

# PRB assessment of the second revision of the draft performance plans for RP3

France, Germany, The Netherlands and Switzerland as-  
sessment report

December 2022

## REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

This report assesses the draft performance plans of France, Germany, The Netherlands and Switzerland. In October 2022, the Commission found the cost-efficiency targets of Belgium-Luxembourg not consistent with the Union-wide targets. This meant that the FABEC performance plan could not be adopted, precluding the respective Member States from adjusting the unit rate for 2023 to start covering the revenue gap incurred during 2020/2021. This led to four FABEC Member States submitting individual draft performance plans.

I would like to thank the NSAs of the Member States involved in this additional round of assessments for the excellent cooperation under considerable time constraints. In addition, the PRB could not have carried out its task without the unwavering support of the colleagues from the PRU (Eurocontrol), the Network Manager, EASA, and the PRB Support Team.



Regula Dettling-Ott  
PRB Chair

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	<i>About this report.....</i>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE PLANS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	<i>Completeness checks .....</i>	5
2.2	<i>Applicable regulations for the assessment of the revised performance plans.....</i>	5
2.3	<i>Criteria for the assessment of performance plans .....</i>	5
<b>3</b>	<b>FRANCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	<i>Assessment of the safety KPA .....</i>	6
3.2	<i>Assessment of the environment KPA.....</i>	6
3.4	<i>Assessment of the capacity KPA.....</i>	7
3.6	<i>Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA .....</i>	8
3.7	<i>PRB recommendations.....</i>	8
<b>4</b>	<b>GERMANY.....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	<i>Assessment of the safety KPA .....</i>	9
4.2	<i>Assessment of the environment KPA.....</i>	9
4.4	<i>Assessment of the capacity KPA.....</i>	10
4.6	<i>Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA .....</i>	11
4.7	<i>PRB recommendations.....</i>	11
<b>5</b>	<b>THE NETHERLANDS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	<i>Assessment of the safety KPA .....</i>	12
5.2	<i>Assessment of the environment KPA.....</i>	12
5.4	<i>Assessment of the capacity KPA.....</i>	13
5.6	<i>Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA .....</i>	14
5.7	<i>PRB recommendations.....</i>	14
<b>6</b>	<b>SWITZERLAND .....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	<i>Assessment of the safety KPA .....</i>	15
6.2	<i>Assessment of the environment KPA.....</i>	15
6.4	<i>Assessment of the capacity KPA.....</i>	16
6.5	<i>Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA .....</i>	17
6.6	<i>PRB recommendations.....</i>	17
<b>7</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>18</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 *About this report*

- 1 In November 2020, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1627 (hereafter the exceptional measures Regulation) entered into force to respond to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic related travel restrictions on air navigation service providers and airspace users.
- 2 Based on the exceptional measures Regulation, the Union-wide targets for the third reference period (RP3) initially adopted in 2019 were revised. The Performance Review Body of the Single European Sky (PRB) advised the Commission regarding the targets in March 2021. Revised Union-wide targets were adopted and published in June 2021.<sup>1</sup>
- 3 In October 2021, Member States submitted draft performance plans as required by the exceptional measures Regulation, containing revised local performance targets.<sup>2</sup> These performance plans covered each year of RP3, from 2020 to 2024, taking into account that the effects of the pandemic set in as of March 2020.
- 4 The PRB assessed the performance plans and advised the Commission on their consistency with the Union-wide targets. The performance plans of Cyprus, FABEC (Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland), Greece, Latvia, Malta, Romania, and Sweden were found to be inconsistent with the Union-wide targets and needed to be revised. These Member States submitted their revised draft performance plans on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2022 for assessment.
- 5 This report contains the PRB assessment of the revised draft performance plans of the FABEC Member States (France, Germany, The Netherlands, Switzerland), who – after the initiation by the Commission of the detailed examination of the cost-efficiency performance targets for the Belgium-Luxembourg charging zone on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2022 - have each submitted a national performance plan. The PRB supports the Commission approving the plans of those Member States.
- 6 The revised national performance plans of France, Germany, The Netherlands and Switzerland contain largely the same information (at national level) as the FABEC revised draft performance plan. For environment and capacity, the national targets have been updated and are based on the national reference values calculated by the Network Manager. The national targets are hence a direct breakdown of the previous FABEC targets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2021/891 of 2 June 2021 setting revised Union-wide performance targets for the air traffic management network for the third reference period (2020-2024) and repealing Implementing Decision (EU) 2019/903.

<sup>2</sup> With Member States we refer to EU Members plus Norway and Switzerland.

## 2 ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE PLANS

### 2.1 Completeness checks

- 7 The performance plans of France, Germany, The Netherlands and Switzerland were submitted using the ESSKY platform in November 2022.<sup>3</sup>
- 8 Upon receipt of the revised performance plans, the PRB assessed the completeness of the performance plans, verified whether they contain all the elements needed to comply with the requirements, and requested any missing elements and clarifications.<sup>4</sup>

### 2.2 Applicable regulations for the assessment of the revised performance plans

- 9 The PRB assessed the performance plans following the same principles as for the assessment of the performance plans submitted in November 2021 and July 2022 (see the report from March 2022 for more details of the assessment criteria).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the assessment considers the specific issues defined in the inconsistency decisions (Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2022/728 and 2022/780).<sup>6</sup>

### 2.3 Criteria for the assessment of performance plans

- 10 The PRB has considered the developments in performance observed in 2022 and has highlighted possible issues associated with achieving the targets within the performance plans. However, the criteria applied to assess the consistency of the plans remains the same as for the previous assessment.

---

<sup>3</sup> The ESSKY platform is a web-based portal provided by the Commission to enable Member States to provide information, data and communication related to the Single European Sky.

<sup>4</sup> Based Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317 and exceptional measures Regulation.

<sup>5</sup> <https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/eusinglesky/Latest+Developments#LatestDevelopments-PRBassessmentofRP3reviseddraftperformance-plans>

<sup>6</sup> The specific issues defined in the inconsistency decisions can be found in Annex I of this report.

### 3 FRANCE

#### 3.1 Assessment of the safety KPA

- 12 The targets for the safety KPA submitted by France within the revised national performance plan and the related measures remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 13 France provided targets for the effectiveness of safety management for each year of RP3 and plans to achieve the Union-wide targets at the latest by the end of RP3.
- 14 The PRB concludes that the safety targets proposed by France should be approved.

#### 3.2 Assessment of the environment KPA

- 15 The targets for the environment key performance indicator adopted by France within the revised national performance plan are consistent with the reference values calculated by the Network Manager for each year of RP3 (Table 1).
- 16 The measures to achieve these targets defined within the national performance plan for France remain the same as those submitted

within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.

- 17 The implementation of the new 4-Flight ATM system (planned to be completed by 2025) is foreseen to enable enhanced free route airspace (FRA) implementation. Meanwhile initial FRA implementation in France took place at the end of 2021 in Brest ACC, Bordeaux ACC and Paris ACC.
- 18 France highlights that preliminary evaluations of the first implementation step (end 2021) shows that KEA should remain stable.
- 19 The PRB concludes that the environment targets proposed by France should be approved. However, the performance target for France was not achieved in 2021 (by 0.33 percentage points) and performance is currently behind the target for 2022.
- 20 The PRB will closely monitor performance of the environment KPI. The PRB encourages France to work with the Network Manager to achieve the targets for the environment KPA in the remaining years of RP3.

KEA	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values	n/a	2.92%	2.83%	2.83%	2.83%
National targets	3.33%	2.92%	2.83%	2.83%	2.83%

Table 1 – Environment reference values and targets for France.

### 3.4 Assessment of the capacity KPA

- 21 The targets for the capacity key performance indicator adopted by France within the revised national performance plan are consistent with the national reference values calculated by the Network Manager and are below the range of the delay forecast for each year between 2022 and 2024 (Table 2).<sup>7</sup>
- 22 France missed its capacity targets in 2020 and 2021, and looks likely to miss the capacity targets in 2022.
- 23 Capacity plans indicate a capacity gap in Bordeaux and Reims ACCs. Based on the latest information, Marseille and Paris ACCs are generating excess delays in 2022. In addition to previously observed capacity problems, France faces difficulties in implementing new ATM systems in its ACCs. These transition projects resulted in high delays in 2021 and 2022 and will likely continue to be a key driver behind delays for 2023 as well.
- 24 Measures proposed by France to improve capacity are in line with those of the NOP. The benefits of those measures will not be realised until the transition to the new ATM system is successfully carried out.
- 25 Based on the above information, there are inconsistencies in the performance plan between capacity profile plans, planned number of ATCO FTEs (full time equivalents), the proposed capacity enhancement measures, and the proposed national targets. France may not be able to achieve capacity targets without introducing additional measures, mitigating the impact of the system transitions and realising capacity gains from the new ATM systems.
- 26 The en route and terminal capacity incentive schemes proposed in the performance plan have a maximum penalty parameter set at 0.5% of determined costs, thus lacking a material impact on revenue.
- 27 The PRB concludes that the capacity targets proposed by France should be approved.
- 28 Due to the foreseen major capacity gaps and the network-wide effects associated with the planned transition projects in French ACCs, For this reason, the PRB will closely monitor performance of the capacity KPI.

ATFM delay per flight	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values (min/flight)	n/a	0.18	0.25	0.25	0.25
National targets (min/flight)	3.12	0.18	0.25	0.25	0.25

Table 2 – Capacity reference values and targets for France.

<sup>7</sup> Delay forecasts are provided by the European Network Operations Plan (NOP) 2022-2026 July 5 2022 Edition, and are calculated for ANSPs.

### 3.6 Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA

- 29 The en route and terminal cost-efficiency targets of France have not been revised and are equal to the revised FABEC draft performance plan submitted in July 2022 (and in November 2021).
- France is consistent with the RP3 Union-wide DUC trend (-0.4% against +1.0% RP3 Union-wide trend).
  - France is not consistent with the long-term Union-wide DUC trend. However, the difference is negligible therefore the trend can be considered consistent with the Union-wide one (-1.2% against -1.3% long-term Union-wide trend).
  - France's baseline is lower than, and thus is outperforming, the average DUC baseline of the comparator group (59.43€<sub>2017</sub>, -1.8% of the average of the comparator group).
  - France presents justifications for a deviation to achieve capacity targets. However, no deviation from cost-efficiency trends is identified.
- 30 The PRB concludes that the cost-efficiency targets proposed by France should be approved.

### 3.7 PRB recommendations

- 31 The PRB recommends the Commission to approve the revised performance plan of France.
- 32 For the environment KPA:
- France should ensure it implements all relevant projects outlined in the June 2021 ERNIP (European Route Network Improvement Plan).
- 33 For the capacity KPA:
- France should ensure that all capacity enhancement measures are properly implemented and are aligned with the reference values.
  - France should reduce and mitigate the significant impact of its transition projects on the ANSPs of neighbouring Member States and the airspace users by closely coordinating with the Network Manager.
  - France should align capacity profile plans, capacity enhancement measures and proposed capacity breakdown values.
  - France should revise the incentive schemes so that they have a material impact on the revenues.



## 4 GERMANY

### 4.1 Assessment of the safety KPA

- 34 The targets for the safety KPA submitted by Germany within the revised national performance plan and the related measures remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 35 Germany provided targets for the effectiveness of safety management for each year of RP3 and plan to achieve the Union-wide targets at the latest by the end of RP3.
- 36 The PRB concludes that the safety targets proposed by Germany should be approved.

### 4.2 Assessment of the environment KPA

- 37 The targets for the environment key performance indicator adopted by Germany within the revised national performance plan are consistent with the reference values calculated by the Network Manager for each year of RP3 (Table 3).

- 38 The measures to achieve these targets defined within the national performance plan for Germany remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 39 The PRB concludes that the environment targets proposed by Germany should be approved.
- 40 Germany achieved their target for the environment KPI in 2021. However, performance so far in 2022 suggests that the target for 2022 may not be achieved.
- 41 The PRB will closely monitor performance of the environment KPI. The PRB encourages Germany to work with the Network Manager to achieve the targets for the environment KPA in the remaining years of RP3.

KEA	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values	n/a	2.31%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%
National targets	2.37%	2.31%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%

Table 3 – Environment reference values and targets for Germany.

#### 4.4 Assessment of the capacity KPA

- 42 The targets for the capacity key performance indicator adopted by Germany within the revised national performance plan are consistent with the national reference values calculated by the Network Manager and are below the range of the delay forecast for each year between 2022 and 2024 (Table 4).<sup>8</sup>
- 43 Germany achieved its capacity targets in 2021. However, the average en route ATFM (Air Traffic Flow Management) delays per flight so far this year suggest that Germany is likely to miss their capacity target for 2022.
- 44 Capacity plans indicate a capacity gap in Bremen and Langen ACCs. Karlsruhe, Munich and Bremen ACCs are generating most of the excess delays during 2022. DFS is transitioning to new ATM systems in its ACCs between 2022 and 2025, which will likely cause additional delays in 2023 and 2024.
- 45 Measures proposed by Germany to improve capacity are in line with those of the NOP. However, it is not clear how the benefits of these measures will be impacted by the transition projects.
- 46 Based on the above information, there are inconsistencies in the performance plan between capacity profile plans, planned number of ATCO FTEs, the proposed capacity enhancement measures, and the proposed national targets. Germany may not be able to achieve their capacity targets without introducing additional measures and mitigating the impact of the system transitions.
- 47 The en route and terminal capacity incentive schemes proposed in the performance plan have the maximum penalty parameter set at 0.5% of determined costs, thus they do not have a material impact on revenue.
- 48 The PRB concludes that the capacity targets proposed by Germany should be approved.
- 49 Capacity plans and recent data for Bremen, Karlsruhe and Munich ACCs indicate that Germany may not be able to achieve the national capacity targets. For this reason, the PRB will closely monitor performance of the capacity KPI.

ATFM delay per flight	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values (min/flight)	n/a	0.22	0.27	0.27	0.27
National targets (min/flight)	3.45	0.22	0.27	0.27	0.27

Table 4 – Capacity reference values and targets for Germany.

<sup>8</sup> Delay forecasts are provided by the European Network Operations Plan (NOP) 2022-2026 July 5 2022 Edition, and are calculated for ANSPs.

#### 4.6 Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA

- 50 The cost-efficiency targets of Germany have not been revised and are equal to the revised FABEC draft performance plan submitted in July 2022 (and in November 2021).
- Germany is consistent with the RP3 Union-wide DUC trend (-2.4% against +1.0% RP3 Union-wide trend).
  - Germany is consistent with the long-term Union-wide DUC trend (-3.8% against -1.3% long-term Union-wide trend).
  - Germany's baseline is above, and thus worse than, the average DUC baseline of the comparator group (66.01€<sub>2017</sub>, +13.2% of the average of the comparator group).
  - Germany presents justifications for a deviation to achieve capacity targets. However, no deviation from cost-efficiency trends is identified.
- 51 The DFS pension adjustment should not have been included in the cost baseline. The proposed adjustment to the DFS pension costs relates to a payment 2020 onwards. Therefore, this should not be reflected in neither the 2014 nor the 2019 cost baseline. However, Germany

would achieve the cost-efficiency trends without such an adjustment.

- 52 The PRB concludes that the cost-efficiency targets proposed by Germany should be approved.

#### 4.7 PRB recommendations

- 53 The PRB recommends the Commission to approve the revised performance plan of Germany.
- 54 For the environment KPA:
- Germany should ensure it implements all relevant projects outlined in the June 2021 ERNIP.
- 55 For the capacity KPA:
- Germany should revise the incentive schemes so that they have a material impact on revenue.
  - Germany should ensure that all capacity enhancement measures are properly implemented and sufficient capacity is available to meet traffic demand.

## 5 THE NETHERLANDS

### 5.1 Assessment of the safety KPA

- 56 The targets for the safety KPA submitted by the Netherlands within the revised national performance plan and the related measures remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 57 The Netherlands provided targets for the effectiveness of safety management for each year of RP3 and plan to achieve the Union-wide targets at the latest by the end of RP3.
- 58 The PRB concludes that the safety targets proposed by the Netherlands should be approved.

### 5.2 Assessment of the environment KPA

- 59 The targets for the environment key performance indicator adopted by the Netherlands within the revised national performance plan are consistent with the reference values calculated by the Network Manager for each year of RP3 (Table 5).
- 60 The measures to achieve these targets defined within the national performance plan for the Netherlands remain largely the same as those

submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.

- 61 The main difference is that the performance plan notes is a project which has been completed in 2022 allowing a better traffic distribution between two sector groups.
- 62 The PRB concludes that the environment targets proposed by the Netherlands should be approved.
- 63 The performance target for the Netherlands was not achieved in 2021 (by 0.10 percentage points). The indicator is currently at 3.04% for 2022, which suggests the target for 2022 may not be achieved either.
- 64 The PRB will closely monitor performance of the environment KPI. The PRB encourages the Netherlands to work with the Network Manager to achieve the targets for the environment KPA in the remaining years of RP3.

KEA	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values	n/a	2.63%	2.62%	2.62%	2.62%
National targets	2.63%	2.63%	2.62%	2.62%	2.62%

Table 5 – Environment reference values and targets for the Netherlands.

#### 5.4 Assessment of the capacity KPA

- 65 The targets for the capacity key performance indicator adopted by the Netherlands in the revised national performance plan are consistent with the national reference values calculated by the Network Manager. They are consistent with the delay forecast for each year between 2022 and 2024 (Table 6).<sup>9</sup>
- 66 Average en route ATFM delay in the Netherlands was lower than the national reference value in 2021, and the national target for 2022 is also likely to be met by the Netherlands.
- 67 Capacity plans indicate that both Amsterdam and Maastricht ACCs are going to have sufficient capacity during RP3. LVNL is planning to transition to a new ATM system in Amsterdam ACC. During the transition, capacity constraints may be experienced. Delay above the target is not foreseen.
- 68 Measures proposed by the Netherlands to improve capacity to match forecasted traffic demand are in line with those of the NOP.
- 69 The en route and terminal capacity incentive schemes proposed in the performance plan have the maximum penalty parameter set at 0.5% of determined costs, lacking a material impact on revenue.
- 70 The PRB concludes that the capacity targets proposed by the Netherlands should be approved.

ATFM delay per flight	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values (min/flight)	n/a	n/a	0.14	0.14	0.14
National targets (min/flight)	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14

Table 6 – Capacity reference values and targets for the Netherlands.

<sup>9</sup> Delay forecasts are provided by the European Network Operations Plan (NOP) 2022-2026 July 5 2022 Edition, and are calculated for ANSPs.

## 5.6 Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA

- 71 The cost-efficiency targets of the Netherlands have not been revised and are equal to the revised FABEC draft performance plan submitted in July 2022.
- The Netherlands is consistent with the RP3 Union-wide DUC trend (+0.7% against +1.0% RP3 Union-wide trend).
  - The Netherlands is not consistent with the long-term Union-wide DUC trend (+0.7% against -1.3% long-term Union-wide trend).
  - The Netherlands' baseline is lower than, and thus is outperforming, the average DUC baseline of the comparator group (69.56€<sub>2017</sub>, -10.9% of the average of the comparator group).

- The Netherlands presents justifications for a deviation to achieve capacity targets. However, no deviation from cost-efficiency trends is identified.

- 72 The PRB concludes that the cost-efficiency targets proposed by The Netherlands should be approved.

## 5.7 PRB recommendations

- 73 The PRB recommends the Commission to approve the revised performance plan of the Netherlands.

- 74 For the capacity KPA:

- The Netherlands should revise the incentive schemes so that they have a material impact on revenue.

## 6 SWITZERLAND

### 6.1 Assessment of the safety KPA

- 75 The targets for the safety KPA submitted by Switzerland within the revised national performance plan and the related measures remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 76 Switzerland provided targets for the effectiveness of safety management for each year of RP3 and plan to achieve the Union-wide targets at the latest by the end of RP3.
- 77 The PRB concludes that the safety targets proposed by Switzerland should be approved.

### 6.2 Assessment of the environment KPA

- 78 The targets for the environment key performance indicator adopted by Switzerland in the revised national performance plan are consistent with the reference values calculated by the Network Manager for each year of RP3 (Table 7).

- 79 The measures to achieve these targets defined in the national performance plan for Switzerland remain the same as those submitted within the previous revised FABEC draft performance plan of July 2022.
- 80 In 2021, Switzerland out-performed the target for the environment KPI (by 0.08 percentage points). Performance so far in 2022 suggests that the target for 2022 may not be achieved.
- 81 The PRB concludes that the environment targets proposed by Switzerland should be approved.
- 82 The PRB will closely monitor performance of the environment KPI. The PRB encourages Switzerland to work with the Network Manager to achieve the targets for the environment KPA in the remaining years of RP3.

KEA	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values	n/a	3.95%	3.95%	3.95%	3.95%
National targets	4.78%	3.95%	3.95%	3.95%	3.95%

Table 7 – Environment reference values and targets for Switzerland.

#### 6.4 Assessment of the capacity KPA

- 83 The targets for the capacity key performance indicator adopted by Switzerland in the revised national performance plan are consistent with the national reference values calculated by the Network Manager and are consistent with the delay forecast for each year between 2022 and 2024 (Table 8).<sup>10</sup>
- 84 Average en route ATFM delays in Switzerland were lower than the national reference values in 2021. In 2022 Switzerland may not achieve the national capacity targets due to delays accumulated in the first ten months of the year. A large share of the en route ATFM delays were reported to have been caused by adverse weather in 2022.
- 85 Despite the weather-related delays in 2022, capacity plans indicate that both Geneva and Zurich ACCs should have a capacity surplus during RP3.
- 86 Measures proposed by Switzerland to improve capacity to meet forecasted traffic demand are in line with those of the NOP. Switzerland plans an overall decrease in the number of ATCOs (air traffic controllers) in OPS FTEs during RP3.
- 87 The performance plan notes that these plans will be adapted based on traffic development, however failure to recruit and train ATCOs to maintain and improve capacity may jeopardise the capacity performance of later years.
- 88 The en route and terminal capacity incentive schemes proposed in the performance plan have the maximum penalty parameter set at 0.5% of determined costs, thus they do not have a material impact on revenue.
- 89 Switzerland proposes a trigger mechanism to the terminal capacity incentive scheme, which limits the application of financial penalties and bonuses: A penalty is only due if average airport arrival ATFM delay is over 1.94 minutes per flight, and a bonus is only due if average airport arrival ATFM delay is below 1.94 minutes per flight. This weights the incentive scheme towards a bonus-only outcome given that such high delays are unlikely to occur in Switzerland during RP3, based on historical performance and the current traffic forecast.
- 90 The PRB concludes that the capacity targets proposed by Switzerland should be approved.

ATFM delay per flight	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
National reference values (min/flight)	n/a	0.12	0.19	0.19	0.19
National targets (min/flight)	0.47	0.12	0.19	0.19	0.19

Table 8 – Capacity reference values and targets for Switzerland.

<sup>10</sup> Delay forecasts are provided by the European Network Operations Plan (NOP) 2022-2026 July 5 2022 Edition, and are calculated for AN-SPs.



## 6.5 Assessment of the cost-efficiency KPA

- 91 The cost-efficiency targets of Switzerland have not been revised and are equal to the revised FABEC draft performance plan submitted in July 2022.
- Switzerland is consistent with the RP3 Union-wide DUC trend (-0.5% against +1.0% RP3 Union-wide trend).
  - Switzerland is not consistent with the long-term Union-wide DUC trend. However, the difference is negligible. Therefore, the trend can be considered consistent with the Union-wide one (-1.2% against -1.3% long-term Union-wide trend).
  - Switzerland's baseline is above, and thus worse than, the average DUC baseline of the comparator group (87.82€<sub>2017</sub>, +22.0% of the average of the comparator group).
- 92 Switzerland should detail the changes in the cost allocation and should ensure that the overspent determined costs related to the RP2 investments are not recovered during RP3.
- 93 The PRB concludes that the cost-efficiency targets proposed by Switzerland should be approved.

## 6.6 PRB recommendations

- 94 The PRB recommends the Commission to approve the revised performance plan of Switzerland.

95 For the environment KPA:

- Switzerland should ensure it implements all relevant projects outlined in the June 2021 ERNIP.

96 For the capacity KPA:

- Switzerland should revise the incentive schemes so that they have a material impact on revenue.
- Switzerland should ensure that the terminal capacity incentive scheme does not include a trigger mechanism which renders the incentive scheme a bonus only scheme, and that the terminal incentive scheme is compliant with Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317.

97 For the cost-efficiency KPA:

- Switzerland should detail the changes in the cost allocation and should ensure that the overspent determined costs related to the RP2 investments are not recovered during RP3.

## 7 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- 98 Table 9 presents a summary of the PRB’s assessment of the revised national performance plans submitted by France, Germany, The Netherlands, and Switzerland. Elements of the revised performance plans the PRB recommends being approved but with close monitoring during RP3 are highlighted with an orange symbol.
- 99 These revised performance plans are consistent with the Union-wide targets, but the measures or performance so far in RP3 indicate that they might not deliver.
- 100 Approximately 60% of flights enter the airspace covered by the four performance plans of France, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland. If the capacity and environment targets are not achieved at local level then the PRB anticipates there will be a network impact. The ANSPs must work closely with the NM (Network Manager) to achieve the local performance targets and to avoid the network impacts that were observed in 2018 and 2019.

Performance plan	Overall assessment	Recommendation per KPA			
		SAF	ENV	CAP	CEF
France	✓	✓	✓ (!)	✓ (!)	✓
Germany	✓	✓	✓ (!)	✓ (!)	✓
The Netherlands	✓	✓	✓ (!)	✓ (!)	✓
Switzerland	✓	✓	✓ (!)	✓ (!)	✓

Table 9 – Summary of the PRB assessment across the KPAs.