic which had a large impact on the structure of WiM activity as a whole entity, since 1st January 2021 WiM is in testing phase of the new accounting policy concerning especially the improvement of management accounting, which will be fully implemented by 1st January 2022. Therefore, the planning exercise for years 2022-2024 and future reporting methodology will include these changes in order to provide full consistency between methodologies of calculating the determined and actual costs to provide comparable data. One of the aims of these decision was to provide more accurate allocation of assets and identification of cost centers.

As concerns Radom Meteo (RM):

RM has gone through the restructuring process in 2019/2020 which resulted in a large cost-efficiency due to minimalization of the costs incurred, in order to provide the minimal scope of services which is essential to fulfil the obligations stemming from the ANSP certificate and designation and enables RM to incur much lower costs in the next years. At the same time, RM maintains the potential in order to smoothly reorganise once again when the EPRA airport reconstruction will be finished.

6. Verification of actual costs

Findings of the verification of actual costs by the NSA (in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317), and where applicable identification of corrections applied to the reported actual costs as a result of this verification.

Initial NSA's verification of actual costs in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317 did not reveal any irregularities.

4. Monitoring of actual 2020 performance

Poland zone 1	2019 A	2020 A	Difference in value	Difference in %
Total terminal costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	44 126 045	34 344 320	-9 781 725	-22,2%
Total terminal costs in real terms (in national currency at 2017 prices)	42 896 651	32 457 081	-10 439 569	-24,3%
Total terminal Service Units (TSU)	107 857	43 637	-64 220	-59,5%
Real terminal unit costs (in national currency at 2017 prices) - DUC	397,72	743,79	346	87,0%

Analysis of the evolution of the actual costs for 2020 in comparison with the actual costs of 2019 and evaluation of the measures undertaken by the ANSP(s) to address and mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 crisis in the cost-efficiency KPA

As concerns PANSAs:

1) staff costs: the actual staff costs for 2020 are lower by 23.6% than 2019 staff costs, mainly due to implementation of one-off cost containment measures taken in order to respond to traffic decrease and liquidity issues. Such decrease in staff costs is a result of temporary suspension of hiring new employees (including courses for ATCO), temporary suspension of contributions to the occupational pension scheme and group insurance, limited number of working hours on weekends and night hours, reduction of bonuses and rewards and overtimes as well as use of furloughs/downtime. All these drivers led to reduction of basic as well as non-obligatory remuneration components comparing to pre-pandemic period. It should be also noted that 2020 ATCO TWR EPWA basic remuneration scheme did not consider any gratification for RAD licenses.

2) other operating costs: the actual 2020 other operating cost are lower by 53.8% than in 2019 due to work reorganization (remote work), temporary business travelling restrictions as well as temporary training suspension and lower cost of accommodation (cancellation of new recruitments for ATC courses, use of furloughs/downtime for current students). Extraordinary measures undertaken following COVID-19 crisis, including revision of investment plan, had impact on temporary change in the level of energy and materials consumption, level of taxes and charges as well as temporary reduction in use of external services and limitations in the provision of some air navigation services. Optimisation (including cancellation/postponement) of repair schedules where possible, using own staff for some repairs instead of external contractors led to temporary reductions in repair services costs. It should be noted that some unexpected costs related to purchase of additional materials and external services needed to minimise possible spreading of COVID among employees have been incurred in 2020.

3) depreciation: the 3.3% decrease in the level of depreciation costs in 2020 is mainly impacted by investments executed before the COVID pandemic especially in previous years and in 1Q 2020, which in respect of EPWA were quite limited. Starting from the outbreak of the pandemic PANSAs has undertaken a complete review of CAPEX plan looking for possible savings in the level of expenditures, especially for the rest of 2020 – this included revised planning for EPWA TWR. It should be noted that 2020 actual depreciation presented in the charges' reporting tables does not include effects of implementation of IFRS16 – costs related to leasing are still disclosed under other operating costs.

4) cost of capital: increase in cost of capital comparing to 2019 is a result of different WACC rates applied in 2020 and 2019. 2020 actual WACC rate has been calculated taking into account updated CAPM assumptions reflecting current market conditions and the actual capital structure with extraordinary debt financing usage. WACC for 2019 adopted in 2014 in the RP2 PP did not reflect actual financial and regulatory risks. The material decrease in net current assets base is mainly the result of lower than in 2019 TNC WAW actual cost base.

As concerns IMWMs:

Analysis of the actual costs for 2020 compared to the actual costs of 2019.

The costs of 2020 in nominal values increased by 14.0% compared to the costs incurred in 2019, while in real values this increase was 9.9%.

The increase of costs in nominal terms, among others, resulted from the following points:

*the increase in the inflation rate from 2.10% in 2019 to 3.70% in 2020, this, despite savings introduced by IMWM due to Covid-19, led to an increase in the cost of materials and services,

*in March 2020, an agreement was signed to amend the IMWM Collective Labor Agreement, as a result of which wages in IMWM were regulated and equalized,

*in 2020 IMWM continued to implement new products for PANSAs - we developed a manual for VENTO application.

IMWM took the following measures in order to address and mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 crisis. This resulted in 2020 costs decrease and had a positive impact on cost-effectiveness:

*enabled the realization of 24-hour duty in stead of 12-hour duty,

*kept to a minimum the overtime hours of operation staff,

*limited business trips both inside and outside the country,

*carried out internal audits and inspections of the Aeronautical Meteorological Stations Inspector remotely,

*limited to the necessary minimum the participation of staff in planned trainings that raise professional qualifications, some of the trainings were held remotely,

5. Major operational or structural changes

Has the ANSP implemented any major operational or structural changes (incl. any new fixed assets put into operation) during the calendar year enabling current or future cost-efficiency gains? Please outline the relevant changes and their estimated impact on performance.

As concerns PANSAs:

PANSAs has been implementing a number of projects aimed at increasing efficiency and effectiveness of its operations and use of resources, which should allow for limiting further increase in e.g. staff numbers in certain areas (e.g. tools supporting ATCO work or tools supporting efficiency of financial management processes). These projects constitute continuation of measures initiated already in RP2 and are taken into consideration during financial planning for RP3.

As concerns IMWMs:

No investments (fixed assets) were implemented for EPWA.

6. Verification of actual costs

Findings of the verification of actual costs by the NSA (in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317), and where applicable identification of corrections applied to the reported actual costs as a result of this verification.

Initial NSA's verification of actual costs in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317 did not reveal any irregularities.

4. Monitoring of actual 2020 performance

Poland zone 2	2019 A	2020 A	Difference in value	Difference in %
Total terminal costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	114 834 656	110 932 731	-3 901 925	-3,4%
Total terminal costs in real terms (in national currency at 2017 prices)	111 822 410	105 246 034	-6 576 376	-5,9%
Total terminal Service Units (TSU)	138 516	62 352	-76 165	-55,0%
Real terminal unit costs (in national currency at 2017 prices) - DUC	807,29	1 687,94	881	109,1%

Analysis of the evolution of the actual costs for 2020 in comparison with the actual costs of 2019 and evaluation of the measures undertaken by the ANSP(s) to address and mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 crisis in the cost-efficiency KPI

As concerns PANSA:

- 1) staff costs: the actual staff costs for 2020 are lower by 7.4 % than 2019 staff costs mainly due to implementation of one-off cost containment measures taken in order to respond to traffic decrease and liquidity issues. Such decrease in staff costs is a result of temporary suspension of hiring new employees (including courses for ATCO), temporary suspension of contributions to the occupational pension scheme and group insurance, limitations in the provision of some air navigation services. Optimisation (including cancellation/postponement) of repair schedules where possible, using own staff for some repairs instead of external contractors led to temporary reductions in repair services costs. It should be noted that some unexpected costs related to purchase of additional materials and external services needed to minimise possible spreading of COVID among employees have been incurred in 2020.
- 2) other operating costs: the actual 2020 other operating cost are lower by 39.4% than in 2019 due to work reorganization (remote work), temporary business travelling restrictions as well as temporary training suspension and lower cost of accommodation (cancellation of new recruitments for ATCO courses, use of furloughs/downtime for current students). Extraordinary measures undertaken following COVID-19 crisis, including revision of investment plan, had impact on temporary change in the level of energy and materials consumption, level of taxes and charges as well as temporary reduction in use of external services and limitations in the provision of some air navigation services. Optimisation (including cancellation/postponement) of repair schedules where possible, using own staff for some repairs instead of external contractors led to temporary reductions in repair services costs. It should be noted that some unexpected costs related to purchase of additional materials and external services needed to minimise possible spreading of COVID among employees have been incurred in 2020.
- 3) depreciation: a slight increase in the level of depreciation costs in 2020 is mainly impacted by investments executed before the COVID pandemic, especially in previous years (including towers at Kraków and Katowice airports) and in 1Q 2020. Starting from the outbreak of the pandemic PANSA has undertaken a complete review of CAPEX plan looking for possible savings in the level of expenditures, especially for the rest of 2020. It should be noted that 2020 actual depreciation presented in the charges' reporting tables does not include effects of implementation of IFRS16 – costs related to leasing are still disclosed under other operating costs.
- 4) cost of capital: increase in cost of capital comparing to 2019 is a result of different WACC rates applied in 2020 and 2019. 2020 actual WACC rate has been calculated taking into account updated CAPM assumptions reflecting current market conditions and the actual capital structure with extraordinary debt financing usage. WACC for 2019 adopted in 2014 in RP2 PP did not reflect actual financial and regulatory risks. Slight decrease in average net book value of fixed assets as well as in average net asset base comparing to 2019 has an immaterial impact on cost of capital.

As concerns IMWM:

Analysis of the actual costs for 2020 compared to the actual costs of 2019.

The costs of 2020 in nominal values increased by 3.1% compared to the costs incurred in 2019, while in real values they are lower by 0.1%.

The increase of costs in nominal terms, among others, resulted from the following points:

*the increase in the inflation rate from 2.10% in 2019 to 3.70% in 2020, this, despite savings introduced by IMWM due to Covid-19, led to an increase in the cost of materials and services,

*in March 2020, an agreement was signed to amend the IMWM Collective Labor Agreement, as a result of which wages in IMWM were regulated and equalized,

*in 2020 IMWM continued to implement new products for PANSA - we developed a manual for VENTO application,

*in December 2019 the following investment purchases were made - sensors for AWOS systems and a truck for the AWOS systems service team, this resulted in an increase of depreciation costs in 2020,

*the increase in the cost of capital was due to the increase in receivables at the end of 2020. This was the result of an annex to the contract concluded with the Polish Air Navigation Services Agency, under which, due to the aviation situation related to COVID-19, the partial payment for 2020 was postponed in the amount of PLN 35.4 million until April 2021.

IMWM took the following measures in order to address and mitigate the effects of the COVID-19 crisis. This resulted in 2020 costs decrease and had a positive impact on cost-effectiveness:

*applied for for the postponement or deprivation of liabilities to the contractors with whom IMGW has financial obligations, e.g. signed lease of premises agreements,

*changed the investment plan and transferred some of the investments to the next years of RP3.

5. Major operational or structural changes

Has the ANSP implemented any major operational or structural changes (incl. any new fixed assets put into operation) during the calendar year enabling current or future cost-efficiency gains? Please outline the relevant changes and their estimated impact on performance.

As concerns PANSA:

PANSA has been implementing a number of projects aimed at increasing efficiency and effectiveness of its operations and use of resources, which should allow for limiting further increase in e.g. staff numbers in certain areas (e.g. tools supporting ATCO work or tools supporting efficiency of financial management processes). These projects constitute continuation of measures initiated already in RP2 and are taken into consideration during financial planning for RP3.

As concerns IMWM:

1. In December 2019 the following were purchased: sensors for AWOS systems and a car for AWOS service team. In 2020, network switches were purchased.

2. IMWM implemented changes within AWOS system connections with the infrastructure of airports and PANSA - we launched smartMET function to 5 AWOS systems at the following airports: EPSC, EPWR, EPKT, EPRZ, EPKK. The changes concerned the extension of the ATIS system functionality due to the needs reported by PANSA and the unification of MET / OPS / NAV data presentation at all communication airports in FIR Warsaw.

3. reconfiguration of the IMWM-PANSA connection in order to increase the isolation of the IMWW-PIB and PANSA networks and to increase its reliability.

4. IMWM launched a new website, awiacja.imgw.pl, adapted to mobile phones and tablets display.

5. A number of measures were taken to improve the efficiency of the management and operation within IT infrastructure (details included in the Annual activity report of meteorological services for civil aviation for 2020). 6. all points from the Meteorological Services for Civil Aviation Operational Activity Plan for 2020 as well from the ATSEP Training Plan were completed in 100%.

As concerns PL Bydgoszcz (PLB):

Initially, PLB was planning to hire the external company for performing MET services. Due to the lack of agreement, PLB decided to hire its own staff, which resulted in higher certainty of provided services and larger impact on the staff's competences development which will result in the next years in its effectiveness and quality.

PLB is also participating with PANSA on the implementation of the SmartMET/NAV system at EPBY airport, which will support the MET staff in their duties.

In terms of AFIS, PLB has postponed the modernization of the TWR building and other associated investments to the next years (currently it is expected that the investment would be resumed in 2023), mainly due to the COVID-19 pandemic and cost-cutting initiatives, which resulted in huge cost-efficiency comparing to the initially planned values. What is more, the operating hours of AFIS personnel were optimized and adjusted to the levels of traffic at EPBY airport.

As concerns Warmia i Mazury (WiM):

Due to COVID-19 pandemic which had a large impact on the structure of WiM activity as a whole entity, since 1st January 2021 WiM is in testing phase of the new accounting policy concerning especially the improvement of management accounting, which will be fully implemented by 1st January 2022. Therefore, the planning exercise for years 2022-2024 and future reporting methodology will include these changes in order to provide full consistency between methodologies of calculating the determined and actual costs to provide comparable data. One of the aims of these decision was to provide more accurate allocation of assets and identification of cost centers.

As concerns Radom Meteo (RM):

RM has gone through the restructuring process in 2019/2020 which resulted in a large cost-efficiency due to minimalization of the costs incurred, in order to provide the minimal scope of services which is essential to fulfil the obligations stemming from the ANSP certificate and designation and enables RM to incur much lower costs in the next years. At the same time, Radom Meteo maintains the potential in order to smoothly reorganise once again when the EPRA airport reconstruction will be finished.

6. Verification of actual costs

Findings of the verification of actual costs by the NSA (in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317), and where applicable identification of corrections applied to the reported actual costs as a result of this verification.

Initial NSA's verification of actual costs in accordance with Art. 22(7), Art. 23 and Art. 28(7) of IR 2019/317 did not reveal any irregularities.

2.4.3 - Additional Cost-Efficiency Indicators

Number of additional Cost-Efficiency Indicators	Click to select number of additional Indicators
---	---

SECTION 3: INCENTIVE SCHEMES

3 - INCENTIVE SCHEMES

Incentive schemes not applicable for 2020-2021

SECTION 4: INVESTMENTS

4 - INVESTMENTS

Polish Air Navigation Services Agency (PANSZA)

Currency: PLN

Investment plan as per the draft RP3 performance plan

Number of new major investments (PP): 18

#	Name of new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Planned date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
1	01440701_Campus - construction and design	425 259 915	373 708 567	807 268	10/15/20/40	93%	7%	2024	487 373
2	02440701_Communication systems	29 427 538	18 208 853	869 534	10/15/20/40	100%	0%	2021	117 719
3	03440701_ATM system with a simulator	130 825 787	73 847 766	122 271	10/15/20/40	100%	0%	2023	1 246 360
4	06440701_VCS system	47 547 021	22 547 021	163 523	10/15/20/40	100%	0%	2021	638 749
5	21440701_ATM OPS Centre Poznań	88 856 944	7 752 202	5 524 592	10/15/20/40	100%	0%	2020	4 602 015
6	IA480139_ASMGCS	23 737 670	23 737 670	287 484	20/15	0%	100%	2022	0
7	IO450701_Warszawa Tower	40 205 677	39 303 177	53 225	15/40	30%	70%	2022	54 135
8	IP470701_UAV environment development (U-Space Programme)	25 008 526	21 747 108	565 661	10	0%	100%	after RP3	560 098
9	IR470208_Virtualization of ATS airport services	45 455 557	45 210 902	5 652	10	85%	15%	2023	0
10	IT170202_Tower at the Central Hub Airport	61 742 903	38 742 903	376	15/40	30%	70%	after RP3	0
11	IT410120_Radar PSR/MSSR Warsaw ASR-10	23 410 970	23 314 511	3 773	15/20	100%	0%	2022	8 210

12	IT430803_Radar PSR/MSSR Gdańsk	24 824 530	24 819 274	7 316	15/20	100%	0%	2023	301
13	IT430900_Modernization of the ATM system	90 324 483	26 417 245	645 622	15/10/05	85%	15%	2022	10 952 496
14	IT440732_MLAT system for FIR Warsaw	35 289 101	30 071 187	881 542	10	90%	10%	2023	138 759
15	IT460706_System ATIS smartMET/NAV EPLL, EPMD, EPSY, EPRA and EPLB	27 719 674	16 225 891	1 866 861	10	81%	19%	2022	440 720
16	IT470203_Radar PSR / MSSR for Central Hub Airport	50 135 812	535 812	376	15/20	100%	0%	after RP3	0
17	IT470405_A-SMGCS for Central Hub Airport	34 538 201	5 678 201	334	15/20	0%	100%	after RP3	0
18	IT480904_A/V Recording FIR Warsaw	23 202 510	23 202 510	728 681	10	85%	15%	2021	0
Sub-total of new major investments above (1)		1 227 512 819	815 070 800	12 534 091					19 246 935
Sub-total other new investments (2)		1 026 745 359	438 833 028	35 284 193					49 045 566
Sub-total existing investments (3)				154 344 849					113 353 186
Total new and existing investments (1) + (2) + (3)		2 254 258 178	1 253 903 828	202 163 133					181 645 686

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Has the ANSP made progress on the implementation of major investments in accordance with the schedule contained in the performance plan?	No
--	----

<p>Please indicate what were the changes related to the planned schedule and for which major investments did those changes apply</p> <p>Following outbreak of the pandemic PANSAs has undertaken a complete review of CAPEX plan looking for possible savings in the level of expenditures. Restrictions related to the COVID pandemic also impacted ability to execute some of the elements of the planned investments in line with initial schedules.</p> <p>Following the comprehensive review of the investment plan, changes were implemented to a number of projects - some were cancelled, some were shifted in time, for some the scope has changed (details are further provided below). These changes aimed at adjusting the CAPEX plan to current operational needs as well as to PANSAs financial capabilities following the crisis. Investments carried out during 2020-2021 were limited to those which were considered necessary to ensure service continuity, required by regulatory framework or are subject to agreements signed with contractors. In this review investments were also updated due to 2020 opening balance adjustment (in the draft RP3 PP dated 11.2019 the end of 2018 was taken as the starting point, for the updated plan the end of 2019 was taken as the starting point).</p> <p>Following the above mentioned review of the investment plan undertaken in 2020, 2 additional investments (not listed above under major investment part) started to meet the criteria of major investments: CWP TWR (being a merger of earlier 3 investment tasks) and Aircraft II (this is a new investment project for RP3).</p> <p>PANSAs CAPEX for 2021+ is currently under review as part of the process of revision of RP3 performance plan and will be subject to further consultation process during the works on revised RP3 performance plan.</p>

In case of changes to the implementation schedule, please analyze the related justifications provided by the ANSP for each major investment.

The information presented below is based on outcome of the investment plan review process undertaken by PANSa in 2020. However, as indicated above, investment plan for 2021+ is currently under further review as part of the works on revised draft RP3 performance plan.

POSTPONED

1. 01440701_Campus - construction and design - postponed - The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid, although due to the COVID-19 pandemic and postponed schedule for implementation might be achieved later than initially planned. Besides postponement of the expenditures, the total value of the asset increased, as a result of the accomplishment of the design phase of the investment. It should be emphasized that until the design documentation was accomplished, the value of the investment was an estimate and was based on the indicative price estimation method. As a result of the completion of the design phase and preparation of the investor's cost estimate, the total value of the investment has been made more realistic and takes into account the actual (at the time of preparing the documentation) valuation of the applied solutions against the estimated valuation.

Due to the prolonged COVID-19 pandemic and the effects of the longer term decrease in air traffic, the investment schedule will be subject to further verification, including the possible division of the investment into stages, closely correlated with the schedules of the ATM system implementation. Work is currently underway on the preparation of the schedule for the first stage of the project, including the construction of the operational part of the facility.

6. IA480139_ASMGCS - postponed - Update due to changes in the project execution. The change of expenditure schedule in the current version of the Investment Plan in relation to the draft RP3 PP, in relation with the update of the inflation forecast, results in a change of value of the task in real terms (2017 prices), and consequently makes the value of this project below the threshold for classifying it as a major investment in the meaning of Regulation 2019/317. The original task implementation schedule was adjusted to the construction schedule of the new Warsaw TWR. As a result of COVID-19, the implementation of the Warsaw TWR is suspended, but the A-SMGCS task will be continued (installation on the current TWR). The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Change of the schedule will also shift achieving the expected benefits.

9. IR470208_Virtualization of ATS airport services - postponed - As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the decrease in air traffic and the need to reduce capital expenditure, the tasks carried out under the project were verified, and internal resources possible to perform the task were identified. The value of the task was reassessed (project at the conceptual stage). The above resulted in a significant reduction in the value of the task, making the value of this project below the threshold for classifying it as a major investment in the meaning of Regulation 2019/317. The project value decrease will not affect the scope of the expected benefits. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Changing of the schedule will postpone the deadlines for achieving the expected benefits.

10. IT170202_Tower at the Central Hub Airport - postponed - Changes to the financial schedule and scope will not reduce the benefits for users. The task schedule is closely correlated with the Solidarity CTH investments. The deadlines for achieving the expected benefits are subject to Solidarity CTH implementation schedule.

12. IT430803_Radar PSR/MSSR Gdańsk - postponed - As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the decrease in air traffic and the need to reduce capital expenditure, the deadlines for the task were postponed. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Changing of the schedule will postpone the deadlines for achieving the expected benefits.

14. IT440732_MLAT system for FIR Warsaw - postponed - As part of the review, the schedule and scope of individual stages of the project were verified, taking into account, on the one hand, the need to postpone the costs incurred, and on the other hand, the experience of implementing the MLAT infrastructure in EPWA and the necessity to decommission obsolete radars operating significantly beyond the standard assumed operating life, as well as the assumption of successive achievement of operational benefits. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. There are some changes in the material scope and changes in the schedule of incurring expenses. Changes to the schedule will postpone the deadlines for achieving the expected benefits.

16. IT470203_Radar PSR / MSSR for Central Hub Airport - postponed - Changes to the financial schedule and scope will not reduce the benefits for users. The task schedule is closely correlated with the Solidarity CTH investments. The deadlines for achieving the expected benefits are subject to Solidarity CTH implementation schedule.

17. IT470405_A-SMGCS for Central Hub Airport - postponed - Changes to the financial schedule and scope will not reduce the benefits for users. The task schedule is closely correlated with the Solidarity CTH investments. The deadlines for achieving the expected benefits are subject to Solidarity CTH implementation schedule.

CHANGE OF SCOPE

2. 02440701_Communication systems - change of scope - The total value of the asset increased. The increase in the value in the updated plan was caused by the increase in the scope of the task, the need to perform structured cabling, rack cabinets and a power system for devices installed in cabinets. Due to the fact that it is the equipment required for all works related to the delivery of system equipment for ATC Centre in Poznań, this task precedes other works related to the equipment of this ATC Center. Changes of the schedule comparing to the draft RP3 PP were caused by the need to synchronize the implementation of the investment in the centers in Poznań and Reguły, providing the Poznań ATC Center and the ATCI Center in Reguły with the necessary means / systems for voice communication and data transmission is a precondition for achieving operational capabilities by the Poznań ATC Center and the ATC Center in Reguły. Further review of the amount is underway as a result of new information collected from the ATM system provider in 2021. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Apart from scope change, the time schedule of execution of the investment was also changed in order to synchronize it with other projects (ATM system and Campus).

3. 03440701_ATM system with a simulator - change of scope - The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Change concerns value of the investment, following valuation of the contractor (change of financial scope). The initial expenditure estimate for the ITEC system was based on assumptions for the functionality of a similar system and it was prepared with the re-scaling of the prices of

individual components purchased in the P_21 / ITEC Testing and Validation Platform project. Since then, the concept of building the system in Poznań ATC Center has changed, the key element of which was the construction of a system based on ITEC V3 components, not ITEC V2. The current expenditure estimates for the ITEC project were based on the manufacturer's valuation (ROM) sent in December 2019, taking into account the implementation of the infrastructure part by PANSa and not by the contractor. At the same time, the previous plan assumed that PANSa would sign the contract at the latest possible date resulting from the licenses acquired when joining ITEC cooperation (4 years from March 2017). The contract with INDRA was signed in August 2020 for the value over 36 million EUR (delivery, installation and implementation in OKRL Poznań).

4. 06440701_VCS system - postponed - Adjustment of the schedule to the implementation schedules of the Poznań ATC Center and the Reguły ATC Center. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Change of the schedule will also shift achieving the expected benefits.

5. 21440701_ATM OPS Centre Poznań - change of scope - Slight increase in the budget due to the need for additional works necessary for the implementation - the need arose during the works. Small change of scope. (material scope timeframe - due to COVID) - without impact on the benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019.

11. IT410120_Radar PSR/MSSR Warsaw ASR-10 - change of scope - Changing the location results in a decrease in the value of the planned investment. The above resulted in a significant reduction in the value of the task below the threshold qualifying it as a major investments in the meaning of Regulation 2019/317. It will not affect the scope of the expected benefits - the benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. Changing the location results in a decrease in the value of the planned investment and changing of the schedule will postpone the deadlines for achieving the expected benefits.

15. IT460706_System ATIS smartMET/NAV EPLL, EPMO, EPSY, EPRA and EPLB - change of scope - The original assumptions from 2019 foresaw the installation of the ATIS smartMET NAV System in the following locations: EPMO, EPBY, EPSY, EPLL, EPRA, EPLB. There were delays during the implementation (EPMO, EPBY) at the stage of negotiations with the airports. At the same time, in January 2020, a decision was taken by PANSa to suspend the work (resignation from implementation) in EPLB and EPRA due to insufficient preparation by the airports. The scope of the task was limited (number of locations was limited) and schedule for its implementation was modified. The current value of the task is below the threshold qualifying it as major investments in the meaning of Regulation 2019/317. Benefits are planned to be achieved in the locations where the system will be installed. Changing of the schedule will postpone the deadlines for achieving the expected benefits.

18. IT480904_A/V Recording FIR Warsaw - change of scope - The scope of the task was slightly changed (locations changed) and schedule for its implementation was modified. Due to the failure of the procurement procedure under TWR Katowice for the purchase of A/V recording for Katowice, it was decided that purchase will be made within this project, in order to avoid splitting the public procurement. It should also be emphasized that the introduced changes are to allow for synchronization of the task implementation with the implementation of the digital matrix system in preparation, which is to improve the functioning of non-standard tools used by operational staff. The benefits identified at the stage of work on the draft RP3 PP in 2019 remain valid. A change of the material scope, schedule and financial scope will delay the achievement of the identified benefits.

CANCELLED / SUSPENDED

7. 0450701_Warszawa Tower - cancelled / project suspended. The pandemic situation forced PANSa to take actions aimed at reduction of investments..

As a consequence, a decision was taken to suspend the implementation of the investment. This was mainly due to the unprecedented decline in air traffic, both in terms of the entire FIR EPWW and EPWA airport. Currently, it is difficult to estimate the time horizon needed for the air traffic handled by EPWA TWR to return to pre-pandemic level. The above circumstances raise doubts as to the validity of the previous business justification for the project. By the time of the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, design documentation (construction and detailed design, connection designs) has been obtained and the implementation decision is being processed under the concluded contracts. If the general situation changes and there is an increase in air traffic to the level requiring the expansion of the TWR Warsaw, and the completion of the Solidarity Transport Hub Poland is significantly delayed, the preparatory activities will allow for the launch of the investment. Until then, activities will be carried out to adapt the existing TWR infrastructure to technical and operational requirements. It is assumed that some elements related to the preparation for the implementation of A-SMGCS in EPWA will be implemented under the CWP TWR task using the existing WAW tower facility. Cancellation of the project implies no potential benefit to users. Instead work will be undertaken aimed at adapting the existing infrastructure to technical and operational requirements - which is expected to bring benefits proportional to the scope of modernization

NO CHANGE

8. IP470701_UAV environment development (U-Space Programme) - no change - Update due to changes in the project execution.

13. IT430900_Modernization of the ATM system - no change - A new contract was signed in Dec 2020. The contract value (higher by apr. 10 million PLN) includes new functionalities related to the improvement of the ATM system and the improvement of communication between P_21 and the implemented electronic flight strips (tower system).

Has the ANSP requested, during this calendar year, any changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317)?	Yes
---	-----

<p>Please explain what changes were requested, what were the provided justifications and how did the NSA conclude on the request(s)</p> <p>In 2020, PANSAs requested changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317). Following the consultation, comments to the proposed changes to the investment plan were received from LOT Polish Airlines and Lufthansa. During the consultations concerns of these airspace users were raised with regard to several investments. Therefore the NSA asked PANSAs for more details of the new/changed major investments and for accompanying these with a cost-benefits analysis. NSA expressed reservations about the purchase of the new aircraft, new/higher value for the Campus and new value for ATM system. Updated value of the ATM system was accepted, while changes to Campus and the new aircraft project are still under analysis. PANSAs's CAPEX is under review and will be further subject to consultation with stakeholders, including airspace users' representatives, at the stage of the revised RP3 performance plan consultation in Summer 2021.</p>

<p>Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period</p> <p>As indicated in the draft RP3 PP dated 11.2019, these cover a number of investments aimed at ensuring required capacity in FIR Warsaw, both for ER operations and airport operations. These include communication ground stations necessary for increasing ER capacity, MLAT installations, Traffic Complexity Tool development, DVOR/DMEs, ILS/DMEs, voice communication systems, investments related to cybersecurity, radars etc. Large majority of these investments is related to capacity increase - either for ER traffic or in terminal airspace (90% of total PANSAs RP3 CAPEX is related to the capacity KPA). Number of investments is related to safety in the Polish airspace. The planned investment projects include functionalities foreseen by the Pilot Common Project.</p>
--

Additional investments not foreseen as part of the draft performance plan

Number of additional new major investments	2
--	---

#	Name of additional new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
1	IA490011_Aircraft II	48 593 163	39 360 939		20	70%	30%	2023	0
2	IR470209_CWP TWR	66 104 994	66 104 994		10	88%	12%	2022	239 687
Sub-total of additional new major investments above (1)		114 698 157	105 465 932						239 687
Sub-total other additional new investments (2)									
Total additional new investments (1) + (2)		114 698 157	105 465 932						239 687

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Name of New Major Additional investment 1	IA490011_Aircraft II	Total value of the asset	48 593 163
Description of the asset	<p>The project was added to the Investment Plan right after the completion of full analyses of the pre-design phase, which were carried out over 2 years due to the financial scope of the investment.</p> <p>The currently operated L410 Turbolet aircraft is a 30-year-old aircraft, which currently does not meet the requirements and expectations in the area of validation of procedures or radar control, which means that it is not replaceable with the second, modern aircraft owned by PANSA. It is a technologically outdated aircraft, incompatible with modern control and measurement equipment.</p> <p>Using one aircraft to handle all the assumed inspections may expose PANSA to the lack of operational capacity due to downtime and the lack of ensuring continuity in exercising control over air navigation devices.</p> <p>The Agency plans the sale of the L410 Turbolet, SP-TPA aircraft, due to the very high maintenance costs. An additional reason is the very poor availability of spare parts. The L410 Turbolet, as SP-TPA, planes have been withdrawn from production and component manufacturers are not interested in restarting the production of components due to small series, therefore the availability of parts is severely limited.</p> <p>Another argument in favour of the sale of the L410 are the upcoming: R3 structural inspection (in 2021), engine overhaul (in 2023) and other minor repairs resulting from component resources. The estimated cost is approx. PLN 15 million. Such high costs of repairs, with a small value of the aircraft, and very long periods of shutdown of the aircraft from operations make further operation unprofitable.</p> <p>There is also a risk of introducing further, obligatory service bulletins or airworthiness directives, the implementation of which will entail further high costs (in addition to those mentioned above).</p> <p>Having two aircraft of the same type (Beech King Air 350i) with a better developed service base, with better access to parts, allows for such management to reduce the risk of downtime to a minimum.</p> <p>Despite several benefits identified within PANSA analyses, there are unfortunately lots of constraints, such as financial consequences of the pandemic situation. Due to the above, PANSA's CAPEX is under review and will be further subject to consultation with stakeholders, including with airspace users' representatives, at the stage of the revised RP3 performance plan consultation in Summer 2021.</p>		
The investment is mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)?	No		
Level of impact of the investment	Network		
	Local	Yes	
	Non-performance		
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety	Having an aircraft as a back-up will reduce the risk of time pressure on flying and maintenance personnel. This will keep the level of safety at the current level.	
	Environment	Having an aircraft as a back-up will reduce the risk of having to bring the plane to the holding or departure to an alternate airport. This will positively affect other operating costs without fuel, as well as fuel costs and carriers' ETS.	
	Capacity	Having a backup aircraft in the fleet will reduce the risk of shutting down the ILS device due to the inability to perform air control. This will reduce the risk of irregularities and flight delays, which will reduce the costs of airspace users in this area and will have a positive effect on capacity (KPA). An aircraft serving as a back-up will also reduce the number of cancelled flights, which will have a positive effect on capacity.	
	Cost Efficiency	Having an aircraft in the fleet as a backup will also reduce the need for control and measurement flights by external suppliers. This will optimise PANSA costs due to higher rates for an hour of control and measurement flight compared to the variable cost of an hour of flight carried out by the air operations department.	

Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives	In accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317 in 2020 consultations were held with airspace users who expressed reservations about the purchase of the aircraft. This investment is under review and will be consulted finally with airspace users representatives at the stage of revised RP3 performance plan consultation in Summer 2021.	
Joint investment / partnership	No	
Investment in ATM systems	No	
If investment in ATM system, type?	Click to select	n/a
If investment in ATM system, Reference to European ATM Master Plan / PCP / CP1	Click to select	n/a
Please describe if the investment is delivering the expected impact on the KPAs	The project will positively contribute to reducing potential financial loss of airspace users resulting from delays, redirections of flights caused by the disconnection of infrastructure / devices to ensure air flow, capacity limitations or the inability to introduce air procedures in a timely manner. Equipment control and validation of procedures will be maintained at the highest possible level in accordance with applicable standards in time and on time to reduce the negative impact of adverse factors on air operations of airspace users. In the current state, there is a serious risk of not ensuring the continuity of control and measurement flights (periodic, implementation, ad hoc, categorization and in case of failure) a. Failure to handle such needs may result in the need to turn off devices or the inability to implement new procedures, which will directly translate into the operations of airspace users. Failure to implement the project will leave the current state unchanged and might result in multiple periodical and long-term lack of operational capabilities of PANSO Air Operations Department in the coming years. The implementation of the task will affect: safety, environment, capacity and cost efficiency.	

Name of New Major Additional investment 2	IR470209_CWP TWR	Total value of the asset	66 104 994
Description of the asset	The CWP TWR project consists in the modernization of TWR FIR Warszawa in the scope of unifying working positions through the use of technology that allows the necessary minimum technical equipment to be left at workstations. This investment in the current scope is a merger of 3 separate projects foreseen in the draft RP3 performance plan dated 11.2019: the CWP-TWR project, the modernization of the towers and CWP TWR Implementation. Due to the said merger, the scope of the project has been extended as compared to initial RP3 assumptions and its value estimate was updated (the increase in value is a direct result of the merger of the said 3 projects). This merger makes the value of the updated project above the threshold for classifying it as a major investment in the meaning of Regulation 2019/317.		
Level of impact of the investment	Network		
	Local	Yes	
	Non-performance		

Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety	<p>Implementation of the CWP-TWR project will enable remote data exchange in the future, based on free access to operational data obtained from various sources (a / c, airport, other airport, ultimately Network Manager and any other interested air traffic control unit), transmitted to the right places in real time.</p> <p>(1) Minimizing the number of technical devices in the TWR operating room (transferring them to the technical room) will limit the number of technical interventions in the operating room. As a consequence, the number of working hours of the TWR controller in arduous conditions caused by the repair / maintenance of technical devices in the operating room provided to airspace users will significantly decrease and the quality of service will be maintained even in case of installing additional devices.</p> <p>(2) The unification of the TWR working position will allow for the continuity of work without the effect of the employee's initial adaptation to a different arrangement of the workplace.</p>
	Environment	
	Capacity	
	Cost Efficiency	<p>Benefits in the area of operating systems and data exchange: operating positions will be adapted to the implementation of modern air traffic management systems in the future. The CWP position will eliminate the need to add new equipment (monitors) when introducing and developing new systems (such as: SMGCS and in the perspective of A-SMGCS level 2) that are planned in the future. This will allow for the free evolution of the software using the installed hardware. Unification and standardization will enable efficient role management at the operational position and also gives a lot of room for maneuver for Contingency plans, also between towers.</p> <p>(1) The costs of adaptation when transferring the employee to another location will not occur. The same aspect applies to the employee of the technical service.</p> <p>(2) The location of equipment that can be removed from the operating room in one location (technical room) will save the resources and work time of technical services responsible for monitoring and maintenance.</p>
Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives	<p>During 2020 PANSAs requested changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317). So far no reservation has been made. This investment is under review and will be consulted finally with airspace users' representatives at the stage of revised RP3 performance plan consultation in Summer 2021.</p>	
Joint investment / partnership	No	
Investment in ATM systems	No	
If investment in ATM system, type?	Click to select	n/a
If investment in ATM system, Reference to European ATM Master Plan / PCP / CP1	Click to select	n/a

<p>Please describe if the investment is delivering the expected impact on the KPAs:</p>	<p>The project will positively benefit in the area of airport control services: maintaining the level of quality and improvement of the quality of operational services by installing ergonomic workstations, while reducing noise and heat energy emitted in the operating room, and increasing the comfort of work of technical services by creating modern server rooms with a monitoring system.</p> <p>The main benefit is to maintain high safety standards with increasing air traffic and the complexity of operating systems. Due to the implementation of CWP-TWR, the need to add new equipment (monitors) will be eliminated when introducing and developing new systems (such as: SMGCS and in the perspective of A-SMGCS level 2), which are planned in the future. This will also eliminate the problem of the lack of space for new devices, and certainly reduce the need to build expensive new facilities.</p> <p>Unification and standardization will enable efficient role management at the operational position and also gives a wide room for maneuver for Contingency plans, also between towers.</p> <p>The implementation of the task will affect: safety and cost efficiency.</p>
---	---

Detail of additional other new investments not foreseen as part of the performance plan

<p>Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of additional other new investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period</p> <p>n/a</p>
--

4 - INVESTMENTS

Institute of Meteorology and Water Management - National Research Institute (IMWM)

Currency

Investment plan as per the draft RP3 performance plan

Number of new major investments (PP)

#	Name of new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Planned date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
	Sub-total of new major investments above (1)	0	0	0					0
	Sub-total other new investments (2)								
	Sub-total existing investments (3)								
	Total new and existing investments (1) + (2) + (3)	0	0	0					0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Has the ANSP made progress on the implementation of major investments in accordance with the schedule contained in the performance plan?

Has the ANSP requested, during this calendar year, any changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317)?

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

Additional investments not foreseen as part of the draft performance plan

Number of additional new major investments Click to select

#	Name of additional new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
Sub-total of additional new major investments above (1)		0	0						0
Sub-total other additional new investments (2)									
Total additional new investments (1) + (2)		0	0						0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Detail of additional other new investments not foreseen as part of the performance plan

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of additional other new investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

4 - INVESTMENTS

Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A.

Currency: PLN

Investment plan as per the draft RP3 performance plan

Number of new major investments (PP): 0

#	Name of new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Planned date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
	Sub-total of new major investments above (1)	0	0	0					0
	Sub-total other new investments (2)								
	Sub-total existing investments (3)								
	Total new and existing investments (1) + (2) + (3)	0	0	0					0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Has the ANSP made progress on the implementation of major investments in accordance with the schedule contained in the performance plan?	Click to select
Has the ANSP requested, during this calendar year, any changes to the list of major Investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317)?	Click to select
Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing Investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period	

Additional investments not foreseen as part of the draft performance plan

Number of additional new major investments	Click to select
--	-----------------

#	Name of additional new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
	Sub-total of additional new major investments above (1)	0	0						0
	Sub-total other additional new investments (2)								
	Total additional new investments (1) + (2)	0	0						0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Detail of additional other new investments not foreseen as part of the performance plan

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of additional other new investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

4 - INVESTMENTS

Radom Meteo sp. z o.o.

Currency: PLN

Investment plan as per the draft RP3 performance plan

Number of new major investments (PP): 0

#	Name of new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Planned date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
	Sub-total of new major investments above (1)	0	0	0					0
	Sub-total other new investments (2)								
	Sub-total existing investments (3)								
	Total new and existing investments (1) + (2) + (3)	0	0	0					0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Has the ANSP made progress on the implementation of major investments in accordance with the schedule contained in the performance plan?

Click to select

Has the ANSP requested, during this calendar year, any changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317)?

Click to select

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

Additional investments not foreseen as part of the draft performance plan

Number of additional new major investments Click to select

#	Name of additional new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
Sub-total of additional new major investments above (1)		0	0						0
Sub-total other additional new investments (2)									
Total additional new investments (1) + (2)		0	0						0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Detail of additional other new investments not foreseen as part of the performance plan

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of additional other new investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

4 - INVESTMENTS

Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o.

Currency: PLN

Investment plan as per the draft RP3 performance plan

Number of new major investments (PP): 0

#	Name of new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Planned date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
Sub-total of new major investments above (1)		0	0	0					0
Sub-total other new investments (2)									
Sub-total existing investments (3)									
Total new and existing investments (1) + (2) + (3)		0	0	0					0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Has the ANSP made progress on the implementation of major investments in accordance with the schedule contained in the performance plan? [Click to select](#)

Has the ANSP requested, during this calendar year, any changes to the list of major investments contained in the performance plan (in accordance with Art. 28(4) of IR 2019/317)? [Click to select](#)

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

Additional investments not foreseen as part of the draft performance plan

Number of additional new major investments Click to select

#	Name of additional new major investment (i.e. above 5 M€ equivalent in national currency)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in national currency)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the PP (in national currency)	Determined costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation (%)*		Date of entry into operation	Actual costs of investment (i.e. depreciation, cost of capital and cost of leasing) (in national currency)
				2020		Enroute	Terminal		2020
	Sub-total of additional new major investments above (1)	0	0						0
	Sub-total other additional new investments (2)								
	Total additional new investments (1) + (2)	0	0						0

* The total % enroute+terminal should be equal to 100%.

Detail of additional other new investments not foreseen as part of the performance plan

Description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of additional other new investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period

SECTION 5: MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN

5 - MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN

Environment

Provide analysis and evaluate the scale of the impact of military dimension on the environment KPA. Please highlight the role of airspace design, procedures used in airspace reservation, interoperability of systems, information management, and specific local circumstances.

There are over 20 permanent military areas extending over FL95 in FIR EPWW that have impact on civil traffic flows and thereby can influence the horizontal flight efficiency indicator. Additionally in FIR EPWW recurring significant multinational NATO military exercises are held including: Anakonda, Astral Knight, AV-DET Rotation, Baltops, Defender, Dragon, Rammstein Guard, Tobruq Legacy. Due to large scale of those exercises there are aircraft stopovers and regroupings on military aerodromes in FIR EPWW that increase the load on ACC GAT and OAT Warszawa that might impact the route efficiency of civil aircrafts. Military aerodromes, including EPLK, EPKS, EPPW, EPMM, are located nearby the main civil aerodromes. There are agreed procedures and LoA signed between PANSO and the Military side describing the process of airspace management at pre-tactical and tactical level in order to optimise its use. The procedures are continuously updated according to the current needs of both the civilian and military sides. The local ASM system (CAT) automatically exchanges the data with the Network Manager system. ASM information is available in ATM system, additionally published on website.

What measures have been implemented or planned to improve the situation?

On strategic airspace management level all significant military exercises and permanent military areas are evaluated and analysed taking into account historic civil traffic flows and civil traffic predictions. The impact is consulted with the key stakeholders including neighbouring states, aerodrome operators, aircraft operators, ATS, the military, EUROCONTROL NM. The locations of the military activities are, whenever possible, designed to not affect the main traffic flows, ATC routes, DCTs and POLFRA connectivity. Segmentation, time and level restrictions are imposed when needed to mitigate the impact in location in heavy traffic periods of day. If possible class C TRA airspace is implemented to minimize the impact on civil routing. Military areas are always divided into smaller modules/segments. Each of these segments is designed in order to fit particular military activities without necessity to activate the whole area to perform specific military training assignments. The shape of these segments is always aligned with main civil traffic flows to minimize the horizontal flight inefficiency. Special procedures are prepared including dynamic change of level or segment and creation of new temporary routings for avoidance of military traffic. Special coordination points are prepared in advance to improve the cooperation between military aircrafts and ATC arriving/departing to/from military areas. The information flow is guaranteed by internal procedures and Supporting Self Check-in Documents System. Further measures planned to be implemented include:

- improvement/automation of exchange of information about military activity in segregated areas, especially on tactical level. Update of coordination procedures and local ASM support tool/system, which will reduce time required to release segregated areas back to civil traffic.
- implementation of closer cooperation between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa in order to reduce as much as possible negative influence of segregated areas on civil traffic. Implementation of new coordination procedures taking into account forecasted demand of civil traffic on segregated airspace allocation in time on day of the operations.

Capacity

Provide analysis and evaluate the scale of the impact of military dimension on the capacity KPA. Please highlight the role of airspace design, procedures used in airspace reservation, interoperability of systems, information management, and specific local circumstances.

There are over 20 permanent military areas extending over FL95 in FIR EPWW that have an impact on civil traffic flows and available airspace for civil traffic, which however had only minor impact on declared occupancy values without need for ATFCM measures. Additionally in FIR EPWW recurring significant multinational military exercises are held including: Anakonda, Astral Knight, AV-DET Rotation, Baltops, Defender, Dragon, Rammstein Guard, Tobruq Legacy. Due to large scale of those exercises there are aircraft stopovers and regroupings on military aerodromes in FIR EPWW that increase the load on ACC GAT and OAT Warszawa that might impact the route efficiency of civil aircrafts. Military aerodromes, including EPLK, EPKS, EPPW, EPMM, are located nearby the main civil aerodromes.

There are agreed procedures and LoA signed between PANSAs and the Military side describing the process of airspace management at pre-tactical and tactical level in order to optimise its use. The procedures are continuously updated according to the current needs of both the civilian and military sides. The local ASM system (CAT) automatically exchanges the data with the Network Manager system. ASM information is available in ATM system, additionally published on website.

What measures have been implemented or planned to improve the situation?

On strategic airspace management level all significant military exercises and permanent military areas are evaluated and analysed taking into account historic civil traffic flows and civil traffic predictions taking into account both entry count and occupancy.

The locations of the military activities are, whenever possible, designed not to affect the main traffic flows, ATC routes, DCTs and POLFRA connectivity and to have minimal or even no impact on capacity. Segmentation, time and level restrictions are imposed when needed to mitigate the impact in location in heavy traffic periods of day. If possible class C TRA airspace is implemented to minimize the impact on civil operations.

Further measures planned to be implemented include:

- improvement/automation of exchange of information about military activity in segregated areas, especially on tactical level. Update of coordination procedures and local ASM support tool/system which will reduce time required to release segregated areas back to civil traffic.
- implementation of closer cooperation between AMC Poland and FMP Warszawa in order to reduce as much as possible negative influence of segregated areas on civil traffic. Implementation of new coordination procedures taking into account forecasted demand of civil traffic on segregated airspace allocation in time on day of the operations.

SECTION 6: ANNEXES

6 - ANNEXES

List of annexes

LOŻ-3.543.9.2021.WEW.1

Pan Piotr Samson
Prezes
Urzędu Lotnictwa Cywilnego
w miejscu

Dotyczy: *zatwierdzenia Raportu z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania dla Polski za rok 2020.*

Szanowny Panie Prezesie,

uprzejmie informuję, że w oparciu o art. 37 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2019/317¹ z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku w Departamencie Żeglugi Powietrznej opracowany został Raport z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania (PSD) za rok 2020.

Realizacja celów skuteczności działania w roku 2020 przebiegała w warunkach pandemii COVID-19, co miało bezpośredni wpływ na osiągane wartości celów w poszczególnych kluczowych obszarach skuteczności działania. Stan realizacji celów przedstawia się w następujący sposób:

1. W obszarze przepustowości trasowej średnie roczne opóźnienie ATFM po trasie wyniosło dla FIR Warszawa 0,00 min/lot przy założonym celu 0,30 min/lot.

2. W zakresie przepustowości terminalowej w FIR Warszawa, opóźnienie ATFM wyniosło na poziomie krajowym 0,02 min/lot przy ustalonym celu 0,45 min/lot. Sytuacja lotnisk objętych planem skuteczności działania jest zróżnicowana, szczegóły przedstawione zostały poniżej:

a. Warszawa Okęcie – opóźnienia terminalowe ATFM na lotnisku EPWA w roku 2020 wyniosły 0,04 minuty na przylot (cel na rok 2020 - 0,95 min/przylot).

b. W przypadku lotnisk z tzw. drugiego koszyka², opóźnienia ATFM na żadnym z lotnisk nie przekroczyły w roku 2020 poziomu 0,04 minuty na przylot.

¹ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2019/317 z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku ustanawiające system skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej oraz uchylające rozporządzenia wykonawcze (UE) nr 390/2013 i (UE) nr 391/2013.

² Obejmuje lotniska: Gdańsk im. Lecha Wałęsy (EPGD), Kraków-Balice (EPKK), Bydgoszcz (EPBY), Katowice-Pyrzowice (EPKT), Łódź (EPLL), Poznań-Lawica (EPPO), Rzeszów-Jasionka (EPRZ), Szczecin-Goleniów (EPSC), Wrocław-Strachowice (EPWR), Zielona Góra-Babimost (EPZG), Warszawa/Modlin (EPMO), Lublin (EPLB), Radom-Sadków (EPRA), Olsztyn-Mazury (EPSY).

Zgodnie z treścią art. 3 pkt 3 lit. a rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2020/1627³ z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku, systemy zachęt obejmują wyłącznie lata kalendarzowe 2022–2024. W związku z tym nie ma podstawy do przyznania bonusu wynikającego z realizacji celu.

3. W zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu wskaźnik krajowy ustanowiony na poziomie 1,85% dla Polski został osiągnięty. Wydłużenie rzeczywistej trasy lotu wyniosło 1,67 %. Dla tego obszaru nie ustanowiono systemu zachęt finansowych.
4. W obszarze bezpieczeństwa cele obejmowały ocenę działań instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej w zakresie efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem (*Effectiveness of Safety Management – EoSM*). Cele zawarte w Planie Skuteczności Działania (PSD) dla Polskiej Agencji Żeglugi Powietrznej, Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. na rok 2020 w obszarze bezpieczeństwa zostały osiągnięte i przedstawiają się następująco:

- a. Na koniec 2020 roku wskaźnik efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem w PAŻP osiągnął poziom D w trzech obszarach zarządczych (zarządzanie ryzykiem w zakresie bezpieczeństwa, promocja bezpieczeństwa, kultura bezpieczeństwa) oraz poziom C w dwóch pozostałych obszarach – przy celach ustalonych na 2020 rok na poziomie C we wszystkich pięciu obszarach.

- b. Rok 2020 był pierwszym rokiem, w którym Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. podlegały ocenie pod kątem efektywności w zakresie zarządzania bezpieczeństwem. Za rok 2020 Departament Żeglugi Powietrznej zasugerował ocenę na poziomie C dla wszystkich obszarów w zakresie bezpieczeństwa dla obu portów lotniczych. W kilku przypadkach zakwestionował samoocenę Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmii i Mazur sp. z o.o., uzasadniając to brakiem wystarczających dowodów. Obecnie oczekujemy na weryfikację EASA w zakresie proponowanych poziomów efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem.

5. W obszarze efektywności kosztowej, zarówno w zakresie opłat trasowych jak i terminalowych cele na 2020 r. w związku z wystąpieniem pandemii COVID-19 nie zostały osiągnięte.

W obszarze opłat trasowych (*en route*) całkowita liczba obsłużonych jednostek serwisowych (Total Sevice Units, TSU) zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 56,8% tj. z 4 971 806 w 2019 r. do 2 145 811 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,7%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 6,0%.

Analogicznie w obszarze opłat terminalowych na lotnisku EPWA tj. w pierwszej strefie opłat

³ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2020/1627 z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku w sprawie nadzwyczajnych środków w trzecim okresie odniesienia (2020–2024) systemu skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej w związku z pandemią COVID-19.

terminalowych⁴ liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 59,5% tj. z 107 857 w 2019 r. do 43 367 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 22,2%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 24,3%.

Natomiast w obszarze opłat terminalowych w drugiej strefie liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 55,0% tj. z 138 516 w 2019 r. do 62 352 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,4%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 5,9%.

Zalecenia dla instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej:

1. Zalecenia dla PAŻP:

Dążyć do zapewnienia warunków realizacji celu w zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu poprzez wdrażanie i doskonalenie transgranicznego FRA. Kontynuować proces optymalizacji struktur przestrzeni powietrznej oraz współpracę z ANSP państw sąsiednich.

Kontynuować działania mające na celu utrzymanie osiągniętych wartości celów w ramach przepustowości trasowej i terminalowej. Realizować rozwiązania systemowe w zakresie dostosowania elementów struktury przestrzeni powietrznej i sposobów jej zarządzania oraz prowadzić właściwą politykę kadrową w odniesieniu do personelu operacyjnego, zgodnie z przyjętymi planami rozwoju Agencji.

Przyjęte plany przepustowości, realizować zgodnie z ustaleniami dorocznego spotkania roboczego z Network Managerem.

Doskonalić efektywność systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizować założenia PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

2. Zalecenia dla pozostałych instytucji:

Dążyć do pełnej realizacji celów bezpieczeństwa poprzez podnoszenie efektywności systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizację założeń zrewidowanego PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

Uprzejmie proszę Pana Prezesa o zatwierdzenie i podpisanie dokumentu.

Łączę wyrazy szacunku

DYREKTOR
Departamentu Żeglugi Powietrznej
Karol Kąźmierczak

⁴ Obejmuje lotnisko: Warszawa im. Fryderyka Chopina (EPWA).

LOŻ-3.543.9.2021.WEW.1

Pan Piotr Samson
Prezes
Urzędu Lotnictwa Cywilnego
w miejscu

Dotyczy: *zatwierdzenia Raportu z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania dla Polski za rok 2020.*

Szanowny Panie Prezesie,

uprzejmie informuję, że w oparciu o art. 37 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2019/317¹ z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku w Departamencie Żeglugi Powietrznej opracowany został Raport z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania (PSD) za rok 2020.

Realizacja celów skuteczności działania w roku 2020 przebiegała w warunkach pandemii COVID-19, co miało bezpośredni wpływ na osiągane wartości celów w poszczególnych kluczowych obszarach skuteczności działania. Stan realizacji celów przedstawia się w następujący sposób:

1. W obszarze przepustowości trasowej średnie roczne opóźnienie ATFM po trasie wyniosło dla FIR Warszawa 0,00 min/lot przy założonym celu 0,30 min/lot.
2. W zakresie przepustowości terminalowej w FIR Warszawa, opóźnienie ATFM wyniosło na poziomie krajowym 0,02 min/lot przy ustalonym celu 0,45 min/lot. Sytuacja lotnisk objętych planem skuteczności działania jest zróżnicowana, szczegóły przedstawione zostały poniżej:
 - a. Warszawa Okęcie – opóźnienia terminalowe ATFM na lotnisku EPWA w roku 2020 wyniosły 0,04 minuty na przylot (cel na rok 2020 - 0,95 min/przylot).
 - b. W przypadku lotnisk z tzw. drugiego koszyka², opóźnienia ATFM na żadnym z lotnisk nie przekroczyły w roku 2020 poziomu 0,04 minuty na przylot.

¹ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2019/317 z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku ustanawiające system skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej oraz uchylające rozporządzenia wykonawcze (UE) nr 390/2013 i (UE) nr 391/2013.

² Obejmuje lotniska: Gdańsk im. Lecha Wałęsy (EPGD), Kraków-Balice (EPKK), Bydgoszcz (EPBY), Katowice-Pyrzowice (EPKT), Łódź (EPLL), Poznań-Ławica (EPPO), Rzeszów-Jasionka (EPRZ), Szczecin-Goleniów (EPSC), Wrocław-Strachowice (EPWR), Zielona Góra-Babimost (EPZG), Warszawa/Modlin (EPMO), Lublin (EPLB), Radom-Sadków (EPRA), Olsztyn-Mazury (EPSY).

Zgodnie z treścią art. 3 pkt 3 lit. a rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2020/1627³ z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku, systemy zachęt obejmują wyłącznie lata kalendarzowe 2022–2024. W związku z tym nie ma podstawy do przyznania bonusu wynikającego z realizacji celu.

3. W zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu wskaźnik krajowy ustanowiony na poziomie 1,85% dla Polski został osiągnięty. Wydłużenie rzeczywistej trasy lotu wyniosło 1,67 %. Dla tego obszaru nie ustanowiono systemu zachęt finansowych.

4. W obszarze bezpieczeństwa cele obejmowały ocenę działań instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej w zakresie efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem (*Effectiveness of Safety Management – EoSM*). Cele zawarte w Planie Skuteczności Działania (PSD) dla Polskiej Agencji Żeglugi Powietrznej, Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. na rok 2020 w obszarze bezpieczeństwa zostały osiągnięte i przedstawiają się następująco:

a. Na koniec 2020 roku wskaźnik efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem w PAŻP osiągnął poziom D w trzech obszarach zarządczych (zarządzanie ryzykiem w zakresie bezpieczeństwa, promocja bezpieczeństwa, kultura bezpieczeństwa) oraz poziom C w dwóch pozostałych obszarach – przy celach ustalonych na 2020 rok na poziomie C we wszystkich pięciu obszarach.

b. Rok 2020 był pierwszym rokiem, w którym Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. podlegały ocenie pod kątem efektywności w zakresie zarządzania bezpieczeństwem. Za rok 2020 Departament Żeglugi Powietrznej zasugerował ocenę na poziomie C dla wszystkich obszarów w zakresie bezpieczeństwa dla obu portów lotniczych. W kilku przypadkach zakwestionował samoocenę Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmii i Mazur sp. z o.o., uzasadniając to brakiem wystarczających dowodów. Obecnie oczekujemy na weryfikację EASA w zakresie proponowanych poziomów efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem.

5. W obszarze efektywności kosztowej, zarówno w zakresie opłat trasowych jak i terminalowych cele na 2020 r. w związku z wystąpieniem pandemii COVID-19 nie zostały osiągnięte.

W obszarze opłat trasowych (*en route*) całkowita liczba obsłużonych jednostek serwisowych (Total Service Units, TSU) zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 56,8% tj. z 4 971 806 w 2019 r. do 2 145 811 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,7%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 6,0%.

Analogicznie w obszarze opłat terminalowych na lotnisku EPWA tj. w pierwszej strefie opłat

³ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2020/1627 z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku w sprawie nadzwyczajnych środków w trzecim okresie odniesienia (2020–2024) systemu skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej w związku z pandemią COVID-19.

terminalowych⁴ liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 59,5%, tj. z 107 857 w 2019 r. do 43 367 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 22,2%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 24,3%.

Natomiast w obszarze opłat terminalowych w drugiej strefie liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 55,0% tj. z 138 516 w 2019 r. do 62 352 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,4%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 5,9%.

Zalecenia dla instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej:

1. Zalecenia dla PAŻP:

Dążyć do zapewnienia warunków realizacji celu w zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu poprzez wdrażanie i doskonalenie transgranicznego FRA. Kontynuować proces optymalizacji struktur przestrzeni powietrznej oraz współpracę z ANSP państw sąsiednich.

Kontynuować działania mające na celu utrzymanie osiągniętych wartości celów w ramach przepustowości trasowej i terminalowej. Realizować rozwiązania systemowe w zakresie dostosowania elementów struktury przestrzeni powietrznej i sposobów jej zarządzania oraz prowadzić właściwą politykę kadrową w odniesieniu do personelu operacyjnego, zgodnie z przyjętymi planami rozwoju Agencji.

Kontynuować prace związane z poprawą efektywności kosztowej w celu zapewnienia warunków do osiągnięcia wyznaczonych celów w tym zakresie.

Przyjęte plany przepustowości, realizować zgodnie z ustaleniami dorocznego spotkania roboczego z Network Managerem.

Doskonalic efektywność systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizować założenia PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

2. Zalecenia dla pozostałych instytucji:

Dążyć do pełnej realizacji celów bezpieczeństwa poprzez podnoszenie efektywności systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizację założeń zrewidowanego PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

Uprzejmie proszę Pana Prezesa o zatwierdzenie i podpisanie dokumentu.

NACZELNIK
Wydziału Analiz i Standardów
Żeglugi Powietrznej
Dariusz Wojcisiak

Łączę wyrazy szacunku

DYREKTOR
Departamentu Żeglugi Powietrznej

Karol Kazmierczak

⁴ Obejmuje lotnisko: Warszawa im. Fryderyka Chopina (EPWA).

LOŻ-3.543.9.2021.WEW.1

Pan Piotr Samson
Prezes
Urzędu Lotnictwa Cywilnego
w miejscu

Dotyczy: *zatwierdzenia Raportu z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania dla Polski za rok 2020.*

Szanowny Panie Prezesie,

uprzejmie informuję, że w oparciu o art. 37 rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2019/317¹ z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku w Departamencie Żeglugi Powietrznej opracowany został Raport z monitorowania realizacji Planu Skuteczności Działania (PSD) za rok 2020.

Realizacja celów skuteczności działania w roku 2020 przebiegała w warunkach pandemii COVID-19, co miało bezpośredni wpływ na osiągane wartości celów w poszczególnych kluczowych obszarach skuteczności działania. Stan realizacji celów przedstawia się w następujący sposób:

1. W obszarze przepustowości trasowej średnie roczne opóźnienie ATFM po trasie wyniosło dla FIR Warszawa 0,00 min/lot przy założonym celu 0,30 min/lot.
2. W zakresie przepustowości terminalowej w FIR Warszawa, opóźnienie ATFM wyniosło na poziomie krajowym 0,02 min/lot przy ustalonym celu 0,45 min/lot. Sytuacja lotnisk objętych planem skuteczności działania jest zróżnicowana, szczegóły przedstawione zostały poniżej:
 - a. Warszawa Okęcie – opóźnienia terminalowe ATFM na lotnisku EPWA w roku 2020 wyniosły 0,04 minuty na przylot (cel na rok 2020 - 0,95 min/przylot).
 - b. W przypadku lotnisk z tzw. drugiego koszyka², opóźnienia ATFM na żadnym z lotnisk nie przekroczyły w roku 2020 poziomu 0,04 minuty na przylot.

¹ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2019/317 z dnia 11 lutego 2019 roku ustanawiające system skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej oraz uchylające rozporządzenia wykonawcze (UE) nr 390/2013 i (UE) nr 391/2013.

² Obejmuje lotniska: Gdańsk im. Lecha Wałęsy (EPGD), Kraków-Balice (EPKK), Bydgoszcz (EPBY), Katowice-Pyrzowice (EPKT), Łódź (EPLL), Poznań-Lawica (EPPO), Rzeszów-Jasionka (EPRZ), Szczecin-Goleniów (EPSC), Wrocław-Strachowice (EPWR), Zielona Góra-Babimost (EPZG), Warszawa/Modlin (EPMO), Lublin (EPLB), Radom-Sadków (EPRA), Olsztyn-Mazury (EPSY).

Zgodnie z treścią art. 3 pkt 3 lit. a rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) 2020/1627³ z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku, systemy zachęt obejmują wyłącznie lata kalendarzowe 2022–2024. W związku z tym nie ma podstawy do przyznania bonusu wynikającego z realizacji celu.

3. W zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu wskaźnik krajowy ustanowiony na poziomie 1,85% dla Polski został osiągnięty. Wydłużenie rzeczywistej trasy lotu wyniosło 1,67 %. Dla tego obszaru nie ustanowiono systemu zachęt finansowych.
4. W obszarze bezpieczeństwa cele obejmowały ocenę działań instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej w zakresie efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem (*Effectiveness of Safety Management – EoSM*). Cele zawarte w Planie Skuteczności Działania (PSD) dla Polskiej Agencji Żeglugi Powietrznej, Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. na rok 2020 w obszarze bezpieczeństwa zostały osiągnięte i przedstawiają się następująco:

- a. Na koniec 2020 roku wskaźnik efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem w PAŻP osiągnął poziom D w trzech obszarach zarządczych (zarządzanie ryzykiem w zakresie bezpieczeństwa, promocja bezpieczeństwa, kultura bezpieczeństwa) oraz poziom C w dwóch pozostałych obszarach – przy celach ustalonych na 2020 rok na poziomie C we wszystkich pięciu obszarach.

- b. Rok 2020 był pierwszym rokiem, w którym Port Lotniczy Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmia i Mazury sp. z o.o. podlegały ocenie pod kątem efektywności w zakresie zarządzania bezpieczeństwem. Za rok 2020 Departament Żeglugi Powietrznej zasugerował ocenę na poziomie C dla wszystkich obszarów w zakresie bezpieczeństwa dla obu portów lotniczych. W kilku przypadkach zakwestionował samoocenę Portu Lotniczego Bydgoszcz S.A. oraz Warmii i Mazur sp. z o.o., uzasadniając to brakiem wystarczających dowodów. Obecnie oczekujemy na weryfikację EASA w zakresie proponowanych poziomów efektywności zarządzania bezpieczeństwem.

5. W obszarze efektywności kosztowej, zarówno w zakresie opłat trasowych jak i terminalowych cele na 2020 r. w związku z wystąpieniem pandemii COVID-19 nie zostały osiągnięte.

W obszarze opłat trasowych (*en route*) całkowita liczba obsłużonych jednostek serwisowych (Total Sevice Units, TSU) zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 56,8% tj. z 4 971 806 w 2019 r. do 2 145 811 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,7%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 6,0%.

Analogicznie w obszarze opłat terminalowych na lotnisku EPWA tj. w pierwszej strefie opłat

³ Rozporządzenie wykonawcze Komisji (UE) 2020/1627 z dnia 3 listopada 2020 roku w sprawie nadzwyczajnych środków w trzecim okresie odniesienia (2020–2024) systemu skuteczności działania i opłat w jednolitej europejskiej przestrzeni powietrznej w związku z pandemią COVID-19.

terminalowych⁴ liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 59,5%, tj. z 107 857 w 2019 r. do 43 367 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 22,2%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 24,3%.

Natomiast w obszarze opłat terminalowych w drugiej strefie liczba TSU zmalała w 2020 roku w porównaniu do roku 2019 o 55,0% tj. z 138 516 w 2019 r. do 62 352 w 2020 r. przy nominalnym spadku kosztów obsługi ogółem w 2020 r. o 3,4%, a licząc w cenach stałych z 2017 r. o 5,9%.

Zalecenia dla instytucji zapewniających służby żeglugi powietrznej:

1. Zalecenia dla PAŻP:

Dążyć do zapewnienia warunków realizacji celu w zakresie horyzontalnej efektywności lotu poprzez wdrażanie i doskonalenie transgranicznego FRA. Kontynuować proces optymalizacji struktur przestrzeni powietrznej oraz współpracę z ANSP państw sąsiednich.

Kontynuować działania mające na celu utrzymanie osiągniętych wartości celów w ramach przepustowości trasowej i terminalowej. Realizować rozwiązania systemowe w zakresie dostosowania elementów struktury przestrzeni powietrznej i sposobów jej zarządzania oraz prowadzić właściwą politykę kadrową w odniesieniu do personelu operacyjnego, zgodnie z przyjętymi planami rozwoju Agencji.

Kontynuować prace związane z poprawą efektywności kosztowej w celu zapewnienia warunków do osiągnięcia wyznaczonych celów w tym zakresie.

Przyjęte plany przepustowości, realizować zgodnie z ustaleniami dorocznego spotkania roboczego z Network Managerem.

Doskonalic efektywność systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizować założenia PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

2. Zalecenia dla pozostałych instytucji:

Dążyć do pełnej realizacji celów bezpieczeństwa poprzez podnoszenie efektywności systemu zarządzania bezpieczeństwem i realizację założeń zrewidowanego PSD w obszarze bezpieczeństwa.

Uprzejmie proszę Pana Prezesa o zatwierdzenie i podpisanie dokumentu.

Łączę wyrazy szacunku

Accept
PREZES
Urząd Lotnictwa Cywilnego
1.06.21
Piotr Samson

DYREKTOR
Departamentu Żeglugi Powietrznej

Karol Kaźmierczak

Piotr Samson

⁴ Obejmuje lotnisko: Warszawa im. Fryderyka Chopina (EPWA).

