

FAB Performance Plan

FAB CE

Second Reference Period (2015-2019)

Signatories

Performance plan details	
FAB Name	FAB CE
Version number	Version 0.5
Date of issue	08/04/2014
Date of adoption	

Member State	Name, title and signature of representative
Austria	Franz Nirschl, Director Safety and ANS, Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology
Croatia	Dinko Staničić, Director of Civil Aviation Sector, Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Transport and Infrastructure
Czech Republic	Vítězslav Hezký, Flight Standards Division Director, Civil Aviation Authority
Hungary	Gyula Győri, DGCA, Ministry for National Development
Slovakia	Radmila Valíčková, DGCA, Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development
Slovenia	Alojz Krapez, Head of Aviation Division, Ministry of infrastructure and spatial planning

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

Table of Content

STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE

MAPPING BETWEEN THE TEMPLATE FOR THE FAB PERFORMANCE PLAN AND ANNEX II OF THE PERFORMANCE REGULATION

SIGNATORIES

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 THE SITUATION
- 1.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE MACROECONOMIC SCENARIO INCLUDING OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS
- 1.3 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION
- 1.4 ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE NETWORK STRATEGY PLAN AT FAB LEVEL AND OTHER GUIDING PRINCIPLES
- 1.5 LIST OF AIRPORTS FOR RP2

2 INVESTMENT

3 PERFORMANCE TARGETS AT LOCAL LEVEL

- 3.1 KEY PERFORMANCE AREAS
 - 3.1.(a) *Safety*
 - 3.1.(a).(i) Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management
 - 3.1.(a).(ii) Safety KPI #2: Application of the severity classification based on the Risk Analysis Tool (RAT) methodology
 - 3.1.(a).(iii) Safety KPI #3: Just Culture
 - 3.1.(a).(iv) Optional section - Additional Safety KPI(s)
 - 3.1.(b) *Environment*
 - 3.1.(b).(i) Description of the process to improve route design
 - 3.1.(b).(ii) Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en route flight efficiency (KEA)
 - 3.1.(b).(iii) Optional section - Additional Environment KPI(s)
 - 3.1.(c) *Capacity*
 - 3.1.(c).(i) Capacity KPI #1: En route ATFM delay per flight
 - 3.1.(c).(ii) Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight
 - 3.1.(c).(iii) Capacity plans
 - 3.1.(c).(iv) Optional section - Additional Capacity KPI(s)
 - 3.1.(d) *Cost-efficiency*
 - 3.1.(d).(1) Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS
 - 3.1.(d).(2) Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS aggregated at FAB level
 - 3.1.(d).(3) Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS
 - 3.1.(d).(4) Optional section - Additional Cost-Efficiency KPI(s)
- 3.2 CONSISTENCY WITH UNION-WIDE TARGETS
- 3.3 INTERDEPENDENCIES AND TRADE-OFFS
- 3.4 CONTRIBUTION OF EACH ANSP

4 INCENTIVE SCHEMES

- 4.1 ENVIRONMENT
- 4.1 CAPACITY
- 4.1 COST-EFFICIENCY

5 MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN

- ADDITIONAL (KEY) PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (AND TARGETS)

6 ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE PLAN

- 6.1 ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY
- 6.2 COMPARISON WITH RP1

7 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN

8 ANNEXES

- ANNEX A. PUBLIC CONSULTATION MATERIAL
- ANNEX B. RELEVANT DOCUMENTATION IN LINE WITH THE NSP
- ANNEX C. REPORTING TABLES
- ANNEX D. ANSPS INVESTMENT PLANS
- ANNEX E. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR SECTION 3.1.(d) – Cost-efficiency:

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
 - A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.
2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:
 - The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
 - The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

A detailed list of the information to be provided in the body of the performance plan and Annex C will be found in Paragraph 3.1(d) below, showing that duplication has been avoided and workload reduced to the minimum required by the performance and charging Regulations.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

The table below shows the correspondence between Annex II of EU Regulation 390/2013 and the Performance Plan template with its Annexes.

Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
1. INTRODUCTION	1			
1.1. Description of the situation (scope of the plan, list of air navigation service providers covered, etc.).	1.1.			
1.2. Description of the macroeconomic scenario for the reference period including overall assumptions (traffic forecast, etc.)	1.2.			
1.3. Description of the outcome of the stakeholder consultation in order to prepare the performance plan and the agreed compromises as well as the points of disagreement and the reasons for disagreement.	1.3.			Annex A
1.4. Description of the actions taken by air navigation service providers to implement the Network Strategy Plan at functional airspace block level and other guiding principles for the operation of the functional airspace block in the long term perspective..	1.4.			Annex B

1.5. List of airports submitted to the performance scheme in application of Article 1 of the Regulation, with their average number of IFR air transport movements.	1.5.			
1.6. List of exempted airports pursuant to Article 1(5) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 together with their average number of IFR air transport movements.				
2. INVESTMENT	2			Annex D
2.1. Description and justification of the cost, nature and contribution to achieving the performance targets of investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of existing ATM systems, including their relevance and coherence with the European ATM Master Plan, the common projects referred to in Article 15a of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004, and, as appropriate, the Network Strategy Plan.				
2.2. The description and justification referred to in point 2.1 shall in particular:				
(i) relate the amount of the investments, for which description and justification is given following point 2.1, to the total amount of investments;				
(ii) differentiate between investments in new systems, overhaul of existing systems and replacement investments;				
(iii) refer each investment in new ATM systems and major overhaul of existing ATM systems to the European ATM Master Plan, the common projects referred to in Article 15a of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004, and, as appropriate, the Network Strategy Plan;				
(iv) detail the synergies achieved at functional airspace block level or, if appropriate, with other Member States or functional airspace blocks, in particular in terms of common infrastructure and common procurement;				
(v) detail the benefits expected from these investments in terms of performance across the four key performance areas, allocating them between the en route and terminal/airport phases of flight, and the date as from which benefits are expected;				
(vi) provide information on the decision-making process underpinning the investment, such as the existence of a documented cost-benefit analysis, the holding of user consultation, its results and any dissenting views expressed.				
3. PERFORMANCE TARGETS AT LOCAL LEVEL	3			
3.1. Performance targets in each key performance area, set by reference to each key performance indicator as set out in Annex I, Section 2, for the entire reference period, with annual values to be used for monitoring and incentive purposes:	3.1			
(a) Safety	3.1.(a)			

(i) level of effectiveness of safety management: local targets for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(a).(i)			
(ii) application of the severity classification based on the Risk Analysis Tool (RAT) methodology: local targets for each year of the reference period (percentage);	3.1.(a).(ii)			
(iii) just culture: local targets for the last year of the reference period.	3.1.(a).(iii)			
	3.1.(a).(iv) - Optional section - Additional Safety KPI(s)			
(b) Environment	3.1.(b)			
(i) description of the process to improve route design;	3.1.(b).(i) & (ii)			
(ii) average horizontal <i>en route</i> flight efficiency of the actual trajectory.				
	3.1.(b).(iii) - Optional section - Additional Environment KPI(s)			
(c) Capacity	3.1.(c)			
(i) minutes of average <i>en route</i> ATFM delay per flight;	3.1.(c).(i)			
(ii) minutes of average terminal ATFM arrival delay per flight;	3.1.(c).(ii)			
(iii) the capacity plan established by the air navigation service provider(s).	3.1.(c).(iii)			
	3.1.(c).(iv) - Optional section - Additional Capacity KPI(s)			
(d) Cost-efficiency	3.1.(d)			
(i) determined costs for <i>en route</i> and terminal air navigation services set in accordance with the provisions of Article 15(2)(a) and (b) of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 and in application of the provisions of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A			
(ii) <i>en route</i> and terminal service units forecast for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A 3.1.(d).1.C 3.1.(d).2.C	RT 1 (5.4)		
(iii) as a result, the determined unit costs for the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A	RT 1 (5.5)		
(iv) description and justification of the return on equity of the air navigation service providers concerned, as well as on the gearing ratio and on the level/composition of the asset base used to calculate the cost of capital comprised in the determined costs;		RT 1 (3.1-3.4, 3.6)	AI 1 e)	
(v) description and explanation of the carry-overs from the years preceding the reference period;		RT 1 (3.1-3.4, 3.6)	AI 3 c), d), e)	
(vi) description of economic assumptions, including:	3.1.(d).1.B	RT 1 (5.1-5.2)		

— inflation assumptions used in the plan as compared to an international source such as the IMF (International Monetary Fund) Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the forecasts and Eurostat Harmonised Index of Consumer Price for the actuals. Justification of any deviation from these sources,	3.1.(d).2.B			
— assumptions underlying the calculation of pension costs comprised in the determined costs, including a description on the relevant national pension regulations and pension accounting regulations in place and on which the assumptions are based, as well as information whether changes of these regulations are anticipated,			AI 4 b)	
— interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services, including relevant information on loans (amounts, duration, etc.) and explanation for the (weighted) average interest on debt used to calculate the cost of capital pre tax rate and the cost of capital comprised in the determined costs,		RT 1 (3.7)	AI 4 c)	
— adjustments beyond the provisions of the International Accounting Standards;			AI 1 Item c)	
(vii) if applicable, description in respect to the previous reference period of relevant events and circumstances set out in Article 14(2)(a) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 using the criteria set out in Article 14(2)(b) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 including an assessment of the level, composition and justification of costs exempt from the application of Article 14(1)(a) and (b) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013;		RT 3 (3.1-3.12)	AI 3 b)	
(viii) if applicable, a description of any significant restructuring planned during the reference period including the level of restructuring costs and a justification for these costs in relation to the net benefits to the airspace users over time;		RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 d)	
(ix) if applicable, restructuring costs approved from previous reference periods to be recovered.		RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 e)	
3.2. Description and explanation of the consistency of the performance targets with the relevant Union-wide performance targets. When there is no Union-wide performance target, description and explanation of the targets within the plan and how they contribute to the improvement of the performance of the European ATM network.	3.1.(a).(i) 3.1.(a). (ii) 3.1.(a). (iii) 3.1.(a). (iv) 3.1.(b).(i) & (ii) 3.1.(b).(iii) 3.1.(c).(i) 3.1.(c).(ii) 3.1.(c).(iii) 3.1.(c).(iv) 3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A	RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 e)	
3.3. Description and explanation of the interdependencies and trade-offs between the key performance areas, including the assumptions used to assess the trade-offs.	3.3			

3.4. Contribution of each air navigation service provider concerned to the achievement of the performance targets set for the functional airspace block in accordance with Article 5(2)(c)(ii).	3.1.(a).(i) 3.1.(a). (ii) 3.1.(a). (iii) 3.1.(a). (iv) 3.1.(b).(i) & (ii) 3.1.(b).(iii) 3.1.(c).(i) 3.1.(c).(ii) 3.1.(c).(iii) 3.1.(c).(iv)	RT 1 (All)	AI 4 a)	
4. INCENTIVE SCHEMES	4			
4.1. Description and explanation of the incentive schemes to be applied on air navigation service providers.	4.1			
5. MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN	5			
Description of the civil-military dimension of the plan describing the performance of FUA application in order to increase capacity with due regard to military mission effectiveness, and if deemed appropriate, relevant performance indicators and targets consistent with the indicators and targets of the performance plan.				
6. ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE PLAN	6			
6.1. Sensitivity to external assumptions.	6.1			
6.2. Comparison with previous performance plan.	6.2			
7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN	7			
Description of the measures put in place by the national supervisory authorities to achieve the performance targets, such as:				
(i) monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the ANS safety programmes and business plans are implemented;				
(ii) measures to monitor and report on the implementation of the performance plans including how to address the situation if targets are not reached during the reference period.				

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
1. INTRODUCTION	1			
1.1. Description of the situation (scope of the plan, list of air navigation service providers covered, etc.).	1.1.			
1.2. Description of the macroeconomic scenario for the reference period including overall assumptions (traffic forecast, etc.)	1.2.			
1.3. Description of the outcome of the stakeholder consultation in order to prepare the performance plan and the agreed compromises as well as the points of disagreement and the reasons for disagreement.	1.3.			Annex A
1.4. Description of the actions taken by air navigation service providers to implement the Network Strategy Plan at functional airspace block level and other guiding principles for the operation of the functional airspace block in the long term perspective..	1.4.			Annex B
1.5. List of airports submitted to the performance scheme in application of Article 1 of the Regulation, with their average number of IFR air transport movements.	1.5.			
1.6. List of exempted airports pursuant to Article 1(5) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 together with their average number of IFR air transport movements.				

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 - The situation

NSAs responsible for drawing up the Performance Plan	All FAB CE NSAs as listed below via their participation in the NSA CC working group called Performance Review Working Group
NSA responsible for the coordination within the FAB	FPB (FAB CE Performance Body) was established on 30.1.2013 and notified to the European Commission and PRB by letter dated 21. October 2013
List of accountable entities	Austria: • NSA Austria, Radetzkystraße 2, A- 1030 Vienna, Austria • Austro Control GmbH, Schnirchgasse 11, A-1030 Vienna, Austria Croatia: • CCAA - Croatian Civil Aviation Agency, Ulica grada Vukovara 284, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia • Croatia Control, Rudolfa Fizira 2, Velika Gorica, Croatia • National Protection and Rescue Directorate, Nehajska 5, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia Czech Republic: • Civil Aviation Authority, Ruzyně Airport, 160 08 Praha 6, Czech Republic • ANS CR, Navigační 787, 252 61 Jeneč, Czech Republic • Czech Hydrometeorological Institute (CHMI), Na Šabatce 17, 143 06, Praha, Czech Republic Hungary: • National Transport Authority (AA/NSA), Lincoln út 1, H-2220 VECSÉS, Hungary • HungaroControl, Igló utca 33-35, H-1185 Budapest, Hungary Slovak Republic: • Transport Authority, Letisko M.R.Štefánika, 823 05 Bratislava, Slovak Republic • LPS SR, Ivanská cesta 93, 823 07 Bratislava 216, Slovak Republic • Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute, Jeséniova 17, 833 15 Bratislava, Slovak Republic Slovenia • Civil Aviation Agency (CAA), Kotnikova 19a, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia • Slovenia Control, Zgornji Brnik 130n, SI – 4210 Brnik – aerodrom, Slovenia • Slovenian Environment Agency, Vojkova 1b, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
Geographical scope	The geographical scope and lateral/vertical extensions of FAB CE are laid down in the existing FAB Agreement. For operational reasons, ATS Units (ACCs) are seen as capacity and service provision entities. Wherever considered useful, also major TMAs are reflected. Therefore, the present FAB CE Network Operations Plan (FNOP) 2014 encompasses the Areas of Responsibility of the following ACCs and their major TMAs as laid down in the Letters of Agreement: • ACC Bratislava; • ACC Budapest; • ACC Ljubljana; • ACC Praha; • ACC Sarajevo / Banja Luka; • ACC Vienna; • ACC Zagreb.
Additional comments	

1.2 - Description of the macroeconomic scenario including overall assumptions

Austria, Slovenia, Czech Republic and Slovakia have chosen the Service Unit forecast according to STATFOR EUROCONTROL Seven-Year Forecast February 2014 base scenario, while Hungary and Croatia have chosen the low scenario.

Following this approach other economic indicators (especially inflation) have been taken from IMF World Economic Outlook October 2013, allowing for a harmonized European planning process (data is only available until 2018).

From April 2014 HungaroControl will provide air navigation services in the upper airspace over Kosovo. Based on the mandate of HungaroControl the service provision will last until the first quarter of 2019. After the start of the service provision Hungary will record the recovered costs (e.g. part of ATCO staff cost) as 'other revenues' in the Hungarian cost base to avoid double charging. KFOR sector will be part of Serbia-Montenegro-KFOR charging zone.

According to the multilaterally accepted latest version of BHATM transition plan, BiH ANS Authorities shall take over ATS service provision over a part of the BiH airspace, previously delegated to CCL, starting from October 2014. During the transition, BiH ANS Authorities shall take over ATS service provision over airspace where the delegated ATS service provision have been provided so far by CCL and SMATSA within the BiH airspace. This ATS service provision transition will inevitably result in a change of the current airspace configuration, raising the level of uncertainties in traffic and performance indicators development, having a significant impact on overall CCL's business performance.

Furthermore, for the purpose of this Performance Plan, total en-route determined cost of Croatia includes en-route costs related to delegated ATS service provision within the part of BiH airspace. Potential revenues from these operations will be presented as Other Income, to avoid double counting/charging of revenues /costs.

1.3 - Stakeholder consultation

Number of Meetings	5
--------------------	---

Meeting #1	
Name of meeting	Initial RP2 orientation meeting with PRB/EC
Date	20.6.2013
Type of event	Meeting in Brussels
Level	Union
Stakeholders	PRB, PRU, EC, FAB CE
Deadline for responses	n/a
Main issues	Clarification of legal issues concerning the scope of PP
Actions agreed upon	Proceed with close cooperation FAB / PRB
Points of disagreement and reasons	none
Additional comments	n/a

Meeting #2	
Name of meeting	Consultation meeting with FAB UK-Ireland
Date	13.11.2013
Type of event	Meeting with Ireland FAB representatives
Level	Union
Stakeholders	IAA Ireland, PRB, PRU, FAB CE bodies
Deadline for responses	n/a
Main issues	Flexible sectorisation, Free Route Airspace
Actions agreed upon	Ireland to provide additional data on request
Points of disagreement and reasons	none
Additional comments	none

Meeting #3	
Name of meeting	PP clarifications - template
Date	13.11.2013
Type of event	
Level	Union
Stakeholders	Meeting with PRB/PRU
Deadline for responses	n/a
Main issues	Various questions in regard to the performance plan template
Actions agreed upon	PRB/PRU to provide answers in writing
Points of disagreement and reasons	none
Additional comments	none

Meeting #4	
Name of meeting	Initial user views on RP2
Date	21.11.2013
Type of event	Meeting in Vienna
Level	National
Stakeholders	NSA Austria, ACG, IATA, local airlines, PRB, MoT, FAB (B&H)
Deadline for responses	
Main issues	Traffic development, FRAW locally and in FAB CE
Actions agreed upon	none
Points of disagreement and reasons	none
Additional comments	none

Meeting #5	
Name of meeting	RP2 Stakeholder Consultation
Date	29.4.2014
Type of event	Meeting in Prague
Level	Union
Stakeholders	Note: Focal Point: Vítězslav Hezký A list of concrete names of national stakeholders with email addresses for each State was delivered to Mr. Vítězslav Hezký (Focal point responsible for this FAB CE stakeholder consultation). Updated list will be introduced on the basis of meeting attendance list. Task dedicated to PRWG members until 6 May 2014
Deadline for responses	02/05/2014

Main issues	TBD
Actions agreed upon	TBD
Points of disagreement and reasons	TBD
Additional comments	TBD

1.4 - Actions to implement the Network Strategy Plan at FAB level, and other guiding principles for the operation of the FAB in the long-term perspective

Number of Actions	8
-------------------	---

<i>FAB CE Airspace and route structure planning</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	The FAB CE Airspace and route structure planning involve rolling processes so the plans are updated annually as required				
Description	En-route airspace and route structure is planned and coordinated at a FAB level according to the predicted traffic demand and documented in the FAB CE Network Operations Plan (FNOP) and Airspace Plan. These are updated on a rolling yearly basis and coordinated with the overall European NOP (in coordination with Eurocontrol). Development and maintenance of the FNOP (edition 20.14 is the latest available version) -including capacity planning calendar - in line with the European performance scheme, satisfying FAB CE operational needs. The FNOP includes and considers ANSP strategic operational planning issues, State strategic operational planning (Performance Plans) and its coordination and validation. The FAB CE Airspace Plan defines the sector groups associated with the operational concept. The sector configuration is determined as part of the shared FNOP coordinated with the European NOP.				
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO1 - Manage performance through 'Network-minded' decision making NSP-SO4 - Plan optimum capacity and flight efficiency; Maintain focus on planning improvements with view to the proper delivery of en-route and airport capacity				
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	The FAB CE Airspace and route structure planning is an essential enabler for the benefits described under 'Free Route Airspace' action				
Additional comments					

<i>Free Route Airspace</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	Q1/2015: HUNGARY planning FRA step 2 H24, based on (directional) entry / exit points from lowest usable FL to UNL Q1 2015: CROATIA planning step2 H24 x-border DCTs from FL285/325+ Q4 2015: AUSTRIA planning step 2 H24 x-border DCTs from FL165+	Q1 2016: BHANSA Step 2 FL 285/325 03/2016: AUSTRIA FRAW FL165+, x-border ops FAB CE wide wherever feasible, (considerations to withdraw partially ATS routes) Q4 2016: SLOVENIA planning step 2 H24 enhanced x-border Q4 2016: SLOVAKIA planning step 2 H24, national DCTs FL245+	based on previous experiences of FRA applications in terms of capacity and performance - stepwise increase of FABCE wide cross border FRA applications	based on previous experiences of FRA applications in terms of capacity and performance - stepwise increase of FABCE wide cross border FRA applications Q4 2018: CZECH REPUBLIC planning step 2 H24, DCTs / FRA	Full FABCE wide cross border application of DCT / FRA H24 Step 2d

Description	The Free Route Airspace initiative is organized into 3 main steps: Step 1: Time limited implementation of FRA/direct connections in a defined airspace - o Extended night - o Extension of current night network and/or creation of new direct connections • Specific days during the week (week-end...) • Cross border when possible between ATC units within FAB CE or with adjacent FABs • FAB CE wide • All combinations of the above cases can be envisaged. Step 2: Implementation of FRA direct connections in a defined airspace H24/7 • Step 2.a. FRA DCT within ATC units • Step 2 b. FRA within ATC Units (based on conditional entry/exit points) • Step 2.c. FRA / DCT Cross border when possible between ATC units within FABCE or with adjacent FABs • Step 2.d. FRA / DCT FABCE wide Step 3: FABCE cross border FRA (based on conditional entry/exit points) according to EU regulation
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO3 - Implement a de-fragmented and flexible airspace enabling Free Routes: The FAB CE FRA Project is in line with the Strategic Objective 03 and its details of defined actions can be found in the current NM ERNIP and FABCE Airspace Plan (NB: implementation dates can vary, dependent on actual technical and operational conditions).
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	Through a FAB approach to airspace planning, including route improvements and the planned implementation of free route airspace, it was estimated that flight efficiency improvements delivered over the RP2 period would result in shortening of flown routes growing to 15 million km saved per annum by 2019 (compared to the reference scenario of March 2013). The cost saving for users would increase up to around €77m per annum by 2019. Consequent savings of CO2 emissions were estimated at 172 kilotonnes per annum by 2019.
Additional comments	

Advanced Airspace Management	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	Rolling ASM/ATFCM process	STAM Phase I			
Description	FAB CE is on the way towards the implementation of an Advanced Flexible Use of Airspace by implementing an improved ASM/ATFCM process and CIAM phase I and II. STAM Phase I will be implemented by 2016, • the automatic generation of AFP messages will be completed by the end of 2014, • the rolling ASM/ATFCM process will be introduced by 2015, • the integration of the military users to EAD will be completed by the end of 2014.				
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO3/2 - Implement Advanced Flexible Use of Airspace				
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	The ASM operational procedures will consider the Enhanced Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA) between civil and military users to provide the utmost balanced solution between their corresponding requirements and minimise the use and effect of permanently segregated airspace. The integrated ASM/ATFCM operational procedures should involve the various actors, and the collaborative decision-making process should apply from the strategic phase to the execution phase. The harmonised application of Short Term ATFCM Measures (STAM) will be implemented in FAB CE states in order to provide real time corrections of local demand and capacity imbalances whilst maintaining stability in sector occupancy across the FAB CE network.				
Additional comments					

Airport CDM	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	See the description for the dates				

Description	A-CDM Integration into network operations on a firm basis foreseen for following FABCE airports between 2014 and 2016: Vienna, Prague, Zagreb and Budapest as follows: LOWW: The objective is planned for stepwise completion according to A-CDM project plan by mid of 2014. Departure Planning Information message implementation is planned by end 2014 LKPR: Airport CDM at Praha/Ruzyně launched in October 2009; Target Off-Block Time is provided by ground handler. Target Start-up Approval Time procedure, DEP sequencing and CDM De-icing procedures launched in September 2011. Flight Update Message/Departure Planning Information message expected in 2014. LDZA: Zagreb intent is to start improving information sharing within existing systems and local specific environment. LHBP: The CDM project has been restarted at Budapest Airport in September 2010. Budapest Airport is the leading party, HungaroControl and EUROCONTROL have initiated work to put in place CDM. The modifications of the existing LoAs with all CDM stakeholders (handling agents, AOC, ATC Airport) are in progress and local procedures for turnaround processes planned to be defined in accordance with the CDM guidelines will be implemented till 12/2015.
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO6 - Implement full Airport CDM at the 42 largest European airports by 2019
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	Capacity improvements contributing to ATM network performance are resulting from the A-CDM project, PRNAV and CDO operations plus early alignment with the application of WTC re-categorization at Vienna Airport.
Additional comments	

<i>Concept of Seamless Operations</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	The project includes many elements				
Description	In line with the FAB CE Concept for Seamless Operations (CSO) an effective coordination along the complete seamless trajectory is foreseen with due regard to all relevant downstream and upstream effects. All interventions on the seamless trajectory are coordinated with a view to keeping disruptions to the trajectory to a minimum. This principle is based on identical, shared trajectory information provided in the flight plan and updates thereto, and will include a close coordination with the NM. At the present this future oriented concept is being discussed within FAB CE as to when its various modules can deliver benefits and should be set up for a validation.				
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO5 - Facilitate business trajectories by cooperative traffic management NSP-SO10 - Prepare for RP3 and beyond				
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	Seamless Operations are expected to bring the following quantifiable benefits: • Reduced fuel burn; • Reduced environmental impact (noise and emissions); • In the longer term, airport capacity increase; • Reduction of controller workload; • Full exploitation of the benefits from free-route operations applied also to arriving and departing traffic; • Credit for a safety benefit can be claimed resulting from the fact that aircraft will be flying predictable trajectories which reduces cockpit workload and the risk of misunderstandings. A range of qualitative benefits is also foreseen. For example, handling of traffic on continuous descent and climb trajectories requires a limited paradigm change in the air traffic control service. This is an evolutionary step that streamlines certain elements of the control process without fundamentally altering the approach to separating aircraft. This creates a frame in which new and advanced concepts may be introduced more easily.				
Additional comments					

<i>Optimisation of CNS resources</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation		Initial benefits	Initial common procurement		Full scope of accumulated benefits

Description	"Optimisation of CNS-resources" action is provided by three major activities: 1.) by activities "CNS-cost containment work", initiated by from Steering committee C15_SC#12 and H4_SC#16 • sharing and editing technical specifications, had been started in 2013 • defining requirements for "sharing data" and "sharing spare parts" between FAB-partners, had been started in 2013 • sharing procurement documents (e.g. DMEs in 2013, but with no result so far) • setting up a common procurement project in 2014 for VHF-radios • common CNS strategies, with the final goal in optimising the ANSPs' investment programs 2.) by carrying out specific activities inside technical projects • Project P5: Harmonized modernisation of telecommunication networks including existing and future PENS • Project P6: Harmonized allocation of radio frequencies and usage of radio infrastructure • Project P16: Harmonized approach on implementation of CPDLC services, common creation of Safety cases and Declaration of Conformity 3.) Harmonized activities to implement LSSIP-requirements: • Usage of Mode S is harmonized inside FAB Area under Eurocontrol programme on Aircraft ID (ACID) - until 2015 • applying Regulation (EC) No 633/2007 on implementation of FMTP - initial 2014
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO8 - Optimise CNS resource allocation and costs
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	By carrying out these activities, a slight decrease of 3% - 6% of (inflation-caused) rising CNS cost accumulated for whole RP2 might be expected. If national ANSP's may install a Smart/Common procurement, real cost savings are to be expected.
Additional comments	Note that gaining these commercial synergies depends on solving the list of "non-technical (mostly legal) prerequisites", which are being dealt with by FAB Legal-SC and CEOC. As a longer term goal, a kind of smart common procurement shall be targeted.

<i>Ensure a safety approach to the Network operations</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	For further details see Section 3.1.A SAFETY				
Description	Ensuring a safety approach to the Network operations is ensured through FAB CE Safety SubCommittee and Project 7 Safety activities. FAB CE Safety Management Roadmap has been approved at FAB CE level. It also specifies that FAB CE ANSPs will share experience regarding Just Culture, although the Just Culture concept has to be implemented locally, taking into account the national legislation.				
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance	NSP-SO7 - Ensure network safety, security and robustness				
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	A common approach to safety results in meeting the safety targets in FAB CE. For further details see Section 3.1.A SAFETY				
Additional comments					

1.5 - List of airports for RP2

List of airports submitted to the Performance Regulation						
Number of airports	6					
ICAO code	Airport name	State	IFR air transport movements			
			2011	2012	2013	Average
LOWW	WIEN-SCHWECHAT	Austria	264,301	261,604	247,628	257,844
LKPR	PRAHA/RUZYNE	Czech Republic	146,930	128,030	124,791	133,250
LDZA	ZAGREB / PLESO	Croatia	38,998	35,983	34,823	36,601
LHBP	BUDAPEST LISZT FERENC INTERNATIONAL	Hungary	109,651	87,364	83,563	93,526
LZIB	BRATISLAVA/M. R. STEFANIK	Slovakia	22,156	19,451	18,366	19,991
LJLJ	LJUBLJANA/BRNIK	Slovenia	32,550	28,867	27,271	29,563

Additional comments

List of airports submitted to the Charging Regulation						
Number of airports	14					
ICAO code	Airport name	State	IFR air transport movements			
			2011	2012	2013	Average
LOWW	WIEN-SCHWECHAT	Austria	264,301	261,604	247,628	257,844
LOWG	GRAZ	Austria	20,806	19,425	18,843	19,691
LOWI	INNSBRUCK	Austria	20,979	18,562	17,812	19,118
LOWK	KLAGENFURT	Austria	10,781	9,115	8,338	9,411
LOWL	LINZ	Austria	18,726	18,278	16,763	17,922
LOWS	SALZBURG	Austria	30,132	28,157	28,770	29,020
LKPR	PRAHA/RUZYNE	Czech Republic	146,930	128,030	124,791	133,250
LKKV	KARLOVY VARY	Czech Republic	2,208	2,245	2,094	2,182
LKTB	BRNO/TURANY	Czech Republic	8,351	7,882	6,712	7,648
LKMT	OSTRAVA/MOSNOV	Czech Republic	7,743	6,624	5,498	6,622
LDZA	ZAGREB / PLESO	Croatia	38,998	35,983	34,823	36,601
LHBP	BUDAPEST LISZT FERENC INTERNATIONAL	Hungary	109,651	87,364	83,563	93,526
LZIB	BRATISLAVA/M. R. STEFANIK	Slovakia	22,156	19,451	18,366	19,991
LJLJ	LJUBLJANA/BRNIK	Slovenia	32,550	28,867	27,271	29,563
LJPZ	PORTOROZ/SECOVLJE	Slovenia	1,306	1,409	1,278	1,331
LJMB	MARIBOR/OREHOVA VAS	Slovenia	1,452	1,343	1,292	1,362

Additional comments
According to Article 1(3) of the Performance Regulation and Article 1(5) of the Charging Regulation, States may exclude airports below 70 000 IFR air transport movements per year and there is no link between these articles of the mentioned regulation. There is only a link between Article 1(4) of the Performance Regulation and Article 1(5) of the Charging Regulation, when no airport in a State reaches the threshold of 70000 IFR air transport movements per year. This does not prevent the possibility of State to maintain a system of cross-subsidisation of terminal air navigation services between airports. Article 15(2)(e) of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 allows this. In the letter of the EC, the text of Article 15 (2) (e) specifies that "cross-subsidy shall be allowed between different air navigation services in either one of those two categories only when justified for objective reasons, subject to clear identification". For example, if a State decides to include only the main airports into the scope of the Performance and Charging Regulations but wants to maintain a system of cross-subsidisation in favour of other airports it would not need to identify in a transparent manner the amounts of subsidies, paid from those main airports to other airports(outside the scope of the Performance Regulations ie under 70000 IFR movements). Subsequently, the two lists are provided: • the airports submitted for the Performance Regulation are the main airports per state • the airports submitted for the Charging Regulation where the charging regulation is applied.

SECTION 2: INVESTMENTS

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
2. INVESTMENT	2			Annex D
2.1. Description and justification of the cost, nature and contribution to achieving the performance targets of investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of existing ATM systems, including their relevance and coherence with the European ATM Master Plan, the common projects referred to in Article 15a of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004, and, as appropriate, the Network Strategy Plan.				
2.2. The description and justification referred to in point 2.1 shall in particular:				
(i) relate the amount of the investments, for which description and justification is given following point 2.1, to the total amount of investments;				
(ii) differentiate between investments in new systems, overhaul of existing systems and replacement investments;				
(iii) refer each investment in new ATM systems and major overhaul of existing ATM systems to the European ATM Master Plan, the common projects referred to in Article 15a of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004, and, as appropriate, the Network Strategy Plan;				
(iv) detail the synergies achieved at functional airspace block level or, if appropriate, with other Member States or functional airspace blocks, in particular in terms of common infrastructure and common procurement;				
(v) detail the benefits expected from these investments in terms of performance across the four key performance areas, allocating them between the en route and terminal/airport phases of flight, and the date as from which benefits are expected;				
(vi) provide information on the decision-making process underpinning the investment, such as the existence of a documented cost-benefit analysis, the holding of user consultation, its results and any dissenting views expressed.				

2 - INVESTMENTS

Number of ANSPs	6
-----------------	---

ANS CR

Number of capex	11
-----------------	----

Name of capex 1		SUR - Surveillance	
Description	Investments in the Surveillance domain will be focused mainly of FIR Prague coverage by the multilateral surveillance system and start of ADS-B implementation in accordance with European ATM Master Plan.		
	1) ADS-B Initial implementation of ADS-B into surveillance infrastructure in line with European ATM Master Plan Requirements		
	2) WAM upgrade Mainly replacement of several WAM receivers at the end of their lifecycle, and another modifications and upgrades of WAM system in line with European ATM Master Plan.		
	3) IPv6 Transition of all SUR elements on new communication protocol IPv6 based on requirements of Regulation (ES) 633/2007.		
	4) MSSR PISEK Replacement of radar processor due to extension of its lifecycle and unification of technology of all MSSR in ANS CR.		
	5) Backup tracker Implementation of new backup tracker in connection with preparation of new DPS system implementation.		
	6) RRR Replacement of Radar data Recording and Replay System due to the end of its lifecycle.		
Accountable entity		ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution			
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mostly there are upgrades or replacement of existing systems.	
Replacement investment	Yes		
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relationship with EU Regulation: (EU) No 1207/2011 Relationship with ESSIP: ITY-SPI, ITY-FMTP, Relationship with SESAR Enablers: CTE-S4a, CTE-S4b, CTE-S5	

Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications, common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness. Increase system robustness and reliability.	1.12.2016	En-route, Terminal
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Reduced ATCO load, increase of throughput	1.12.2016	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Reduced ATCO workload could have direct impact to area of CEF (ANS will not increase the number of ATCOs)		

Name of capex 2	DPS – Data processing and presentation
Description	Data processing functions are ensured by combination of several systems (E2000, ESUP, IDP). This combination provides main system support for ATC service provision for ACC /APP Prague. Most of new functionalities and upgrades are governed by EU / ESSIP requirements. 1) OLDI • Implementation of non-mandatory requirements of Regulation (ES) No 1032/2006 relating hand-over (ROF, HOP messages) required also in frame of FABCE • Implementation of non-mandatory requirements of Regulation (ES) No 1032/2006 relating system support of coordination (RRQ/RLS, BFD/CFD to neighbouring ACC, INF, PAC messages) required also in frame of FABCE. • Implementation of silent inter-sector coordination (FL, SPD, HDG messages) 2) DLS: Implementation of requirements of Regulation (ES) No 29/2009 3) FASTI: Implementation functions for conflict detection and monitoring of trajectory required by ESSIP objective ATC-12 according requirements of European ATM Master Plan 4) TCM: Implementation or adjustment of function for pretactical and tactical traffic planning according requirements of SESAR Interim Deployment Programme WP1.2 5) FRA: System support for development of Free Route Airspace according requirements of ESSIP FABCE and SESAR Interim Deployment Programme WP 2.3 6) A-CDM: Enhancement of system support for Airport-CDM for LKPR. 7) IP-v6: Upgrade current FMTP (IPv4) to new internet protocol version IP-v6 according requirements (ES) No 633/2007 8) SNET - Phase 2: Enhancement of current Safety Nets functions (STCA, MSAW a APW) and addition of APM (Approach Path Monitor) function according requirements of EUROCONTROL specifications (part of ESSIP objectives ATC02.2, 2.5, 2.6 a 2.7) 9) SWIM: Implementation of initial SWIM concept elements according European ATM Master Plan requirements 10) HW replacement: Replacement of system components as their technical lifecycle will approach the end to maintain its seamless operability.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Main investments are upgrades of current systems (E2000, ESUP, IDP, WALDO), but partly it incorporates hardware replacement
Replacement investment	<i>No</i>	
Common project	<i>Yes</i>	OLDI and FRA - common projects are currently under preparation
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>Yes</i>	Relevance with EC Regulations: (ES) 1032/2006, (ES) 633/2007, (ES) 29/2009, (ES) 283/2011 Relevance with ESSIP Objectives (Level 3 of ATM Master Plan): AOP-05, ATC-02.2, ATC-02.5, ATC-02.6, ATC-02.7, ATC-12, ATC-17, ITY-AGDL, ITY-COTR, ITY-FMTP Relevance with SESAR Interim Deployment Programme v. 3.1 WP2.3, WP3.1, WP4.1, WP5.1, WP5.2,
Joint investment	<i>No</i>	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Yes</i>	Common specifications, common requirements under preparation
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Yes</i>	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	<i>Yes</i>	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Yes</i>	Improved situational awareness, interoperability for consistency	2015 - 2017	En-route
Environment	<i>Yes</i>	FRA - potential saving miles flown, reduce fuel and emission	31.12.2017	En-route
Capacity	<i>Yes</i>	Reduced ATCO load, increase of throughput	2015 - 2017	1,2,3,4,5 En-route 6 Airport
Cost efficiency	<i>Yes</i>	Reduced ATCO workload could have direct impact to area of CEF (ANS will not increase the number of ATCOs)		

Name of capex 3	DPS – New system
Description	Operation of current main DPS system is acceptable till 2020 at the latest regarding its lifecycle and legacy technology. So purpose of this investment is replacement and modernization of current system with the modern one, which brings the ability to deploy most of required future concepts of European ATM Master plan. Part of the investment covers also adaptation of current systems and interfaces.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>New system</i>	The main investment is a new system
Replacement investment	<i>No</i>	

Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with European ATM Master plan All current and future functionalities of DPS systems required till 2020. It is main enabler for implementation of future SESAR concepts: ER APP ATC 14a-f, ER APP ATC 15, ER APP ATC 17, ER APP ATC 61a-b, ER APP ATC 68a-b, ER APP ATC 69a-b, ER APP ATC 70, ER APP ATC 76, ER APP ATC 77, ER APP ATC 78, ER APP ATC79, ER APP ATC82a, ER APP ATC 86, ER APP ATC 90, ER APP ATC 91, ER APP ATC 92a-d, ER APP ATC 93, ER APP ATC 94a-b, ER APP ATC 95, ER APP ATC 100a-d2, ER APP ATC 111, ER APP ATC 119, ER APP ATC 120, ER APP ATC 121a-g, ER APP ATC 122, ER APP ATC 123, ER APP ATC129, ER APP ATC130, ER APP ATC133, ER APP ATC134a-b, ER APP ATC137a-c, ER APP ATC 138, ER APP ATC 139a-b, ER APP ATC 140, ER APP ATC 141a-b, ER APP ATC 143, ER APP ATC 144, ER APP ATC 145, ER APP ATC 146, ER APP ATC 147, ER APP ATC 149, ER APP ATC 152, GGSWIM-07, GGSWIM-11		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness, interoperability for consistency	1.1.2019	En-route/Terminal
Environment	Yes	FRA - potencial saving miles flown, reduce fuel and emission	1.1.2019	En-route/Terminal
Capacity	Yes	Reduced ATCO load, increase of throughput, additional working positions	1.1.2019	En-route/Terminal
Cost efficiency	Yes	Reduced ATCO workload could have direct impact to area of CEF (ANS will not increase the number of ATCOs)		

Name of capex 4	COM - Communication	
Description	In the domain of communication, an overall renewal of the communication system will take place, which will enable increase of safety and smooth operability of this system and continued implementation of the 8.33 kHz channel separation project in accordance with requirements of EUROCONTROL and SESAR. Further a renewal of the main VCS communication system is planned, which will enable to increase its capacity and switch to VoIP in accordance with the SESAR concept. The A/G Datalink system will be implemented in accordance with SES legislation, which will enable data communication between ATC and aircraft. Further, renewal of the data communication infrastructure and transition to IPv6 protocol in accordance with requirements of SESAR are planned. Part of the plan is to implement the AMHS system in accordance with international development of this fixed communication network. The Main investments are: 1) VCS – main system Complete replacement of Voice Communication System with new technology providing implementation of Voice over IP (ESSIP COM-11 requirements) 2) VCS – regional airports Complete replacement of VCS system for APP/TWR of regional airports (LKMT, LKKV, LKTB). 3) AGVN LKPR Implementation of new independent network for ATC voice communication (ATC Ground Voice Network) 4) SIEM Integration of Security Event Management and Security Information Management into one service providing better quality and security of communication systems and higher resistance against potential threats. 5) IPv6 Replacement of switches in frame of whole network. All new switches will provide IPv6 capability according the EU Regulation requirements. After preparation of infrastructure the migration on full IPv6 operation will follow. 6) AMHS Finish replacement of legacy CIDIN X.25 system with new AMHS system according the international strategy and plans. 7) NOS Replacement of NOTAM / OPMET system with capability of providing Digital NOTAM. 8) AGDL Providing communication infrastructure for implementation of Air-Ground Data Link.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mostly there are upgrades or replacement of existing systems
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	Yes	Partly influenced by FAB-CE projects
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with EU Regulation (EC) No 633/2007, (EC) No 29/2009 Relevance with ESSIP ITY-AGDL, ITY-AGVCS2, ITY-FMTP, COM09, COM10, COM11 Relevance with SESAR Interim Deployment Programme WP4.1, WP5.1
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)

Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications, common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Increase system robustness and reliability	2015 - 2017	1,8 En-route/Terminal 2,4,7 En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Additional working positions	2015 - 2019	En-route
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 5	RCOM – Radio communication systems	
Description	VHF radio communication system is basic means of communication between ATCO and pilot. Planned investments will provide increase of 8,33 kHz channel separation use and implementation of VoIP technology along with providing the safe and seamless operation of this vital function. The main investments are: 1) OBR+ Complete replacement of RCOM system for ACC/APP/TWR Praha enabling implementation of new technologies (VoIP) and providing further radio communication functionality with regard to the end of old system lifecycle. 2) STORAD LKPR Replacement of central switchboard of radio communication backup system due to the end of its lifecycle.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Click to select	Mostly there are replacement of existing system
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with EU Regulation (EC) No 1079/2012 Relevance with ESSIP ITY-AGVCS2, COM11
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared

Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Increase system robustness and reliability	31.12.2017	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Additional working positions	31.12.2017	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 6	RNAV – Radio navigation’s systems	
Description	Development and investments in RNAV are based on Air Navigation Concept of Czech Republic till 2020 to ensure Performance Based Navigation. Investments are represented in most cases by replacement of current navigation devices at the end of their lifecycle. The main investments: 1) FIR Praha • Replacement of DME in localities: OKG(Cheb), BNO(Brno), VOZ(Vožice), PR(Praha-GP24). • Replacement of VOR/DME in localities: OKF-Dešná, OKX-Frýdlant, OKL-Praha, VLM-Vlašim, OTA-Ostrava. 2) LKPR • Installation of new navigation equipment (ILS/DME) for parallel runway in LKPR 3) LKMT • Replacement of ILS22 + NDB04/22 4) LKTB • Replacement of ILS28 + NDB28	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mostly there are replacements of existing systems
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with ESSIP NAV03
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)

Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Increase system reliability	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Increase capacity of LKPR runway system	31.5.2019	Airport
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 7	MOS – Monitoring and control	
Description	Central Monitoring and Control System (CMOS) is basic integrated system for monitoring and remote control of current operational status of all technical system and devices supporting Air Traffic Control service. Technical Information System (TIS) is system for gathering and evidence of all planned and unexpected events related to ATM system. It is used as basic administrative system of technical supervision service and also as basic means for gathering report about air accidents and incidents directly from ATC operational rooms.	
	Main investments: 1) Regular upgrades of CMOS system is based on upgrades or replacement or new installations of all other ATM systems monitored by CMOS (SUR, COM, NAV, DPS, etc.). 2) Transition of CMOS on IPv6 communication protocol 3) Replacement of CMOS hardware due to the end of its lifecycle 4) Upgrades of TIS according the user requirements	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mostly there are upgrades of existing system
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with ESSIP ITY-FMTP
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)

Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared		
Consultation with stakeholders	No			
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Better CNS/ATM system monitoring, increase reliability	2015-2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 8	AIM – Aeronautical information management
Description	In the area of AIS, the development is focused on reaching a level of system functionality, which will assure an increase of quality and efficiency in the area of updating and maintenance of database of information published by AIS, its publishing in electronic form and automatic distribution of this data to users. The individual development steps suppose establishment of a statistic ADB data database, creation of a DMI/ESI application assuring data integrity and an interface for ADB, which will be linked to tools for creation and presentation of eAIP, further establishment of a SLPN-IZPP application for creation of AIP and a cartographic AIS line with connection to ADB, which will support AIS system for processing and interpretation of statistic and dynamic AIS data. In accordance with the initiative of EUROCONTROL Airspace Infringement, high attention will be devoted to graphical presentation of information for end users. The AIS publication system will become a central point data publishing and sharing among ATM system of ANS CR, surrounding ATM systems and other external systems or databases. Further development of systems in the AIM domain will be heavily influence by application of the EC Directive no. 73/2010, which define requirements for aeronautical data quality for the single European sky (IR ADQ). One of part of this domain is represented by the METRAD system, which provides for central processing and presentation of meteorological data, and whose generation renewal is also planned. The main investments: 1) ADB Complete replacement of AIS publication system regarding requirements of Regulation (EU) No 73/2010, implementation of AIXM 5.1 data format and implementation of eTOD based on ICAO Annex 15 requirements. 2) DMI/ESI Modifications of system regarding of new AIS publication system implementation, or based on EUROCONTROL EAD requirements (eAIP implementation). 3) SLPN/IZPP Modifications of system parts related with new AIS publication system implementation. Replacement of the AISView system regarding its lifecycle and modification based on new information transfer technology (AIXM, WIXM, TIXM) 4) ATM GIS Modification and extension of connection of ATM GIS system with other AIS systems (ADB, eTOD) 5) METRAD Software upgrades based on system and software changes of CHMI (Meteo data provider). Replacement of the system regarding its lifecycle (and also FABCE requirements) is also planned.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Mostly there are upgrades of existing system, except for METRAD – this is replacement.		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance to EU Regulation (EU) No 73/2012 Relevance to ESSIP ITY-ADQ, INF-04 Relevance to European ATM Master Plan Enablers AIMS-06, AIMS-07, AIMS-13, AIMS-16, AIMS-17, AIMS-22, GGSWIM-11, GGSWIM-53		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	No			
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 9	SIMU – ATM simulators	
Description	ATM simulators are main devices providing capability for high-quality training of Air Traffic Controllers. High fidelity with current ATC systems is one of the prerequisite of good training and safe provision of ATC. So the simulators have to follow upgrades of ATC systems functionalities.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Main investment is a replacement
Replacement investment	Yes	

Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No			
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared		
Consultation with stakeholders	No			
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Better ATCO training supports safety in general	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Better ATCO training has influence to increase of throughput	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 10	DPP - TWR	
Description	DPP-TWR domain merges all systems supporting service provision on TWR Prague. 1) Integrated Tower Working Position (ITWP) Current coexistence of several systems (E2000, IDP, ASMGCS) supporting of service provision on TWR Prague will be replaced by integrated solution. This will bring unification of all working positions on TWR, and reduction of number of systems. 2) DCL Implementation of Departure Clearance functionality via Datalink. 3) SMR Replacement of old surface movement radar at the end of its lifecycle 4) Contingency TWR Development of contingency TWR solution for provision of service continuity in case of unexpected events with TWR systems or building. 5) AMAN/DMAN Implementation of Arrival Manager following with implementation of Departure Manager or integrated solution according requirements of ESSIP and European ATM Master Plan. 6) LKPR Parallel runway Necessary upgrades and adjustment of all appropriate systems regarding the operation of new parallel runway in LKPR.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Upgrade of existing systems and replacement systems
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	Relevance with EU Legislation (EC) No 29/2009, (EC) No 1207/2011 Relevance with ESSIP AOP04.1, AOP 04.2, AOP05, ATC07.1, ITY-SPI
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Specifications and requirements can be shared
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness	31.12.2016	3 - Airport 5 - En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	Yes	Potential saving miles flown, reduce holdings, reduce fuel and emission	31.12.2016	Terminal/Airport
Capacity	Yes	Increase capacity of LKPR runway system	31.5.2019	Airport
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 11	Buildings
Description	The main investments: 1)VU Jeneč reconstruction 2) TWR Ostrava construction - new building for the APP/TWR Ostrava Mošnov unit 3) TEB and IATCC – adaptation for DPS NS 4) IATCC – technologies replacement 5) TWR LKTB reconstruction
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Mainly overhaul, only TWR Ostrava is new building
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	No	
Decision-making process	Yes	Individual investments are approved by the ATM System Development Middle term Plan 2014-2019 (Ed 1.0) and investments over 10 mil. CZK are approved by Investment committee

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	No			
Environment	No			

Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
<i>SUR - Surveillance</i>	140,300,000	41,600,000	22,000,000	27,200,000	49,500,000	-		90% / 10%	2015-2019
<i>DPS – Data processing and presentation</i>	413,900,000	192,500,000	91,000,000	62,400,000	37,000,000	31,000,000		71% / 29%	2015-2019
<i>DPS – New system</i>	1,128,400,000	234,000,000	421,200,000	93,600,000	260,000,000	119,600,000		85% / 15%	11/07/1905
<i>COM - Communication</i>	358,800,000	57,200,000	143,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	28,600,000		84% / 16%	2015-2019
<i>RCOM – Radio communication systems</i>	132,700,000	70,200,000	52,000,000	10,500,000	-	-		84% / 16%	2015-2017
<i>RNAV – Radio navigation's systems</i>	129,100,000	6,500,000	-	55,000,000	26,000,000	41,600,000		61% / 39%	2015-2019
<i>MOS – Monitoring and control</i>	53,900,000	5,200,000	18,200,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	9,700,000		84% / 16%	2015-2019
<i>AIM – Aeronautical information management</i>	49,400,000	8,700,000	8,000,000	10,200,000	11,500,000	11,000,000		73% / 27%	2015-2019
<i>SIMU – ATM simulators</i>	85,000,000	33,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	13,300,000	12,300,000		82% / 18%	2015-2019
<i>DPP - TWR</i>	214,600,000	101,400,000	7,600,000	43,600,000	49,400,000	12,600,000		8% / 92%	2015-2019
<i>Buildings</i>	251,700,000	67,100,000	70,600,000	59,900,000	33,900,000	20,200,000		72% / 28%	2015-2019
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	2,957,800,000	818,200,000	846,400,000	450,600,000	556,000,000	286,600,000			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	295,600,000	56,700,000	61,600,000	55,700,000	69,600,000	52,000,000			
Total capex (1) + (2)	3,253,400,000	874,900,000	908,000,000	506,300,000	625,600,000	338,600,000			

Additional comments

The investments part consist of input of ANS CR (where we try to follow the PRB Template) and inputs of CHMI (the MET provider in CR). The later investments are due to relatively small impact presented in a simplified form.

CHMI – the MET Provider

Name of the investment	Depreciation (Years)	Year of purchase	Expected CAPEX	Operational status	Start of depreciation	Coefficient for aeronautical activities	CAPEX attributable to aeronautical activities
Super computer replacement	4	2015	70	2015	2016	0,2	14
Radar replacement (Skalky)	6	2014	64	2014	2015	0,231	12,474
Radar replacement (Brdy)	6	2015	64	2015	2016	0,231	12,474
RWY 24L/06R equipment	7	2018	42	2019	2019	1	42
Cellometers (CT25K) replacement	6	2017	29,9	2017	2018	0,161	4,8139
ORACLE archiving SW replacement	6	2015	26,7	2015	2016	0,2	5,34
Transmitters for LKPR replacement	7	2014	13,6	2014	2015	1	13,6
DB SW replacement	6	2015	7,3	2015	2016	0,2	1,46
Total			297,4				106,1

Austro Control

Number of capex	8			
Name of capex 1	COM Services			
Description	The investments are mainly focussed on CPDLC requirements, as well as the modernisation of Radio Infrastructure to fulfill compliance. Investments provide 8,33 channel separation and implementation of VoIP technology. In accordance with European ATM Masterplan. - introduction of CPDLC - implementation of 8,33 kHz channels separation - implementation of VoIP technology - adaptations to airport layout			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	New and existing		
Replacement investment	Yes	Mainly overhaul and EoL exchange		
Common project	Yes	Work in progress		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ENB01, ENB01.01, ENB01.01.03, SPC01.03 COM02, COM06, COM11, ITY-AGDL		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	LOWW infrastructure planning together with airport master plan. ATM improvement planning, documented CBA, Individual Investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015 - 2019.		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	reduced frequency load, improved information consistency	2015 - 2020	En-route / Terminal
Environment	Yes			
Capacity	Yes			
Cost efficiency	Yes	improved FAB interoperability	2016 - 2020	En-route / Terminal

Name of capex 2	NAV Services			
Description	Investments mostly for replacement of existing NAV systems who reached end of lifetime. Investments for introduction of GBAS infrastructure. - GBAS infrastructure - NAV infrastructure upgrades - Replacement VDF at local airports - Replacement ILS, VOR, DME equipment - Adaptions to airport layout			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	New and existing		
Replacement investment	Yes	Mainly overhaul and EoL exchange		
Common project	Yes	Work in progress		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	ENB01, PAC01 ENB01.01, SPC01.03 NAV03		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	LOWW infrastructure planning together with airport master plan. ATM improvement planning, documented CBA, Individual Investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015 - 2019.		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved navigation precision	2016 - 2020	En-Route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	PBN enabler	2016 - 2020	
Cost efficiency	Yes	Improved FAB interoperability	2016 - 2020	En-Route

Name of capex 3	SUR Services			
Description	Many enabling systems or constituents reach end of lifetime eithin RP2 period. Projects are checked against ATM Masterplan. - Surveillance tools - Upgrade Vienna & Salzburg & Koralpe to Mode-S - Replacement Koralpe Radom - WAM-Austria - SMR & MDS Sensors for A-SMGCS Vienna - Adaptions to airport layout			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Only small amount forseen for new functions and services		
Replacement investment	Yes	Mainly overhaul and EoL exchange		
Common project	Yes	Work in progress		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ENB01 ENB01.01 ITY-SPI, ACID, SERA		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	LOWW infrastructure planning together with airport master plan. ATM improvement planning, documented CBA, Individual Investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015 - 2019.		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness	2016 - 2020	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Reduced traffic spacing	2016 - 2020	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Cost efficiency	Yes	Improved FAB interoperability	2016 - 2020	En-route/Terminal

Name of capex 4		DPS ATM Services		
Description		Evolution of existing services to maintain useability and enable improved useability of the current ATS-System including the support of ACID and PCP for ATM Systems. To meet punctuality and predictability goals together with a reduction of ATCO workload and improvements in TWR/APP coordination, the following projects are planned: - ATM support services & safety nets - Training and Simulator facilities - ATM System and subsystem evolution - Maintain and enable compliance - Future evolution of the shared ATM system platform in line with SESAR and NM deployment - CDM enhancements		
Accountable entity		ANSP		
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mainly overhaul of already existing functions and services		
Replacement investment	Yes	Partly EoL replacements		
Common project	Yes	COOPANS, Airport Vienna (CDM)		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	PCP 2014.2020, CS 2017-2022, ENB01, ENB02, PAC01, PAC04, PAC05, PAC06 SPC01.01, SPC01.02, SPC01.03, SPC4.01,SPC05.03, SPC06.01, SPC06.02, SPC06.03, ATC07.01, AOP05, ASP05, AOM20, ASP02, AOP04.1, AOP04.2, ASP01.03, ASP02, ATC17, FCM03, ITY-AGDL, ITY-COTR, ITY-SPI		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Consultation with General Aviation took place		
Decision-making process	Yes	SESAR Deployment (PCP, CP, NM, CS) Documented CBA (Domain ATM System) Standard stakeholder consultation process is established Airport masterplan FAB-CE planning COOPANS Roadmap Individual Investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015 - 2019		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness, improved safety net performance, interoperability for improved consistency	2015 continous	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	Yes	Subproportional emissions increase vs. Traffic increase	continous improvements	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Capacity	Yes	Reduced ATCO workload, increase of throughput, additional working positions	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport

Cost efficiency	Yes	>30% cost savings by implementation of shared technical platform, ist evolution, operation and maintenance compared to individual platform	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
-----------------	-----	--	-------------	---------------------------

Name of capex 5	DPS AIM Services			
Description	Combination of different support services enabling improved ATC service provision, derived from EU/ESSIP requirements. - Modification of AIS publication system - Evolution of AIM Database and data sharing			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Mainly overhaul of already existing functions and services
Replacement investment	Yes	Only small amount foreseen for new functions and services
Common project	Yes	Work in progress
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ENB02 ENB02.01 INF04, INF01, ITY-ADQ
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established
Decision-making process	Yes	SESAR deployment (PCP, CP, NM, CS) Documented CBA (Domain AIM Services) FAB-CE planning Individual investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015-2019

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Enhanced information consistency	2015 - 2020	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Enhanced system consistency	2015 - 2020	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Cost efficiency	Yes	Increased automation	2015 - 2020	En-route/Terminal/Airport

Name of capex 6	DPS MET Services			
Description	Enabling systems or constituents reach end of lifetime within RP2 period. Projects will be checked against ATM masterplan. - exchange of windprofiler - MET switch adaptions - WXR renewal programme			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mainly overhaul of already existing functions and services		
Replacement investment	Yes	Only small amount foreseen for new functions and services		
Common project	Yes	Work in progress		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ENB02 ENB02.01 AOP02, AOP05, ATC12		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	SESAR deployment (PCP, CP, NM, CS) documented CBA (Domain AIM Services) FAB-CE planning individual investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015-2019		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved situational awareness in weather conditions	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Flight path optimisation	2015 - 2019	En-route/Terminal/Airport

Name of capex 7	Building & Facility Management			
Description	Enabler for ATM services in line with the ATM Masterplan - Adaptions on FEICHTBERG building - Major overhaul of electrical supply equipment - Renewal and overhaule of air condition systems - TCMS renewal - Tower building Salzburg airport - Optical waveguide system Graz airport			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Mostly major overhauls on buildings and facility management systems		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	New Facility & Infrastructure COM06		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constrains) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Documented CBA (Domain AIM Services) Individual investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015-2019		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	No	Improved technical control and monitoring data consistency, improved system availability	2015 - 2020	En-Route / Terminal / Airport
Environment	Yes	Improved thermal insulation	2016 - 2020	En-Route / Terminal / Airport
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Improved thermal insulation	2016 - 2020	En-Route / Terminal / Airport

Name of capex 8	Other CAPEX			
Description	enabler of common services to different ATS-stakeholder, supporting the ATM Masterplan. - WXR product enhancements - Enhancements CWP info screens - Prototyping - MET adaption (Sensoric, Forecast tools) - IT-Security - Voice and data recording program - MIL interoperability			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	New system	New and existing		
Replacement investment	Yes	Replacement of already existing systems		
Common project	Yes	MIL interoperability		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ITY-COTR, MIL01, MIL02, AOM20, ASP01, ASP02, INF04, COM11		
Joint investment	Yes	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common specifications and common requirements under preparation		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Standard stakeholder consultation process is established		
Decision-making process	Yes	Documented CBA (Domain AIM Services) Individual investments are approved by ACG System Development Mid Term Plan 2015-2019		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved MIL interoperability, improved weather situational awareness, IT-Security	2015 - 2020	En-Route / Terminal / Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Optimised usage of airspace	2015 - 2020	En-Route / Terminal / Airport

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
COM Services	23,725,000	3,795,000	3,740,000	3,740,000	5,700,000	6,750,000	6 - 10	75%R / 25%T	2015/2020

NAV Services	11,358,000	1,748,000	845,000	1,495,000	2,385,000	4,885,000	6 - 10	75%R / 25%T	2015/2020
SUR Services	10,540,000	40,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	4,250,000	3,250,000	6 - 10	75%R / 25%T	2015/2020
DPS Services	68,018,000	11,175,000	9,734,500	16,246,500	15,818,500	15,043,500	6 - 10	75%R / 25%T	2016/2020
Building & Facility Management	27,282,500	6,362,500	4,360,000	8,010,000	5,220,000	3,330,000	10 - 33	75%R / 25%T	2016/2020
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	140,923,500	23,120,500	20,679,500	30,491,500	33,373,500	33,258,500			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	24,712,500	3,788,500	7,093,500	4,993,500	4,793,500	4,043,500			
Total capex (1) + (2)	165,636,000	26,909,000	27,773,000	35,485,000	38,167,000	37,302,000			

Additional comments

Croatia Control

Number of capex		7	
Name of capex 1		DATA-COM Systems Modernization Project	
Description		This investment is driven by the need to keep providing: 1. cost-effective IP service data transport for all Air Traffic Management applications being voice or data 2. operational store-and-forward messaging service (AFTN/AMHS) in compliance to SES regulations, new standards, technology improvements and local requirements. It is also driven by the need to provide Air/Ground Data-Link Service as a means to comply with the European Commission Regulation EC 29/2009. The Service enables the following Functions: • CPDLC provides a digital channel for ATC communications via point-to-point air/ground datalink between a controller and an aircraft. • ATN Ground Network Interfaces between ANSP and ATN domains of Communication Service Providers	
Accountable entity		ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution			
Differentiation	New system		
Replacement investment	No		
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation.D903	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	SO2 and SO4, IDP task 4 (Datalink)	
Joint investment	No		

Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	FAB CE P5, FAB CE P10, FAB CE P16		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process.		
Decision-making process	Yes	Project Committee, compliancy with EU regulation. B910		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Safety enhancement	2016	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Increased capacity through both reduction of voice congestion and increase in controller efficiency	2016	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Reduced costs by reusing Internet off the shelf technologies that can be based on standard hardware	2017-2019	En-route

Name of capex 2		VOICE-COM Systems Modernization and Replacement Project	
Description		The upgrade of existing VHF and UHF Radio Network is intended for: Coverage Improvement of coverage area; Increase capacity (number of frequencies) with introduction of the new radio sites; Future seamless and easy migration to VoIP technology; Future seamless and easy implementation of VDL technology for data link services. Replacement of current VCCS equipment at many sites is necessary because is very obsolete and it is difficult to support maintenance. This is compliant with Implementing Regulation (EU) 1079/2012.	
Accountable entity		ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution			
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system		
Replacement investment	Yes		
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No		
Joint investment	No		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process	
Decision-making process	Yes	Project Committee, compliancy with EU regulation	

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	No			
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Increased capacity by satisfying the demand for new frequency assignments in the VHF band	2017-2019	En-route, Terminal
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 3	NAV Systems Modernization and Replacement Project			
Description	Project consists of modernization and replacement of existing NDB, VOR/DME and ILS systems. All the above mentioned existing systems have been in operational use for more than 20 years. Additional five DME stations shall be introduced to enable implementation of RNAV routes in both en-route and terminal airspace required by both LSSIP, and European and global ICAO navigation strategies. This is aligned with Regulation (EC) 206/2008			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system			
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No			
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Project Committee, compliancy with EU regulation		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Increase safety by increased situational awareness	2015	En-route, Terminal
Environment	Yes	Emissions and noise nuisance reduced by use of optimal flight procedures and routings	2015	Terminal

Capacity	Yes	Indirect enabler	2015	En-route, Terminal
Cost efficiency	Yes	Fuel cost reduction through optimised routes and TMA procedures	2015	

Name of capex 4	Ground-based Surveillance Systems Upgrade			
Description	Existing ground-based surveillance sensors are not ensuring the sufficient level of radar coverage in some volumes. According to the study conclusions, in regard of operational, technical and economic aspects two most appropriate solutions are chosen: 1. Procurement and Implementation of the new Mode S MSSR in North Adriatic area, and 2. Procurement and implementation of ADS-B/WAM surveillance system in south Adriatic area.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	New system			
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ITY-SPI		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Project committee, Cost Benefit: PRO-SUR-P-2012-04-1-00 (Projekt nadogradnje SUR sustava za TMA Pula i TMA Dubrovnik)		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Safety improvement	2016-2019	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Indirect enabler	2016-2021	En-route
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 5	AWOS/MET Systems Modernization and Replacement Project
Description	This investment is driven by the need to replace old and unreliable equipment to continue sustaining one of the core service areas in CCL. The maintenance costs are high and some spare parts are not even available and it is not possible to install new software on the existing hardware which makes implementation of the changing ICAO Annex 3 requirements (that change frequently) difficult.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	Project committee

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved safety	2015-2019	En-route, Terminal
Environment	No			
Capacity	No	Capacity indirect enabler		
Cost efficiency	Yes	Maintenance cost reduction	2015-2019	En-route, Terminal

Name of capex 6	ATM System Upgrade
Description	Regular ATM systems upgrades are required in order to comply with SES regulations, new standards, technology improvements, as well as with local requirements to enhance and harmonize operational use of the system. Upgrades can cover software functionality, but also hardware enhancements due to new interfaces required, extensions of the system or obsolescence, whatever might be required from regulations and operational requirements to achieve SES goals, increase safety or increase capacity.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	SO2/2, SO2/4, SO4/3
Joint investment	Yes	Croatia Control, Austro Control, LFV, Naviar and IAA
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	As a member of COOPANS association CCL works in close cooperation with four European ANSPs: Austro Control, LFV, Naviar and IAA
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	Project committee, Investment plan for Croatia Control, 2011-2015

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved safety	2015-2019	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Improved capacity	2015-2019	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Enabler	2015-2019	En-route

Name of capex 7	Reconstruction of Old Buildings
Description	Some buildings are older than 30 years and need to be reconstructed. Some of them were long out of use and they also need to be renovated. (Old ACC building Zagreb, TWR Osijek, Building Split.)
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	Project committee

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	No			
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Enabler for additional capacity	2015-2019	En-route, Terminal
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
DATA-COM Systems Modernization Project	21,000,000	6,600,000	2,900,000	2,600,000	6,000,000	2,900,000	7	100%R	2016-2019
VOICE-COM Systems Modernization and Replacement Project	41,950,000	2,650,000	13,600,000	10,600,000	8,000,000	7,100,000	7	80%R / 20%T	2015-2020
NAV Systems Modernization and Replacement Project	38,000,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	8,000,000	7	80%R / 20%T	2015-2021
Ground-based Surveillance Systems Upgrade	23,800,000	8,800,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	7	70%R / 30%T	2016-2022
AWOS/MET Systems Modernization and Replacement Project	18,920,000	400,000	7,220,000	5,000,000	5,500,000	800,000	7	20%R / 80%T	2015-2023
ATM System Upgrade	135,410,000	40,330,000	23,770,000	23,770,000	23,770,000	23,770,000	7	100%R	2015-2024
Reconstruction of Old Buildings	53,300,000	10,000,000	7,300,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	20	70%R / 30%T	2016-2025
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	332,380,000	75,780,000	69,290,000	67,470,000	63,270,000	56,570,000			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	76,676,000	19,660,000	16,266,000	16,250,000	12,750,000	11,750,000	7	80%R / 20%T	2015-2021
Total capex (1) + (2)	409,056,000	95,440,000	85,556,000	83,720,000	76,020,000	68,320,000			

Additional comments

HungaroControl

Number of capex		10		
Name of capex 1	MATIAS Build 12			
Description	By introducing the new FDP system which is capable for full 4D operation this Build will be a major step towards fulfilling the European ATM MP, this will also ensure the SWIM capability and add an improved MTCD tool.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current MATIAS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	Yes	The project will enable the SWIM capability as targeted in AF5, will contribute to the AF6 with the implementation of the 4D capability		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	The project will contribute to the following Network strategy plan elements: SO2 by introducing extended SWIM functionality, SO4 by accelerating the modernization of the ATC systems to improve capacity		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Planned		
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	With the profile calculation is based on actual downloaded 4D profile the warnings and medium term conflict detection tools will be more precise therefore the alerts will be more relevant and the number of false alerts will decrease.	31.12.2019	En-route/Terminal

Environment	Yes	With the more efficient safety tools the number of tactical interventions necessary to maintain separation could decrease therefore less deviation should occur which decreases fuel consumption.	31.12.2019	En-route/Terminal
Capacity	Yes	The improved safety tools with the better profile calculation will allow controllers to separate traffic, so the predictability and plannability will increase which increases the capacity.	31.12.2019	En-route/Terminal
Cost efficiency	Yes	By the increased plannability of the traffic the controllers will be able to offer shorter routes.	31.12.2019	En-route/Terminal

Name of capex 2	CPDLC			
Description	The implementation consist of the upgrade of the MATIAS ATM system (version Build 10) and the implementation of air-ground communication service capability.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current MATIAS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system and an establishment of air ground communication capability.		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	Yes	The project will contribute to the FAB CE common activity in relation to the 'Common datalink transfer procedure in FABCE' and common approach of CPDLC safety cases (WP16) and planning of common network infrastructure establishment (P5).		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	The project will contribute to the following Network strategy plan element: SO2/2 VDL Mode 2 infrastructure will be deployed in support of CPDLC Datalink.		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Continuous with the aircraft operators and other stakeholders.		
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	With CPDLC implementation the number of misunderstood negotiation on the VHF frequency will be decreased.	30.09.2015	En-route, Terminal and Airport
Environment	No			

Capacity	Yes	Capacity will be increased, because VHF frequency load will be reduced and CPDLC enables an other way of communication between aircraft and ATCO.	30.09.2015	En-route, Terminal and Airport
Cost efficiency	Yes	Expected 11% capacity gain across the Link Airspace	30.09.2015	En-route, Terminal and Airport

Name of capex 3	MATIAS Build 11.2			
Description	This software version will introduce an enhanced safety net with upgraded STCA and TCT functionality, add advanced PBN handling capability and improve the Civil Military coordination.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current MATIAS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system.		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	The project will contribute to the following Network strategy plan elements: SO4 by accelerating the modernization of the ATC systems to improve capacity, SO5 by upgrading the civil-military coordination.		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Planned		
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	With the upgraded STCA and the new TCT functionality the system will be able to help the controllers to detect and solve the conflicts earlier.	30.06.2018	En-route/Terminal
Environment	Yes	The better civil-military coordination will allow the usage of the restricted airspace on a on-demand basis, therefore more efficient routing capability.	30.06.2018	En-route/Terminal
Capacity	Yes	The better civil-military coordination can decrease the usage of the TSA-s therefore could increase capacity.	30.06.2018	En-route/Terminal
Cost efficiency	Yes	By the new functionalities higher volume of traffic can be controlled.	30.06.2018	En-route/Terminal

Name of capex 4	MATIAS Build 11.1
Description	This development step for the MATIAS ATC system will contain AMAN OLDI functionality, add improvements for the Free route, increase of the capacity of the system by a new, more efficient HMI.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current MATIAS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system.
Replacement investment	No	
Common project	Yes	The project will contribute to the global PCP AF1 AMAN implementation for the neighbouring APP of Vienna. It will help the further elaboration of the Free route on FAB CE level as planned in AF3.
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	The project will contribute to the following Network strategy plan elements: SO2 by ensuring the compliance of the regulations and standards, SO4 by accelerating the modernization of the ATC systems to improve capacity and improving the Free route capability, SO5 by improving the usage of the airspace and routes.
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	The development will contribute to the FABE-CE static scenario and the Free route project as the technical enabler.
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Continuous
Decision-making process	No	

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	The new, more efficient HMI make available the usage of more enhanced safety features, an enabler of the development and deployment of the future enhanced safety tools.	31.12.2016	En-route/Terminal
Environment	Yes	The free route capability will contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency.	31.12.2016	En-route/Terminal
Capacity	Yes	The new HMI will allow better handling of the traffic, therefore will increase the capacity. It is essential to integrate later developments increasing capacity.	31.12.2016	En-route/Terminal
Cost efficiency	Yes	By the new functionalities higher volume of traffic can be controlled.	31.12.2016	En-route/Terminal

Name of capex 5	ANS I renovation
Description	The old ACC/APP center will be refurbished to a complex, multi-purpose center for contingency, radar-simulation, 3D TWR-simulation, ATCO-training, and R+D.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Former ATC center renovating for a new multi-purposes center for contingency, radar-simulation, 3D TWR-simulation, ATCO-training, and R+D.		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No			
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	No			
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Stand-by system for ACC/APP at 70% capacity within 6 hours	30.06.2016	En-route / Terminal
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Reduced cost of eliminating distributed placing of systems to be housing in ANSI.	31.12.2015	En-route / Terminal

Name of capex 6	A-SMGCS	
Description	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current A-SMGCS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system with implementation of some CDM functionalities in the area of pre-departure and departure mangement.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Being a software and hardware upgrade on the current A-SMGCS system this project is considered as an overhaul of the existing system.
Replacement investment	No	
Common project	Yes	The project will contribute to the global PCP AF2 with implementation of some CDM functionalities in the area of pre-departure and departure management. It will help the further elaboration of the Free route on FAB CE level as planned in AF3.

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	The project will contribute to the following Network strategy plan elements: SO1 by introducing functionalities to achieve an effective network CDM process, SO6/3 by haring information to different stakeholders to improve common awareness and operational performance and SO6/4 by contribution in CDM implementation in Budapest Airport.		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Consultation with Airport Operator, aircraft operators and other stakeholders.		
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	By the hardware upgrade the system robustness will be increased. CDM functionality implementation: the decongestion from situational awareness and transparency will lead to a reduction of incidents and accidents.	31.12.2016	Airport
Environment	Yes	Contribution in CDM: increased efficiency and productivity lead to lessened environmental impact, both emissions and noise-related. After a local analysis of savings, the emissions reductions will be accurately determinable.	31.12.2016	Airport
Capacity	Yes	CDM: More accurate common planning and information sharing leads to increasement of the throughput in peak hours.	31.12.2016	Airport
Cost efficiency	Yes	Overall benefit/cost ratio has been estimated at CDM airports and those with local implementation to be at least 9/1 with a maximum two-year payback.	31.12.2016	Airport

Name of capex 7	Replacement of Voice Communication System (VCS)	
Description	The ATM Voice Communication System (VCS) which was installed in 2008 and started its operation in 2009 reaches the end of life in 2018. That is the reason of the replacement to ensure the safe and continuous telephone and radio communication and the legal voice recording for HungaroControl Pte Ltd Co as a replacement of the current system in operation.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	New system	Even an ATM system reaches end-of-life after 10 years
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No			
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes			
Decision-making process	No			

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	The new system will meet the requirements of the technology of the future implementation date.	31.12.2018	En-route and Terminal
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	With the future functions and backup systems capacity may improve.	31.12.2018	En-route and Terminal
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 8	Replacement of the meteorological system at Budapest Airport	
Description	The current meteorological system was installed in 2006 so it will reach end of life in 2015.	
Accountable entity	MET	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	New system	The system will reach end of life, the elements of the system became obsolete.
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	No	

Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	The new system will represent the current technology will meet the current requirements of the stakeholders.	31.12.2015	En-route, Terminal and Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	With more accurate and easily available meteorological data, capacity may increase.	31.12.2015	En-route, Terminal and Airport
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 9	Implement Voice over IP (VoIP) network segment for VoIP in ATM			
Description	It is an European ATM Master plan roadmap and also an LSSIP objective to implement Voice over IP (VoIP) in ATM. HungaroControl Pte Ltd Co will implement VoIP capable radios and VoIP capability of the Voice Communication System. Between the radios and VCS there is a need for a reliable IP network to carry the VoIP traffic.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	New system	Between the VoIP capable radios and the VoIP capable VCS there is a need for a reliable IP network to carry the VoIP traffic.		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No			
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes			
Decision-making process	No			
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	The network part of the complete VoIP in ATM chain will be reliable and redundant besides of the radios and the VCS.	31.12.2015	En-route and Terminal
Environment	No			

Capacity	Yes	As a reliable network offers more availability figures, the capacity may increase.	31.12.2015	En-route and Terminal
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 10	Replacement of the AFTN / AMHS communication center			
Description	The current AFTN Communication switch was made in 2004. Although it was operationally used from 2009, it reaches end of life in 2016 and needs to be replaced.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>New system</i>	The technology and the system itself becomes obsolete and needs to be replaced in 2016.
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	
Decision-making process	No	

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	With the new technology the system can meet the current requirements and ensure safe operation and delivery of AFTN / AMHS messages in long term.	31.12.2016	En-route, Terminal and Airport
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
MATIAS Build 12	5,902	0	0	0	1,771	4,131	7	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2019
CPDLC	3,462	1,241	0	0	0	0	7	93,56% / 6,44%	30/09/2015
MATIAS Build 11.2	2,951	0	0	885	2,066	0	7	85,94% / 14,06%	30/06/2018
MATIAS Build 11.1	2,066	0	2,066	0	0	0	7	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2016
ANS I renovation	1,579	848	75	0	0	0	11	84,57% / 15,43%	31/12/2016
A-SMGCS	1,180	0	1,180	0	0	0	7	0% / 100%	31/12/2016
Replacement of Voice Communication System (VCS)	590	0	0	0	590	0	10	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2018
Replacement of the meteorological system at Budapest Airport	413	413	0	0	0	0	10	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2015
Implement Voice over IP (VoIP)	400	340	0	0	0	0	5	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2015
Replacement of the AFTN /	295	0	295	0	0	0	7	85,94% / 14,06%	31/12/2016
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	18,838	2,842	3,616	885	4,427	4,131			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	7,485	2,793	1,503	1,063	863	763			
Total capex (1) + (2)	26,323	5,635	5,119	1,948	5,290	4,894			

Additional comments

The amortisation period is the weighted average of the investment items in each project.

LPS

Number of capex	11	
Name of capex 1	Software Upgrade of the Main ATM System - AGDL and COTR	
Description	Upgrade of the main ATM system to implement the new operational improvements specified in the legal regulations	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Implementation of requirements laid down in the Commission Regulation No 29/2009
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP ITY-AGDL, ITY-COTR OIs: AOM-0403 Enabler: CTE-C2a, ER APP ATC 119, SO4		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of situational awareness and safety tools based on more accurate profile calculation, ATCO load reduction	2016	En-route
Environment	Yes	Optimized routes can contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency	2016	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Capacity increase by 4% supported by enhanced system configuration	Q2 2016	En-route
Cost efficiency	No	Optimized routes can contribute to lower fuel costs		

Name of capex 2	Hardware Upgrade of the Main ATM System	
Description	Hardware upgrade of the main ATM system due to its obsolescence	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Replacement of obsolete components
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP AOM21, OIs: CM-0801, AOM-0403 Enabler: ER APP ATC 69a,ER APP ATC 133, SO4
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process

Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of the system reliability and availability	2018	En-route
Environment	Yes	ATM system prerequisite for FRA implementation and optimized routes can contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency	2018	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Capacity increase by 3% supported by enhanced system configuration	2018	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Reduction of HW maintenance costs	2018	En-route

Name of capex 3	Software Upgrade of the Main ATM System			
Description	Gradual upgrade of the main ATM system in relation to adaptation of the new operational improvements			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Implementation of new ATM functions and new legal requirements		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP AOM210Is: CM-0801, AOM-0403 Enabler: ER APP ATC 69a, ER APP ATC 133, SO4		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of situational awareness and safety tools based on more accurate profile calculation, ATCO load reduction	2019	En-route
Environment	Yes	ATM system prerequisite for FRA implementation and optimized routes can contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency	2019	En-route

Capacity	Yes	Capacity increase by 3% supported by enhanced system configuration	2019	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	FRA implementation and optimized routes can contribute to lower fuel costs		

Name of capex 4	Surveillance Systems Upgrade			
Description	ARTAS system upgrade			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Replacement of obsolete components supporting surveillance ATS (ARTAS)
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP ITY-SPI, OIs: IS-0302, ER APP ATC70b
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of DAPs processing and safety tools	2018	En-route
Environment	Yes	Optimized routes can contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency	2018	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Increase overall system processing capacity	2018	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Common EUROCONTROL product	2018	En-route

Name of capex 5	Radiocommunication Equipment Upgrade			
Description	Radio system for air-ground voice communication			

Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	New system	Implementation of requirements on voice channel spacing 8,33 kHz laid down in Regulation No 1079/2012. Radio stations will be VoIP capable.		
Replacement investment	Click to select			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP ITY-AGVCS2, Ois: DCB-0306-A, AOM-0804, Enabler: CTE-C5, SO8		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of situational awareness	2016	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Increase availability of radio frequencies for a/g communication	2016	En-route
Cost efficiency	No			

Name of capex 6	Voice Communication System - Implementation of VoIP	
Description	VCS system for ground-ground and air-ground voice communication in IP environment	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	New system	Adaptation of the main and back up VCSs for ATCC Bratislava and upgrade of VCSs for APP Units at airports to IP environment.
Replacement investment	No	
Common project	No	

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP COM11, OIs: IS-0301, CM-0102-A Enabler: CTE-C8, CTE-C11a, SO2		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of the voice communication reliability and availability	2018	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Standardisation of commication interfaces and protocols to common IP environment, reduction of maintenance costs	2018	En-route

Name of capex 7	Voice Recording System - Implemetation of VoIP	
Description	Adaptation of the recording systems to IP environment.	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	Adaptation of the recording systems to IP environment.
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP COM11, OIs: IS-0301, CM-0102-A Enabler: CTE-C8, CTE-C11a
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process

Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of the voice communication reliability and availability	2018	En-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Standardisation of communication interfaces and protocols to common IP environment, reduction of maintenance costs	2018	En-route

Name of capex 8	SACON Network Upgrade			
Description	Components of the Sloval Aeronautical Communication Network			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	The SACON (Slovak Aeronautical Communication Network) as a system and/or its elements will be adapted in accordance to requirements related to migration application to IP. Some HW and SW components which could be obsolete in time of applicability will have to be replaced.		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	ESSIP COM11, OIs: IS-0204, IS-0301, Enabler: CTE-C11a, CTE-C11b,SO2		
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of the communication network reliability and availability	2018	En-route

Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Support of Network Management functions	2018	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Standardisation of communication interfaces and protocols to common IP environment, reduction of maintenance costs	2018	En-route

Name of capex 9	Navigation Systems Upgrade			
Description	System of ground based navigation equipment			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Replacement of obsolete components
Replacement investment	Yes	
Common project	Yes	Common projects are currently under preparation
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	OIs: AOM-0404, Enabler: CTE-N5a
Joint investment	No	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improvement of pilots situational awareness	2016	En-route
Environment	Yes	Optimized routes can contribute to the lower emission and fuel efficiency	2016	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Supporting route re-structuring	2016	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Rationalization of legacy navigation equipment, reduction of maintenance costs	2016	En-route

Name of capex 10	Central Monitoring System
Description	Central Monitoring System of the ATM/CNS
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>New system</i>	Continuous monitoring of operational statuses of all equipment in order to maintain and improve quality of engineering services. The aim is provide tools for prompt and effective solution of operational situations and source of information for processing and evaluation of technical operational indicators
Replacement investment	<i>Click to select</i>	
Common project	<i>No</i>	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>No</i>	
Joint investment	<i>No</i>	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Yes</i>	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Yes</i>	The project is a part of consultation process
Decision-making process	<i>Yes</i>	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Yes</i>	Improvement of the engineering services availability	2016	En-route
Environment	<i>No</i>			
Capacity	<i>No</i>			
Cost efficiency	<i>Yes</i>	Reduction of maintenance costs	2016	En-route

Name of capex 11	ATS Operation Information System
Description	Information system for supporting information display and exchange within ATS Unit
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>New system</i>	Exchange of supporting information within ATS Unit		
Replacement investment	<i>No</i>			
Common project	<i>Yes</i>	Common projects are currently under preparation		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>Yes</i>	OIs: DC-0103-A, Enabler:AIMS-06, SO2		
Joint investment	<i>No</i>	Non-technical pre-requisites (especially legal constraints) need to be sorted out first (currently ongoing)		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Yes</i>	Common approach in preparation of the harmonized requirements specifications is consulted		
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Yes</i>	The project is a part of consultation process		
Decision-making process	<i>Yes</i>	The Plan of investments is a subject of approval of the Investment Committee and Supervisory Board		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Yes</i>	Improvement of ATCOs situational awareness, ATCO load reduction	2017	En-route
Environment	<i>No</i>			
Capacity	<i>Yes</i>	Support of Network Management functions	2017	En-route
Cost efficiency	<i>No</i>			

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
<i>Software Upgrade of the Main ATM System - AGDL and COTR</i>	4,000,000	3,700,000					4	100 % / 0%	2015
<i>Hardware Upgrade of the Main ATM System</i>	15,000,000	4,000,000	6,000,000	5,000,000			4	97% / 3%	2015, 2016, 2017
<i>Software Upgrade of the Main ATM System</i>	5,000,000		1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		4	97% / 3%	2018
<i>Surveillance Systems Upgrade</i>	200,000				200,000		4	97% / 3%	2018
<i>Radiocommunication Equipment Upgrade</i>	2,600,000	1,008,800	795,600	795,600			4	100 % / 0%	2015,2017, 2016

Voice Communication System - Implementation of VoIP	3,000,000			1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4	67% / 23%	2018, 2019
Voice Recording System - Implementation of VoIP	300,000				300,000		4	100.00%	2018, 2019
SACON Network Upgrade	4,600,000			3,200,000	700,000	700,000	4	97% / 3%	2017, 2018, 2019
Navigation Systems Upgrade	1,425,000	320,000	505,000	300,000	300,000		4	97% / 3%	2015, 2016, 2017, 2018
Central Monitoring System	1,000,000	100,000	400,000	500,000			4	97% / 3%	2016, 2017
ATS Operation Information System	800,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000		4	97% / 3%	2016, 2017, 2018
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	37,925,000	9,328,800	8,900,600	12,995,600	4,700,000	1,700,000			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	14,789,181	5,554,725	2,467,748	2,223,309	3,142,399	1,401,000			
Total capex (1) + (2)	52,714,181	14,883,525	11,368,348	15,218,909	7,842,399	3,101,000			

Additional comments

Slovenia Control

Number of capex	6	
Name of capex 1	Datalink/CPDLC	
Description	Datalink/CPDLC will implement air-ground datalink communication between Ljubljana ACC and enroute traffic. Datalink will be implemented according to DLS-IR (EC Regulation No. 29/2009).	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	New system	This investment will implement new service which will be reflected in upgrade of ATM System and network infrastructure.
Replacement investment	No	
Common project	Yes	Common project: IDP task 4 (Datalink) FABCE P16
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S02-2 and S04-3; ATM MP:relevance and coherence AUO-0301
Joint investment	No	

Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Non technical prerequisites, common documentation, generic safety case, other synergies to be considered in FAB CE Project 16		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved Safety	1.1.2016	en route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Improved Capacity	1.1.2016	en route
Cost efficiency	Yes	CBA provided by Eurocontrol	1.1.2016	en route

Name of capex 2	FDPS Upgrade	
Description	Current FDPS system will be upgraded. New functional requirements will be implemented to improve safety and capacity, mostly related to ATM Master Plan, IDP, LSSIP goals and EC implementing rules. The main upgrades will implement: • MODE-S Processing • AFP Messages • STAM tools • Free Route Concept • Complementary OLDI Messages	
Accountable entity	ANSP	
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	This investment will implement gradual upgrade of existing FDPS with new functionalities of the current system.
Replacement investment	No	
Common project	Yes	Common projects: IDP WP 1.1.: AFP messages, IDP WP 1.2.: STAM tools
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S02/2, S02/4, S04/1, S04/2, S04/3, S05/3, S05/4, S05/5; ATM MP: AOM-0201, AOM-0202, AOM-0203, AOM-0205, AOM-0401, AOM-0504, AOM-0801, AOM-0802, CM-0201, DCB-0203, SDM-0101
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	To be considered through FAB CE cooperation in ATM System Area
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process

Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved Safety	1.1.2017	en-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Improved Capacity	1.1.2017	en-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Lower costs per flight		en-route

Name of capex 3	AIXM Database			
Description	According to the Regulation 73/2010 an improved information infrastructure and procedures have to be implemented. The objective of this investment is to achieve aeronautical information of sufficient quality, accuracy, timelines and granularity as a key enabler of the European ATM Network.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	New system	This investment will implement new information infrastructure – AIXM system.		
Replacement investment	No			
Common project	Yes	Common project: IDP WP 2.1		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S02/3 ATM MP: IS-0202, IS-0204		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Synergies are possible in implementing common information infrastructure in FAB CE, but activities are not defined yet		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved Safety	1.1.2017	en-route
Environment	No			

Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Improved information flow, better information quality	1.1.2017	en-route

Name of capex 4	ATM System upgrade			
Description	Current ATM system will be upgraded (or replaced with) to SESAR compliant system. New functional requirements will be implemented to improve safety and capacity, mostly related to ATM Master Plan, IDP, LSSIP goals and EC implementing rules.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	It is not yet decided how required functionalities will be implemented. Detailed analysis will be provided on the most efficient solution – upgrade or replacement of the current ATM system.
Replacement investment	Yes	Partly; replacement and new functions
Common project	No	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S02/2, S02/4, S04/1, S04/2, S04/3, S05/3, S05/4, S05/5; ATM MP: AOM-0301, AOM-0401, AOM-0504, AOM-0801, AOM-0802, CM-0201, CM-0202, CM-0203, CM-0801
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	To be considered through possible FAB CE cooperation in ATM Systems Area
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process
Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved Safety	1.1.2020	en-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Improved Capacity	1.1.2020	en-route
Cost efficiency	Yes			en-route

Name of capex 5	Operational VoIP			
Description	Ground-ground voice communications are still based on convencional communication technologies (TDM). Flexible use of airspace and day-to-day airspace management require more flexible communication network which could be achieved using VoIP technologies. The investment will implement VoIP into ATM infrastructure (replacement of VCS and radio equipment, upgrade of COM infrastructure).			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	Overhaul of existing system	It is not yet decided how required functionalities will be implemented. Detailed analysis will be provided on the most efficient solution – upgrade or replacement of the current ATM system.		
Replacement investment	Yes	Partly; replaced and new elements in communication infrastructure		
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S04/3 ATM MP: CTE-C8, CTE-C9		
Joint investment	Yes	VHF Radio procurement is selected as pilot common procurement		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Synergies are forseen in common procurement, training and sharing of infrastructure in FAB CE.		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Improved Safety	1.1.2019	en-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	Yes	Improved Capacity	1.1.2019	en-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Lower costs and better use of existing infrastructure	1.1.2019	en-route

Name of capex 6	ACC Hardware Renewal			
Description	In 2018 the majority of standard servers running ATM system will come to expected end of life cycle. Hardware replacement will be needed to keep the required performance and availability of the system.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Replacement system (hardware).		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	Yes	NSP: Contribution to action S02/2, S02/4, S04/1, S04/2, S04/3, S05/3, S05/4, S05/5; ATM MP: Contribution to action AOM-0201, AOM-0202, AOM-0203, AOM-0205, AOM-0401, AOM-0504, AOM-0801, AOM-0802, CM-0201, DCB-0203, SDM-0101		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	Yes	Possible synergies in common procurement		
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Part of RP2 Performance Plan consultation process		
Decision-making process	Yes	Subject of approval through 5-years strategic business plan		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Ensuring long time integrity of the system	1.1.2019	en-route
Environment	No			
Capacity	No			
Cost efficiency	Yes	Cost effective HW platform	1.1.2019	en-route

Name of investment	Total CAPEX for the project	Planned Amount of Capital Expenditures (in national currency)					Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Allocation en route / terminal ANS (%)	Planned date of entry into operation (IOC / FOC dates)
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019			
<i>Datalink/CPDLC</i>	1,000,000	1,000,000					10	en-route (100%)	1.1.2016
<i>FDPS Upgrade</i>	2,200,000	200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			5	en-route (100%)	1.1.2017
<i>AIXM Database</i>	500,000	250,000	250,000				10	en-route (95%) / terminal (5%)	1.1.2017
<i>ATM System upgrade</i>	4,600,000				1,800,000	2,800,000	15	en-route (100%)	1.1.2020
<i>Operational VoIP</i>	400,000				200,000	200,000	15	en-route (100%)	1.1.2019
<i>ACC Hardware Renewal</i>	1,000,000				1,000,000		7	en-route (100%)	1.1.2019
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	9,700,000	1,450,000	1,250,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000			
Sub-total other Capex (2)	2,410,000	300,000	410,000	200,000	700,000	800,000			
Total capex (1) + (2)	12,110,000	1,750,000	1,660,000	1,200,000	3,700,000	3,800,000			

Additional comments

SECTION 3: PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
3. PERFORMANCE TARGETS AT LOCAL LEVEL	3			
3.1. Performance targets in each key performance area, set by reference to each key performance indicator as set out in Annex I, Section 2, for the entire reference period, with annual values to be used for monitoring and incentive purposes:	3.1			
3.2. Description and explanation of the consistency of the performance targets with the relevant Union-wide performance targets. When there is no Union-wide performance target, description and explanation of the targets within the plan and how they contribute to the improvement of the performance of the European ATM network.	3.1.(a).(i) 3.1.(a).(ii) 3.1.(a).(iii) 3.1.(a).(iv) 3.1.(b).(i) & (ii) 3.1.(b).(iii) 3.1.(c).(i) 3.1.(c).(ii) 3.1.(c).(iii) 3.1.(c).(iv) 3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A	RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 e)	
3.3. Description and explanation of the interdependencies and trade-offs between the key performance areas, including the assumptions used to assess the trade-offs.	3.3			
3.4. Contribution of each air navigation service provider concerned to the achievement of the performance targets set for the functional airspace block in accordance with Article 5(2)(c)(ii).	3.1.(a).(i) 3.1.(a).(ii) 3.1.(a).(iii) 3.1.(a).(iv) 3.1.(b).(i) & (ii) 3.1.(b).(iii) 3.1.(c).(i) 3.1.(c).(ii) 3.1.(c).(iii) 3.1.(c).(iv)	RT 1 (All)	AI 4 a)	

SECTION 3.1.(a): SAFETY KPA

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
(a) Safety	3.1.(a)			
(i) level of effectiveness of safety management: local targets for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(a).(i)			
(ii) application of the severity classification based on the Risk Analysis Tool (RAT) methodology: local targets for each year of the reference period (percentage);	3.1.(a). (ii)			
(iii) just culture: local targets for the last year of the reference period.	3.1.(a). (iii)			
	3.1.(a). (iv) - Optional section - Additional Safety KPI(s)			

3 - PERFORMANCE TARGETS AT LOCAL LEVEL

3.1 - Key Performance Areas

3.1.(a) - Safety

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

	2015 Target	2016 Target	2017 Target	2018 Target	2019 Target
Union-wide targets at State level	-	-	-	-	C

Union-wide targets	For Safety Culture MO	-	-	-	-	C
at ANSP level	For all other MOs	-	-	-	-	D

FAB level	Regulatory authorities	B	B	B	B	C
	Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets	FAB targets are consistent with Union-wide targets				
	Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	n/a				
	ANSPs (for Safety Culture MO)	C	C	C	C	D
	ANSPs (for all other Mos)	C	C	C	C	D
	Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets	FAB targets are consistent with Union-wide targets				
	Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	n/a				

Select Number of States >>	6
----------------------------	---

National level	Austria	B	B	B	B	C
	Croatia	B	B	B	B	C
	Czech Republic	B	B	B	B	C
	Hungary	B	B	B	B	C
	Slovakia	B	B	B	B	C
	Slovenia	B	B	B	B	C

Select Number of ANSPs for Safety Culture MO >>	6
---	---

National level	ANS CR	D	D	D	D	D
	Austro Control	C	D	D	D	D
	Croatia Control	C	C	C	C	D
	Hungarocontrol	D	D	D	D	D
	LPS SR	C	C	C	D	D
	Slovenia Control	C	C	C	D	D

Select Number of ANSPs for all other MOs >>	6
---	---

National level	ANS CR	C	C	D	D	D
	Austro Control	C	D	D	D	D
	Croatia Control	C	C	C	C	D
	Hungarocontrol	D	D	D	D	D
	LPS SR	C	C	C	D	D
	Slovenia Control	C	C	C	D	D

Additional comments						
Croatia Control: The transition of BiH airspace will have a significant impact on this KPI in satisfying its target values. There is a potential impact on Safety Plan and meeting its deadlines due to the resource availability.						

3.1.(a).(ii) - Safety KPI #2: Application of the severity classification based on the Risk Analysis Tool (RAT) methodology

Ground Score		2015 Target	2016 Target	2017 Target	2018 Target	2019 Target
Union-wide targets	SMIs	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
	RIs	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
	ATM-S	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%

FAB level	SMIs	90.83%	92.50%	94.17%	98.33%	100.00%
	RIs	91.67%	92.50%	93.33%	98.33%	100.00%
	ATM-S	86.67%	89.17%	92.50%	96.67%	100.00%
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		FAB targets are consistent with Union-wide targets				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency		n/a				

Select Number of ANSPs >>	6
---------------------------	---

National level	ANS CR	SMIs	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		RIs	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	Austro Control	SMIs	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	100.00%
		RIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	100.00%
	Croatia Control	SMIs	80.00%	85.00%	90.00%	95.00%	100.00%
		RIs	70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	90.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	50.00%	60.00%	80.00%	85.00%	100.00%
	Hungarocontrol	SMIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		RIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	LPS SR	SMIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		RIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	Slovenia Control	SMIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		RIs	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
		ATM-S	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Additional comments	
Croatia Control: For ATM Specific Events, the RAT methodology still needs to be developed to provide effective results. The transition of BiH airspace will have a significant impact on this KPI. There is a potential impact on Safety Plan and its deadlines due to the resource availability.	
HungaroControl: Every reported occurrence is investigated and assessed by RAT as far as the knowledge (available information) at the ANSP and the RAT methodology makes it possible - this statement refers mainly to "other incidents".	

Overall Score		2015 Target	2016 Target	2017 Target	2018 Target	2019 Target
Union-wide targets	SMIs	-	-	>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%
	RIs	-	-	>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%
	ATM-S	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%

FAB level	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
	RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
	ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		FAB targets are consistent with Union-wide targets				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency		n/a				

Select Number of States >>	6
----------------------------	---

	Austria	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%
	Croatia	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%

National level	Czech Republic	RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%
	Hungary	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%
	Slovakia	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%
	Slovenia	SMIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		RIs	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
		ATM-S	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	100.00%

Additional comments							

		2019 Target
FAB level	Regulatory authorities	Have you established a common FAB approach in certain areas for Just Culture improvements?
		YES
		If YES, please specify details and level of presence. If NO, please specify any impediments, intent for common FAB approach.
		Based on the National Supervisory Authorities Co-operation Agreement Occurrence Reporting and investigation information are mutually shared on the basis of Article 12 of that agreement. FAB CE NSAs are not able to guarantee any positive outcome in Legal/Judiciary and Policy implementation areas as there is no legal requirement. Safety programme in Just Culture areas has to be implemented locally. However NSAs will share experience regarding Just Culture.
	ANSPs	Have you established a common FAB approach in certain areas for Just Culture improvements?
		YES
		If YES, please specify details and level of presence. If NO, please specify any impediments, intent for common FAB approach.
		FAB CE Safety Management Roadmap specifies that FAB CE ANSPs will share experience regarding Just Culture. Anyway, the Just Culture concept has to be implemented locally, taking into account the national legislation.

Number of States	6
------------------	---

National level	Austria	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? Just Culture is included in the Austrian Aviation Act and the Austrian ANS Safety Regulatory Framework.
	Croatia	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? Croatia implemented Just Culture provisions in its legislative framework through Air Traffic Act and Ordinance on occurrence reporting in civil aviation.
	Czech Republic	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? Implementation of the concept of Just Culture in the Czech Republic is in line with national policy specified by the state administration. Although there is still room for improvement in the national legislation, on the organisational level the Just Culture system has been implemented during 2013 by ANS CR. As this issue is still very sensitive and its success depends mainly on behaviour of staff, believing in main goal - safety and cooperation of all the relevant stakeholders, this policy was broadly discussed internally on the organisational level before implementation. In addition to successful negotiations also the Memorandum of Understanding for the system of Just Culture has been signed between ANS CR and NSA Czech Republic on the high managerial level to present positive attitude of the state administration to this issue. There has been presented full confidence in internal assessment system on the ANSP level, also with necessary feedback lines. The Czech Republic fully believes that after first analysis of the experience with the system, this policy will be implemented also by the other providers and operators.
	Hungary	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? There is no EU level Just Culture legislation and The Hungarian National Legislation is not recognising explicitly the Just Culture Policy at State level. Although the State legislation does not require Just Culture policy to be implemented by Air Navigation Service Providers, the designated air navigation service provider implemented a comprehensive Just Culture policy that is supported in principle by the Hungarian NSA. Also in accordance with Reg. 966/2010/EU Art 4, there is an independent safety investigation body (TSB). The designated ANSP has been actively communicating with juridical entities and also organising awareness campaign to promote the Just Culture principles at the State level.

	Slovakia	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? State safety programme of the Slovak republic is in general addressing principles of JUST CULTURE. However in order to further progress at the state level it is necessary to address it at judicial level e.g. The Constitution of the Slovak Republic does not allow discrimination of citizens on the basis of membership of a particular group of employees. The Ministry of Transport and the Transport Authority will again organise awareness campaign among the aviation and prosecution environment with the aim to apply the application of the JUST CULTURE principles in the Slovak legal environment. However we are not able to guarantee any positive outcome as there is no legal requirement at the EU or national level to implement just culture
	Slovenia	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? Revision of the Aviation Act is planned in the near future and it is expected the Just Culture principles will be implemented.

Number of ANSPs	6
-----------------	---

National level	ANS CR	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? - CAA Czech Republic in a letter containing CAA Declaration to Just Culture expressed its support to the implementation of Just Culture in Air Navigation Services of the Czech Republic. - Just Culture Memorandum and Just Culture Policy were endorsed by the CEO of the Air Navigation Services of the Czech Republic and President of CZATCA (professional association of air traffic controllers). - Subsequent information campaign encompassed following activities: - meetings with operational staff, - Just Culture site on the company intranet, - Information in the company magazine, - JC leaflets. - Changes to the mandatory reporting system were carried out. - Voluntary reporting system was launched, including its database – the system is being used by the staff – the reports are being analysed by the audit and investigation department.
	Austro Control	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? A number of actions and measures were undertaken to improve in all areas of the Just Culture survey. This resulted in a positive response in most survey areas in 2013. - ACG SMM revised and includes now additional Safety Culture in the Safety Policy. - Just Culture procedure for all ANS departments recently enforced. - Just Culture is fully implemented in the Occurrence Investigation Process. - By start of 2014 the interface to and work of Just Culture Committee will be fully implemented. - Information campaign for Just Culture in 2014.
	Croatia Control	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? - Development of mature Safety culture within CCL (Improvement Action Plan for Safety Management System) - Establishment of strong connection/link with CAA/NSA and National accident and incident agency in term of JUST CULTURE. - To reinforce and give strong support for the integration of the “just culture” principles into the Croatian legal framework.
	Hungarocontrol	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? - By mid-2013 HungaroControl developed it's Just Culture Policy and established the internal procedures for the application of JC principles with the involvement of affected staff. - The principles and the regulation were published in June and November 2013. - The internal regulation will be in effect from 1 July 2014. - HungaroControl continues to foster the implementation of JC principles into national law. - Voluntary and anonym reporting system is in place since 2012 the system can be used by all of the staff – the reports are being analysed by Safety department.

	LPS SR	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? • In 2014 SMM revised and includes specific information focused on Safety Culture and the Safety Policy. • Just Culture policy is endorsed by top management. • Just Culture is fully implemented in the Occurrence and Investigation Process. • Critical Incident Stress Management programme has started in 2013. • Safety investigation function is part of safety department independent from line management. • Safety investigators reports directly to safety manager and he/she report further to CEO. • Safety campaigns are organised. • Just culture article published in internal magazine
	Slovenia Control	What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture? • While no EU - wide target is set for the last year of RP2 Slovenia Control position is that any improvement of the JC status in PRB report 2012 is accepted as improvement. • Just culture approach, principles are contained in Slovenia Control Safety Policy document. Slovenia Control has established CISM programme. CISM peer function is established in ATS units and they are well known. Staff providing CISM are clearly nominated and adequately trained through Slovenia Control CISM programme and implementation. • Safety investigation function is part of safety department separated from line management. Safety investigators reports directly to safety manager and he/she report further to CEO. • Investigating commission is established by CEO decree, where investigators are empowered with the rights to access Slovenia Control data relevant for the effective investigation. • Just Culture principles are part of safety briefing for ANS units. It is envisaged that this will be done as well for CNS and AIS additionally to the scope that is contained in Slovenia Control Safety Policy document. Safety Briefings are regularly organised for ATS, CNS and AIS units. Part of those presents a feedback connected to occurrences.

Additional comments	
Croatia Control: The transition of BiH airspace will have a significant impact on this KPI. There is a potential impact on Safety Plan and its deadlines due to the resource availability.	

SECTION 3.1.(b): ENVIRONMENT KPA

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
(b) Environment	3.1.(b)			
(i) description of the process to improve route design;	3.1.(b).(i) & (ii)			
(ii) average horizontal <i>en route</i> flight efficiency of the actual trajectory.				
	3.1.(b).(iii) - Optional section - Additional Environment KPI(s)			

3.1.(b) - Environment

3.1.(b).(i) & (ii) - Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en route flight efficiency (KEA)

	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
Union-wide targets	-	-	-	-	2.60%

FAB reference values	1.99%	1.94%	1.90%	1.85%	1.81%
----------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

FAB level	1.99%	1.94%	1.90%	1.85%	1.81%
Description of the consistency between FAB targets and FAB reference values	The KEA value 2012 was 2.13%, whereas the target percentage points to reach the goal of 1.81% until 2019 is 0.32%. According to the FABCE Free Route Planning and the FRA Roadmap, elaborated in close cooperation with the ECTL/NM, there are no discrepancies to reach the FABCE target				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	none				
ANSP contribution to local targets	Coordinated via FABCE Airspace Planning Group and ECTL/NM (RNDSG)				

Description of the process to improve route design

The FAB CE respects the following airspace design principles:

- The establishment and configuration of airspace structures shall be based on operational requirements, irrespective of national or FIR boundaries and not necessarily be bound by the division level between upper and lower airspace;
- The design of airspace structures shall be a transparent process showing decisions made and their justification through taking into account the requirements of all users whilst reconciling safety, capacity, environmental aspects and having due regard of military and national security needs;
- The present and forecast traffic demand, at network and local level, and the performance targets shall be used as an input for the FAB CE airspace design with the view to satisfy the needs of the main traffic flows and airports;
- Ensure vertical and horizontal connectivity, including terminal airspace and the airspace structure at the interface;
- The possibility for flights to operate along, or as near as possible to, user required routes and flight profiles in the en-route phase of flight;
- The acceptance for assessment and possible development of all airspace structures proposals, including free route airspace, multiple route options and CDRs, received from stakeholders having an operational requirement in that area;
- The design of airspace structures including free route airspace and ATC sectors shall take into account existing or proposed airspace structures designated for activities which require airspace reservation or restriction. To that end only such structures that are in accordance with the application of FUA shall be established. Such structures shall be harmonised and made consistent on the largest possible extent across the FAB CE;
- ATC sector design development shall commence with the required route or traffic flow alignments within an iterative process that will ensure compatibility between routes or flows and sectors;
- ATC sectors shall be designed to enable the construction of sector configurations that satisfy traffic flows and are adaptable and commensurate with variable traffic demand;
- Agreements on service provision shall be established in cases where ATC sectors require, for operational reasons, to be designed across national or functional airspace block borders or FIR boundaries;
- Airspace structures shall be planned to facilitate flexible and timely airspace use and management with regard to routing options, traffic flows, sector configuration schemes and the configuration of other airspace structures;
- Airspace structures should accommodate the establishment of additional route options while ensuring their compatibility (capacity considerations and sector design limitations);

- To ensure the regular performance improvements, FAB CE will undertake a regular review of the effectiveness of the implemented airspace structures:

- Traffic demand evolution;
- Capacity and flight efficiency performance and constraints at State, functional airspace block or network level;
- Evaluation of airspace utilisation aspects from both civil and military perspective;
- Evaluation of sectorisation and sector configurations used;
- Evaluation of airspace structures integrity and continuity;

Croatia Control:

2015

- Introduction of new lateral sector (CENTRAL)
- ATCC Zagreb sector reorganisation
- ARN improvements according to EUROCONTROL RND SG ERNIP

List B - 2015/ 2016

- Cross border DCT continuation with FAB CE partners and other adjacent FABs and neighbouring ANSPs
- Extension to H24 already implemented DCT and Cross border DCT
- Establishment of FRA Zagreb

2016 - ARN improvements according to EUROCONTROL RND SG ERNIP

List B - 2015/2016

- Cross border DCT continuation with FAB CE partners and other adjacent FABs and neighbouring ANSPs

2017 to 2019

Long term projects according to EUROCONTROL ERNIP (coordination with NM)

Additional comments

FABCE Free Route Application Roadmap:

Q1/2014: AUSTRIA/SLOVENIA/CROATIA planning x-border DCTs on South/East axis FL345+

Q4/2014: AUSTRIA DCTs H24/7, FL165+ (to be evaluated) , parallel ops with ATS Routes

Q4/2014: HUNGARY planning FRA step 2 H24, based on (directional) entry / exit points from lowest usable FL to UNL

Q1/2015: CROATIA planning step2 H24 x-border DCTs from FL285/325+

Q4/2015: AUSTRIA planning step 2 H24 x-border DCTs from FL165+

Q1/2016: BHANSA Step 2 FL 285/325

Q1/2016: AUSTRIA FRAW FL165+, x-border ops FAB CE wide wherever feasible, (considerations to withdraw partially ATS routes)

Q4/2016: SLOVENIA planning step 2 H24 enhanced x-border

Q4/2016: SLOVAKIA planning step 2 H24, national DCTs FL245+

Q4/2017: based on previous experiences of FRA applications in terms of capacity and performance - stepwise increase of FABCE wide cross border FRA applications

Q4/2018: based on previous experiences of FRA applications in terms of capacity and performance - stepwise increase of FABCE wide cross border FRA applications

Q4/2018: CZECH REPUBLIC planning step 2 H24, DCTs / FRA

Q2/2019: Full FABCE wide cross border application of DCT / FRA H24

SECTION 3.1.(c): CAPACITY KPA

Mapping between the PRB FAB performance plan template and the Annex II of EU Regulation 390/2013				
Structure of ANNEX II of Regulation 390/2013	Link with PRB template			
	Level 1' FAB PP	Level2' FAB PP - Annex C		FAB PP Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
(c) Capacity	3.1.(c)			
(i) minutes of average <i>en route</i> ATFM delay per flight;	3.1.(c).(i)			
(ii) minutes of average terminal ATFM arrival delay per flight;	3.1.(c).(ii)			
(iii) the capacity plan established by the air navigation service provider(s).	3.1.(c).(iii)			
	3.1.(c).(iv) - Optional section - Additional Capacity KPI(s)			

3.1.(c) - Capacity

3.1.(c).(i) - Capacity KPI #1: En route ATFM delay per flight

	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
Union-wide targets	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50

FAB reference values	0.30	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29
----------------------	------	------	------	------	------

FAB level	0.32	0.31	0.31	0.30	0.29
Description of the consistency between FAB targets and FAB reference values	FAB target is slightly higher than the FAB reference value.				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	Overall, according to the NM position the FABCE is in a good position to deliver the required capacity. The marginal difference is due to anomalous events e.g. impact of severe weather conditions within FABCE region. In addition, specific ATFCM and STAM measures will be applied to ensure that capacity is kept within the limits set.				

Select Number of ANSPs >>	6
---------------------------	---

National level	ANS CR	0.14	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.11
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	The delays in Czech Republic will occur during short traffic peaks only. To reduce the delay to the reference values proposed by NM would definitely induce increased number of ATCOs and additional CAPEX to cover just these short peaks. Considering the interdependency with cost effectiveness (ie Total Economic Value) these induced cost (depreciation and staff) might not be spent in favour of majority of the users as this would be beneficial for only a few users and all the others would pay for it.				
	Austro Control	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.21
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	EnRoute ATFM delays are calculated for ACC Vienna based on ALL reasons, including Weather derived delays, which account for the majority delay reasons.				
	Croatia Control	0.23	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.19
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	CCL capacity targets are set below reference capacity values proposed by NM (0.26, 0.25, 0.25, 0.24, 0.24) per annum and thus CCL directly contributes in achieving the FAB and EU wide capacity and delay targets. CCL targets are set with an emphasis on continuous improvements in manpower planning in order to reduce the capacity shortfalls, especially in peak summer periods. During RP2 a steady growth of ACC Baseline Capacity is predicted, in line with the available STATFOR forecasts. CCL performance has greatly improved during RP1 (Croatia was not monitored in RP1) with advanced staff rostering, optimum DFL and other ASM and CNS improvements. Further improvements are expected from advanced functionalities of new ATM system COOPANS, also compliant with SES requirements, as well as dynamic Demand-Capacity Balancing Concepts which are being developed for RP2 use.				
	HungaroControl	0.0649	0.0549	0.0549	0.0449	0.0549
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	Hungarian national en-route capacity target for the second reference period is in line with the reference value defined by the network manager.				
	LPS	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.10
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	Calculation of Slovak Capacity target is based on the latest STATFOR forecast of annual traffic growth and planned technical improvements of ATM system. Delay targets correspond to a objective capacity increase during RP2.				
	Slovenia Control	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.23	0.22
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	EnRoute ATFM delays are calculated for ACC Ljubljana based on ALL reasons, taking into account the number of IFR flights from BASE STATFOR February 2014 and fully meeting the NM Capacity target for Slovenia.				

Additional comments
Croatia Control: The impact of transition of BiH airspace is not specified and not yet assessed in the current version of the NOP, dated February 2014, therefore the effect of those changes are not presented in the figures above. It also means that reference capacity values for CCL were set on ACC level (as it is in February 2014) which includes Zagreb FIR and delegated part of BiH airspace. Any change of a volume of controlled airspace will have a significant impact on CCL's airspace organization, capacity and business performance. Capacity Plan will therefore be revised in terms of capacity requirements and network impacts as the result of transition of BiH airspace. This transition could have a significant impact on CCL's values for Capacity KPI #1 for which CCL is not responsible, not managing them and therefore cannot be incentivized. Due to the impact of transition of BiH airspace for the summer season after the transition as a part of risk mitigation measures and based on initial safety considerations there is a possibility of introducing regulation for inbound and outbound traffic from BiH airspace. Delays resulting from those regulations shall be specially coded as not to be considered under incentive scheme (Regulation 391/2013, Article 15g).

3.1.(c).(ii) - Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight

Number of States	6
------------------	---

Austria		2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level		1.88	1.29	1.28	1.27	1.27
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance		Airport operations of the major Austrian airports are fully integrated into NM / Network Strategic and Operational Planning.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LOWWW (WIEN-SCHWECHAT)	1.88	1.29	1.28	1.27	1.27
	Airport contribution to national targets	Airport operation of Vienna is fully integrated into Network Strategic and Operational Planning. Improvements contributing to ATM network performance are resulting from the A-CDM project, PRNAV and CDO operations plus early alignment with the application of WTC re-categorization.				

Additional comments	

Croatia		2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level		0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance		Airport operations are integrated with Network strategic planning and day to day operations, PRNAV and CDO Operations are planned for further improvements.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LDZA (ZAGREB / PLESO)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	Airport contribution to national targets	Please, see the description above.				

Additional comments	

Czech Republic		2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level		0.25	0.3	0.35	0.4	0.4
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance		Airport operations are integrated with Network strategic planning and day to day operations, PRNAV and CDO Operations are planned for further improvements. With respect to actual runway configuration at Prague airport, the expected increase in traffic will lead to increase of ATFM terminal delays. The significant increase of the airport capacity is expected after the second reference period when the construction of parallel runway at Prague airport is expected to be finished, more information is provided in LSSIP. Further development of CDM Project is also expected to contribute to the airport operations efficiency and to the European ATM network performance.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LKPR (PRAHA/RUZYNE)	0.25	0.3	0.35	0.4	0.4
	Airport contribution to national targets	Please see the description above.				

Additional comments
This KPI is influenced not only by ANSP performance but mainly by the Airport operator while the airport slots are assigned.

Hungary	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance	The Hungarian contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance is based on two elements. With the introduction of the CDO and CCO technique to and out of LHBP Hungary contributes to the reduction of arrival delays. The new sequencing tool, the MergeStrip allows to provide CDO service to all airlines, at all time. The introduction of Free route concept in Budapest FIR will allow also for LHBP departure traffic to flight plan DCT between the TMA exit point and FIR exit point.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LHBP (BUDAPEST LISZT FERENC INTERNATIONAL)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
	Airport contribution to national targets	Please see the description above.				

Additional comments

Slovakia	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance	Airport Bratislava / M. R. STEFANIK has never experienced and is not expected to experience in the future the ATFM arrival delay, therefore the national target is set to 0 min.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LZIB (BRATISLAVA/M. R. STEFANIK)	0	0	0	0	0
	Airport contribution to national targets	Please see the description above.				

Additional comments

Slovenia	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level	0	0	0	0	0
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance	Airport Ljubljana/Brnik has never experienced and is not expected to experience in the future the ATFM arrival delay, therefore the national target is set to 0 min.				

Number of airports	1
--------------------	---

Airport level	LJU (LJUBLJANA/BRNIK)	0	0	0	0	0
	Airport contribution to national targets	Please see the description above.				

Additional comments

3.1.(c).(iii) - Capacity Plans

In order to avoid duplication, Member States will not be requested to attach ANSPs capacity plans when submitting the performance plans, for as long as they are already available to the PRB and the Commission. In any case, they are an integral part of the FAB performance plans.

SECTION 3.1.(d): COST-EFFICIENCY KPA

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
(d) Cost-efficiency	3.1.(d)			
(i) determined costs for <i>en route</i> and terminal air navigation services set in accordance with the provisions of Article 15(2)(a) and (b) of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 and in application of the provisions of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A			
(ii) <i>en route</i> and terminal service units forecast for each year of the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A 3.1.(d).1.C 3.1.(d).2.C	RT 1 (5.4)		
(iii) as a result, the determined unit costs for the reference period;	3.1.(d).1.A 3.1.(d).2.A	RT 1 (5.5)		
(iv) description and justification of the return on equity of the air navigation service providers concerned, as well as on the gearing ratio and on the level/composition of the asset base used to calculate the cost of capital comprised in the determined costs;		RT 1 (3.1-3.4, 3.6)	AI 1 e)	
(v) description and explanation of the carry-overs from the years preceding the reference period;		RT 1 (3.1-3.4, 3.6)	AI 3 c), d), e)	
(vi) description of economic assumptions, including: — inflation assumptions used in the plan as compared to an international source such as the IMF (International Monetary Fund) Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the forecasts and Eurostat Harmonised Index of Consumer Price for the actuals. Justification of any deviation from these sources, — assumptions underlying the calculation of pension costs comprised in the determined costs, including a description on the relevant national pension regulations and pension accounting regulations in place and on which the assumptions are based, as well as information whether changes of these regulations are anticipated, — interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services, including relevant information on loans (amounts, duration, etc.) and explanation for the (weighted) average interest on debt used to calculate the cost of capital pre tax rate and the cost of capital comprised in the determined costs, — adjustments beyond the provisions of the International Accounting Standards;	3.1.(d).1.B 3.1.(d).2.B	RT 1 (5.1-5.2)		
			AI 4 b)	
		RT 1 (3.7)	AI 4 c)	
			AI 1 item c)	
(vii) if applicable, description in respect to the previous reference period of relevant events and circumstances set out in Article 14(2)(a) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 using the criteria set out in Article 14(2)(b) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013 including an assessment of the level, composition and justification of costs exempt from the application of Article 14(1)(a) and (b) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 391/2013;		RT 3 (3.1-3.12)	AI 3 b)	
(viii) if applicable, a description of any significant restructuring planned during the reference period including the level of restructuring costs and a justification for these costs in relation to the net benefits to the airspace users over time;		RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 d)	
(ix) if applicable, restructuring costs approved from previous reference periods to be recovered.		RT 3 (4.1)	AI 4 e)	

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR SECTION 3.1.(d) – Cost-efficiency:

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;:
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
 - A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.
2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:
 - The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
 - The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d) - Cost Efficiency

List of En Route Charging Zones

Number of en route charging zones	
6	
1	<i>Austria</i>
2	<i>Croatia</i>
3	<i>Czech Republic</i>
4	<i>Hungary</i>
5	<i>Slovakia</i>
6	<i>Slovenia</i>

List of Terminal Charging Zones

Number of terminal charging zones	
6	
1	<i>Austria</i>
2	<i>Croatia</i>
3	<i>Czech Republic</i>
4	<i>Hungary</i>
5	<i>Slovakia</i>
6	<i>Slovenia</i>

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #1

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

in EUR													
		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP
		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D
		Average pct variation p.a.											
		2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D								
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Austria												
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	157,659,293	163,593,028	172,597,516	176,965,143	194,975,019	198,233,801	192,588,653	195,541,677	198,354,277	203,009,085	207,579,757	198,233,801
	Inflation %		1.90%	3.60%	2.60%	2.50%	2.50%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	92.3	94.1	97.5	100.0	102.5	105.1	107.0	108.9	110.8	112.8	114.9	105.1
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	170,765,791	173,888,919	177,085,051	176,965,143	190,219,531	188,681,786	180,067,438	179,595,747	178,957,747	179,918,835	180,716,738	188,681,786
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	2,423,824	2,448,711	2,519,384	2,469,156	2,814,000	2,486,000	2,577,000	2,658,000	2,728,000	2,798,000	2,882,000	2,947,000
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	70.45	71.01	70.29	71.67	67.60	75.90	69.87	67.57	65.60	64.30	62.71	64.03
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	170,765,791	173,888,919	177,085,051	176,965,143	190,219,531	188,681,786	180,067,438	179,595,747	178,957,747	179,918,835	180,716,738	188,681,786
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.8%	1.8%	-0.1%	7.5%	-0.8%	-4.6%	-0.3%	-0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	70.45	71.01	70.29	71.67	67.60	75.90	69.87	67.57	65.60	64.30	62.71	64.03
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		0.8%	-1.0%	2.0%	-5.7%	12.3%	-7.9%	-3.3%	-2.9%	-2.0%	-2.5%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	101.90	105.57	108.31	111.02	113.80	115.84	117.93	120.05	122.21	124.41	113.80
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	157,659,293	160,542,716	163,493,542	163,382,836	175,619,932	174,200,211	166,247,026	165,811,538	165,222,506	166,109,829	166,846,492	174,200,211
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.8%	1.8%	-0.1%	7.5%	-0.8%	-4.6%	-0.3%	-0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	65.05	65.56	64.89	66.17	62.41	70.07	64.51	62.38	60.57	59.37	57.89	59.11
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		0.8%	-1.0%	2.0%	-5.7%	12.3%	-7.9%	-3.3%	-2.9%	-2.0%	-2.5%	
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		Austria's performance plan shows a yearly reduction of the DUC by -3.7%, i.e. a development noticeably better than the agreed pan-European target of -3.3% p.a. Determined costs will go down by almost one percent per year despite an expected traffic growth (STATFOR) of 3%. On a pan-European level, traffic is expected to grow by 1.2%, a slightly weaker development. The empirical GDP/Traffic Growth multiples that (also) STATFOR uses for their forecasts, are a little higher for Central/Eastern Europe than they are on average, which is why a moderately higher-than-average traffic growth can be expected for the FAB CE region. This fact is therefore reflected in Austria's PP as well as the PPs of most other FAB CE states.											

B - Inflation assumptions

Austria	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				2.60%	2.50%	2.50%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	102.50	105.06	106.95	108.88	110.84	112.83	114.86
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.02	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.13	0.15
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references											

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Austria	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total en route service units (TSU)				2,469,156	2,814,000	2,486,000	2,577,000	2,658,000	2,728,000	2,798,000	2,882,000
Year on Year variation TSU					14.0%	-11.7%	3.7%	3.1%	2.6%	2.6%	3.0%
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				2,469,156	2,456,012	2,485,902	2,576,922	2,657,841	2,728,050	2,798,177	2,881,891
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					-0.5%	1.2%	3.7%	3.1%	2.6%	2.6%	3.0%
Difference in percentage points					0.14	-0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				2,469,156	2,456,012	2,436,040	2,484,777	2,511,031	2,539,058	2,571,422	2,607,492
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					-0.5%	-0.8%	2.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.4%
Difference in percentage points					0.14	-0.11	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.15	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.11
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source											

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Austria	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.

- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2.In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #2

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

in HRK																	
		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average pct variation p.a.			
Croatia		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	475,856,477	489,352,995	578,794,470	562,263,223	614,648,029	650,618,753	667,769,947	677,924,675	678,412,094	670,885,539	679,397,022	650,618,753	3.6%	0.9%	2.0%	0.9%
	Inflation %		1.10%	2.30%	3.40%	2.99%	2.50%	2.70%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	2.50%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	93.51	94.54	96.71	100.00	102.99	105.56	108.41	111.56	114.90	118.35	121.31	105.6	2.6%	2.8%	2.9%	2.8%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	508,889,292	517,628,790	598,473,482	562,263,223	596,815,191	616,333,944	615,950,676	607,694,259	590,418,624	566,862,429	560,052,856	616,333,944	1.0%	-1.9%	-0.8%	-1.9%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	1,298,237	1,450,834	1,634,250	1,678,634	1,694,578	1,649,000	1,652,000	1,673,000	1,697,000	1,722,000	1,754,000	1,649,000	3.1%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	391.98	356.78	366.21	334.95	352.19	373.76	372.85	363.24	347.92	329.19	319.30	373.76	-2.0%	-3.1%	-1.7%	-3.1%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2012 prices)	67,714,400	68,877,305	79,634,753	74,816,502	79,414,095	82,011,322	81,960,323	80,861,698	78,562,948	75,428,487	74,522,384	82,011,322	1.0%	-1.9%	-0.8%	-1.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.7%	15.6%	-6.1%	6.1%	3.3%	-0.1%	-1.3%	-2.8%	-4.0%	-1.2%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices)	52.16	47.47	48.73	44.57	46.86	49.73	49.61	48.33	46.30	43.80	42.49	49.73	-2.0%	-3.1%	-1.7%	-3.1%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices) %n/n-1		-9.0%	2.6%	-8.5%	5.1%	6.1%	-0.2%	-2.6%	-4.2%	-5.4%	-3.0%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	101.10	103.43	106.94	110.14	112.89	115.94	119.30	122.88	126.57	129.73	112.89				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2009 prices)	64,847,899	65,961,576	76,263,636	71,649,353	76,052,320	78,539,600	78,490,760	77,438,642	75,237,204	72,235,431	71,367,686	78,539,600	1.0%	-1.9%	-0.8%	-1.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.7%	15.6%	-6.1%	6.1%	3.3%	-0.1%	-1.3%	-2.8%	-4.0%	-1.2%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices)	49.95	45.46	46.67	42.68	44.88	47.63	47.51	46.29	44.34	41.95	40.69	47.63	-2.0%	-3.1%	-1.7%	-3.1%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices) %n/n-1		-9.0%	2.6%	-8.5%	5.1%	6.1%	-0.2%	-2.6%	-4.2%	-5.4%	-3.0%					

Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets	Even though Croatia was not taking part of the RP1 performance scheme, Croatia has significantly contributed to RP1 EU wide targets in all KPAs, especially in the course of 1) cost efficiency: a) RP1 DUC was below the EU wide average, all accompanied by b) nominal unit rate well below the EU wide average 2) and in the area of capacity where delay records have substantially and dramatically improved during the course of RP1. These performance results delivered to the community during RP1 need to be highly respected if the Croatia RP2 targets are to be assessed in a fair manner. Even though not using eventual RP1/2014 forecast as a starting point, but instead of that the most recent 2014 cost base forecast (presented and approved on the CER 100th session as of Nov 2013) and even though being well below the EU starting point for 2014, Croatia has nevertheless opted to deliver real and significant cost efficiency improvement fully in line with the RP2 EU wide targets in terms of DC and DUC. Therefore, Croatian DC and DUC, based on the STATFOR low traffic forecast published in Feb 2014 (of 1.2% increase pa), are expected to decrease further by 1.9% and 3.1% pa respectively. The Croatian determined unit cost for 2019 in 2009 prices is targeted to EUR 40.69 which is substantially below the EU wide DUC target of EUR 49.1. Furthermore, for the purpose of this PP, total en-route determined costs of Croatia include en-route costs related to ANS provision within the delegated BiH airspace. Potential revenues from these operations will be presented as Other income, ensuring for the avoidance of revenues/costs double counting/charging.
--	--

B - Inflation assumptions

Croatia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				3.40%	2.99%	2.50%	2.70%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	2.50%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	102.99	105.56	108.41	111.56	114.90	118.35	121.31
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.03	0.06	0.08	0.12	0.15	0.18	0.21
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references				Croatian inflation assumptions are in line with IMF projections for 2014-2018, and in line with local expert expectations for 2019.							

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Croatia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total en route service units (TSU)				1,678,634	1,694,578	1,649,000	1,652,000	1,673,000	1,697,000	1,722,000	1,754,000
Year on Year variation TSU					0.9%	-2.7%	0.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.9%
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				1,678,634	1,694,578	1,682,040	1,715,227	1,770,276	1,823,613	1,872,179	1,937,314
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					0.9%	-0.7%	2.0%	3.2%	3.0%	2.7%	3.5%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	-0.02	-0.04	-0.05	-0.07	-0.08	-0.09
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				1,678,634	1,694,578	1,649,190	1,652,477	1,673,244	1,697,157	1,722,036	1,753,812
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					0.9%	-2.7%	0.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.8%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source				Croatian traffic development assumptions are in line with STATFOR low scenario forecast published on Feb 2014.							

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Croatia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.

- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2.In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #3

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average pct variation p.a.			
Czech Republic		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	2,229,139,000	2,526,238,000	2,584,109,000	2,600,745,756	2,866,389,446	2,983,316,999	3,076,235,800	3,110,133,800	3,146,097,800	3,168,968,400	3,137,144,600	2,983,316,999	3.5%	1.0%	2.5%	1.0%
	Inflation %		1.50%	2.10%	3.50%	1.40%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	93.233	94.631	96.618	100.000	101.400	103.428	105.50	107.61	109.76	111.95	114.19	104.0	2.0%	2.0%	2.1%	1.9%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	2,390,943,339	2,669,564,113	2,674,552,815	2,600,745,756	2,826,814,049	2,884,438,449	2,915,958,397	2,890,284,559	2,866,378,760	2,830,603,861	2,747,233,360	2,867,471,164	1.4%	-1.0%	0.3%	-0.9%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	2,022,528	2,190,096	2,304,684	2,304,641	2,374,021	2,441,000	2,521,000	2,607,000	2,685,000	2,756,000	2,842,000	2,499,820	3.5%	3.1%	2.7%	2.6%
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	1,182.16	1,218.93	1,160.49	1,128.48	1,190.73	1,181.66	1,156.67	1,108.66	1,067.55	1,027.07	966.65	1,147.07	-2.0%	-3.9%	-2.3%	-3.4%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2012 prices)	95,250,635	106,350,357	106,549,097	103,608,764	112,614,895	114,910,542	116,166,236	115,143,439	114,191,078	112,765,874	109,444,552	114,234,597	1.4%	-1.0%	0.3%	-0.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		11.7%	0.2%	-2.8%	8.7%	2.0%	1.1%	-0.9%	-0.8%	-1.2%	-2.9%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 Prices)	47.09	48.56	46.23	44.96	47.44	47.08	46.08	44.17	42.53	40.92	38.51	45.70	-2.0%	-3.9%	-2.3%	-3.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices) %n/n-1		3.1%	-4.8%	-2.8%	5.5%	-0.8%	-2.1%	-4.2%	-3.7%	-3.8%	-5.9%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	101.50	103.63	107.26	108.76	110.94	113.15	115.42	117.73	120.08	122.48	111.59				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2009 prices)	84,390,093	94,224,217	94,400,297	91,795,223	99,774,469	101,808,364	102,920,884	102,014,707	101,170,934	99,908,233	96,965,610	101,209,491	1.4%	-1.0%	0.3%	-0.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		11.7%	0.2%	-2.8%	8.7%	2.0%	1.1%	-0.9%	-0.8%	-1.2%	-2.9%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 Prices)	41.73	43.02	40.96	39.83	42.03	41.71	40.83	39.13	37.68	36.25	34.12	40.49	-2.0%	-3.9%	-2.3%	-3.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices) %n/n-1		3.1%	-4.8%	-2.8%	5.5%	-0.8%	-2.1%	-4.2%	-3.7%	-3.8%	-5.9%					
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		The local target for RP2 was set as an average annual decrease of DUC by -3.4% in comparison with 2014 approved performance plan figures. This target exceeds the union-wide target at level of -3.3%. The level of DUC (€2009 prices) continuously descends from €40.83 in 2015 to €34.12 in 2019. Approved union-wide targets in the area of costs-efficiency were set from €56.64 in 2015 to €49.10 in 2019. It means that the level of CZ DUC is below the union-wide target by 27.9 % in 2015 and by 30.7% in 2019. With regard to these facts the Czech Republic targets in the area of cost-efficiency are fully consistent with the union-wide targets and appropriately contribute to these targets.															

B - Inflation assumptions

Czech Republic	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				3.50%	1.40%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	101.40	103.43	105.50	107.61	109.76	111.95	114.19
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.01	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.14
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references											

C - Service Units forecast for en route

	Czech Republic	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
	Total en route service units (TSU)				2,304,641	2,374,021	2,441,000	2,521,000	2,607,000	2,685,000	2,756,000	2,842,000
	Year on Year variation TSU					3.0%	2.8%	3.3%	3.4%	3.0%	2.6%	3.1%
Baseline	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				2,304,641	2,374,021	2,440,939	2,520,579	2,606,803	2,684,833	2,756,010	2,841,571
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					3.0%	2.8%	3.3%	3.4%	3.0%	2.7%	3.1%
	Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Low	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				2,304,641	2,374,021	2,398,388	2,445,768	2,475,883	2,509,046	2,539,940	2,575,088
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					3.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	1.4%
	Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
	Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.10
	Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source											

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Czech Republic	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.

- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2.In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #4

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

														in HUF			
		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average pct variation p.a.			
Hungary		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	18,270,090,911	22,847,491,091	23,736,569,065	24,636,627,719	27,197,031,799	27,648,005,680	28,556,264,442	29,539,526,061	30,034,370,265	30,798,070,657	31,734,626,162	28,157,420,160	5.7%	2.8%	3.7%	2.4%
	Inflation %		4.90%	3.90%	5.70%	1.70%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	86.803	91.056	94.607	100.000	101.700	104.751	107.89	111.13	114.46	117.90	121.44	104.8	3.4%	3.0%	3.2%	3.0%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	21,047,801,119	25,091,640,209	25,089,553,501	24,636,627,719	26,742,410,815	26,394,025,528	26,467,077,722	26,580,974,332	26,239,084,536	26,122,602,056	26,132,988,990	26,880,335,424	2.2%	-0.2%	0.5%	-0.6%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	2,038,443	2,091,322	2,067,028	2,023,649	2,101,186	2,186,850	2,256,829	2,304,223	2,352,611	2,402,016	2,459,665	2,186,850	1.9%	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%
Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	10,325.43	11,997.98	12,137.98	12,174.36	12,727.29	12,069.43	11,727.55	11,535.77	11,153.17	10,875.28	10,624.61	12,291.80	0.3%	-2.5%	-1.7%	-2.9%	
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	72,861,024	86,859,553	86,852,329	85,284,439	92,574,014	91,368,011	91,620,895	92,015,170	90,831,653	90,428,426	90,464,383	93,051,466	2.2%	-0.2%	0.5%	-0.6%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		19.2%	0.0%	-1.8%	8.5%	-1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	-1.3%	-0.4%	0.0%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	35.74	41.53	42.02	42.14	44.06	41.78	40.60	39.93	38.61	37.65	36.78	42.55	0.3%	-2.5%	-1.7%	-2.9%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		16.2%	1.2%	0.3%	4.5%	-5.2%	-2.8%	-1.6%	-3.3%	-2.5%	-2.3%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	104.90	108.99	115.20	117.16	120.68	124.30	128.03	131.87	135.82	139.90	120.68				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	65,320,544	77,870,348	77,863,872	76,458,245	82,993,412	81,912,220	82,138,933	82,492,404	81,431,370	81,069,874	81,102,109	83,421,452	2.2%	-0.2%	0.5%	-0.6%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		19.2%	0.0%	-1.8%	8.5%	-1.3%	0.3%	0.4%	-1.3%	-0.4%	0.0%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	32.04	37.23	37.67	37.78	39.50	37.46	36.40	35.80	34.61	33.75	32.97	38.15	0.3%	-2.5%	-1.7%	-2.9%
Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		16.2%	1.2%	0.3%	4.5%	-5.2%	-2.8%	-1.6%	-3.3%	-2.5%	-2.3%						
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		As it could be observed from the above figures the Hungarian determined cost base shows a slight reduction of 0.2% per annum during the second reference period. For RP2 Performance Plan Hungary applies the low scenario of the February 2014 STATFOR forecast in line with the proposal of the Commission Implementing Decision. As a result of these two components the Hungarian cost efficiency target is already close to the EU wide target. The determined unit cost shows an average 2.5% reduction per annum over the period. Taking into account the current and planned level of the Hungarian DUC, thus the distance of the Hungarian DUC from the EU wide DUC target, the target is in line with the EU wide target. The Hungarian determined unit cost for 2019 in 2009 prices is 32.73 euros which is far lower than the EU wide DUC target of 49.10 euros.															

B - Inflation assumptions

Hungary	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				5.70%	1.70%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	101.70	104.75	107.89	111.13	114.46	117.90	121.44
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.02	0.05	0.08	0.11	0.14	0.18	0.21
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references	The Hungarian inflation forecast is in line with IMF World Economic Outlook October 2013 and also with the forecast of the Hungarian National Bank.										

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Hungary	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total en route service units (TSU)				2,023,649	2,101,186	2,186,850	2,256,829	2,304,223	2,352,611	2,402,016	2,459,665
Year on Year variation TSU					3.8%	4.1%	3.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				2,023,649	2,100,927	2,202,955	2,315,709	2,412,101	2,503,638	2,584,126	2,691,016
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					3.8%	4.9%	5.1%	4.2%	3.8%	3.2%	4.1%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	-0.01	-0.03	-0.04	-0.06	-0.07	-0.09
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				2,023,649	2,100,927	2,146,279	2,214,608	2,261,103	2,309,502	2,357,417	2,413,140
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					3.8%	2.2%	3.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source	The Hungarian traffic forecast is using STATFOR low scenario's evolution trend.										

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Hungary	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
 - A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.
- In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:
 - The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
 - The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #5

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)					RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	in EUR Average pct variation p.a.				
Slovakia		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	40,946,000	48,820,000	51,087,000	56,355,263	59,611,000	61,113,092	63,554,897	67,850,371	71,136,260	74,814,491	75,958,613	61,113,092	6.4%	4.4%	5.1%	4.4%
	Inflation %		0.70%	4.10%	3.70%	1.40%	2.80%	2.10%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	91.99	92.63	96.43	100.00	101.40	104.24	106.43	108.77	111.27	113.83	116.45	102.9	2.4%	2.2%	2.4%	2.5%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	44,511,316	52,702,020	52,977,219	56,355,263	58,787,968	58,627,745	59,716,206	62,379,878	63,930,439	65,724,418	65,229,255	59,413,856	3.9%	2.2%	2.6%	1.9%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	767,550	855,572	899,810	921,643	984,989	1,050,816	1,114,110	1,168,000	1,219,000	1,268,000	1,329,000	1,017,600	5.6%	4.8%	5.0%	5.5%
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	57.99	61.60	58.88	61.15	59.68	55.79	53.60	53.41	52.44	51.83	49.08	58.39	-1.7%	-2.5%	-2.2%	-3.4%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2012 prices)	44,511,316	52,702,020	52,977,219	56,355,263	58,787,968	58,627,745	59,716,206	62,379,878	63,930,439	65,724,418	65,229,255	59,413,856	3.9%	2.2%	2.6%	1.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		18.4%	0.5%	6.4%	4.3%	-0.3%	1.9%	4.5%	2.5%	2.8%	-0.8%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices)	57.99	61.60	58.88	61.15	59.68	55.79	53.60	53.41	52.44	51.83	49.08	58.39	-1.7%	-2.5%	-2.2%	-3.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices) %n/n-1		6.2%	-4.4%	3.9%	-2.4%	-6.5%	-3.9%	-0.4%	-1.8%	-1.2%	-5.3%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	100.70	104.83	108.71	110.23	113.32	115.70	118.24	120.96	123.74	126.59	111.82				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2009 prices)	40,946,000	48,480,636	48,733,791	51,841,257	54,079,105	53,931,715	54,932,992	57,383,306	58,809,668	60,459,951	60,004,450	54,654,859	3.9%	2.2%	2.6%	1.9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		18.4%	0.5%	6.4%	4.3%	-0.3%	1.9%	4.5%	2.5%	2.8%	-0.8%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices)	53.35	56.66	54.16	56.25	54.90	51.32	49.31	49.13	48.24	47.68	45.15	53.71	-1.7%	-2.5%	-2.2%	-3.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices) %n/n-1		6.2%	-4.4%	3.9%	-2.4%	-6.5%	-3.9%	-0.4%	-1.8%	-1.2%	-5.3%					
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		Slovakia have used STATFOR forecast base scenario from february 2014 which is considered as the most realistic in Slovak case taking into account historical data. The determined unit cost is decreasing by 2.5 % per year in average over the period of years 2015-2019. DUC is lower than EU wide target DUC for each year of the period and is constantly decreasing during whole period.															

B - Inflation assumptions

Slovakia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				3.70%	1.40%	2.80%	2.10%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	101.40	104.24	106.43	108.77	111.27	113.83	116.45
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.01	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.16
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references											

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Slovakia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total en route service units (TSU)				921,643	984,989	1,050,816	1,114,110	1,168,000	1,219,000	1,268,000	1,329,000
Year on Year variation TSU					6.9%	6.7%	6.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.0%	4.8%
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				921,643	984,989	1,050,816	1,114,110	1,168,019	1,219,358	1,268,326	1,328,910
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					6.9%	6.7%	6.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.0%	4.8%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				921,643	984,989	1,033,153	1,081,582	1,110,475	1,139,879	1,170,169	1,204,480
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					6.9%	4.9%	4.7%	2.7%	2.6%	2.7%	2.9%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.10
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source											

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Slovakia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.

- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2.In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).1 - En Route Charging Zone #6

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)					RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	in EUR				
Slovenia		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	Average pct variation p.a.			
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	23,493,772	26,211,582	28,929,420	27,878,188	29,319,542	30,843,133	32,240,775	33,022,957	33,450,454	33,759,497	34,284,178	32,084,460	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
	Inflation %		1.80%	2.10%	2.80%	0.70%	2.30%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	93.59	95.28	97.28	100.00	100.70	103.02	105.18	107.39	109.64	111.95	114.30	104.7	2.0%	2.1%	2.0%	1.8%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	25,102,639	27,511,362	29,739,444	27,878,188	29,115,732	29,940,109	30,653,116	30,751,009	30,508,417	30,156,983	29,995,764	30,657,975	1.8%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.4%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	330,983	365,201	424,670	425,205	410,807	428,780	450,219	465,527	479,027	491,961	508,196	473,976	4.4%	3.5%	2.3%	1.4%
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	75.84	75.33	70.03	65.56	70.87	69.83	68.08	66.06	63.69	61.30	59.02	64.68	-2.5%	-3.3%	-2.1%	-1.8%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2012 prices)	25,102,639	27,511,362	29,739,444	27,878,188	29,115,732	29,940,109	30,653,116	30,751,009	30,508,417	30,156,983	29,995,764	30,657,975	1.8%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.4%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		9.6%	8.1%	-6.3%	4.4%	2.8%	2.4%	0.3%	-0.8%	-1.2%	-0.5%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices)	75.84	75.33	70.03	65.56	70.87	69.83	68.08	66.06	63.69	61.30	59.02	64.68	-2.5%	-3.3%	-2.1%	-1.8%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2012 prices) %n/n-1		-0.7%	-7.0%	-6.4%	8.1%	-1.5%	-2.5%	-3.0%	-3.6%	-3.8%	-3.7%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100.00	101.80	103.94	106.85	107.60	110.07	112.38	114.74	117.15	119.61	122.12	111.82				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in €2009 prices)	23,493,772	25,748,116	27,833,397	26,091,432	27,249,659	28,021,201	28,688,510	28,780,129	28,553,086	28,224,175	28,073,289	28,693,057	1.8%	0.0%	0.1%	-0.4%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		9.6%	8.1%	-6.3%	4.4%	2.8%	2.4%	0.3%	-0.8%	-1.2%	-0.5%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices)	70.98	70.50	65.54	61.36	66.33	65.35	63.72	61.82	59.61	57.37	55.24	60.54	-2.5%	-3.3%	-2.1%	-1.8%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in €2009 prices) %n/n-1		-0.7%	-7.0%	-6.4%	8.1%	-1.5%	-2.5%	-3.0%	-3.6%	-3.8%	-3.7%					
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		The data for Slovenia takes into account actual historical data until 2012 including, while 2013 data is now based on the latest available information prior conclusion of the 2013 financial data audit for all entities (Slovenia Control, ARSO - MET and ACL - REG). This 2013 data will be updated as soon as the final figures are available. Data for 2014 F is the latest estimate on costs and traffic and is considered by Slovenia as the relevant NEW STARTING POINT for RP2 target setting. The RP2 Performance Plan data is taking into account the BASE traffic scenario from February 2014 STATFOR and planned determined costs, which together bring the DUC trend 2014-2019 to -3.3%. Inflation until 2013 including is the actual one, 2014 inflation is taken from approved RP1 Performance Plan and the inflation forecasts 2015 - 2019 are used from IMF October 2013 forecast.															

B - Inflation assumptions

Slovenia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				2.80%	0.70%	2.30%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100.00	100.70	103.02	105.18	107.39	109.64	111.95	114.30
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points					0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.01	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.14
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references											

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Slovenia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total en route service units (TSU)				425,205	410,807	428,780	450,219	465,527	479,027	491,961	508,196
Year on Year variation TSU					-3.4%	4.4%	5.0%	3.4%	2.9%	2.7%	3.3%
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)				425,205	411,103	428,901	450,416	465,930	479,263	492,058	508,161
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					-3.3%	4.3%	5.0%	3.4%	2.9%	2.7%	3.3%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)				425,205	411,103	420,499	434,865	441,386	447,479	454,225	461,925
Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR					-3.3%	2.3%	3.4%	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%	1.7%
Difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0.00	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.10
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source											

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Slovenia	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission							10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation											

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

- In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.

- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2.In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).2 - En Route ANS at FAB level

A - Cost efficiency KPI #1: Determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS aggregated at FAB level

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average percentage variation per annum			
		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D
€2012 prices	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	8,881,565	9,401,736	9,849,826	9,822,928	10,379,581	10,242,447	10,571,159	10,875,750	11,160,639	11,437,977	11,774,860	10,774,246	2.9%	2.8%	2.3%	1.8%
	Trend in Total en route Service Units (TSU)%n/n-1		5.86%	4.77%	-0.27%	5.67%	-1.32%	3.21%	2.88%	2.62%	2.48%	2.95%					
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	476,205,806	516,189,515	532,837,894	524,908,300	562,726,235	565,539,513	560,184,214	560,746,942	556,982,283	554,423,024	550,373,075	568,051,001	1.5%	-0.5%	0.4%	-0.6%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		8.40%	3.23%	-1.49%	7.20%	0.50%	-0.95%	0.10%	-0.67%	-0.46%	-0.73%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	53.62	54.90	54.10	53.44	54.21	55.22	52.99	51.56	49.91	48.47	46.74	52.72	-1.4%	-3.3%	-1.8%	-2.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)%n/n-1		2.40%	-1.47%	-1.22%	1.46%	1.85%	-4.03%	-2.70%	-3.21%	-2.87%	-3.57%					
€2009 prices	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	436,657,602	472,827,609	488,588,535	481,218,346	515,768,897	518,413,311	513,419,104	513,920,726	510,424,768	508,007,493	504,359,635	520,718,672	1.5%	-0.5%	0.4%	-0.6%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		8.28%	3.33%	-1.51%	7.18%	0.51%	-0.96%	0.10%	-0.68%	-0.47%	-0.72%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	49.16	50.29	49.60	48.99	49.69	50.61	48.57	47.25	45.73	44.41	42.83	48.33	-1.4%	-3.3%	-1.8%	-2.4%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)%n/n-1		2.29%	-1.37%	-1.24%	1.43%	1.86%	-4.04%	-2.71%	-3.22%	-2.89%	-3.56%					

Description of benefits and synergies achieved at functional airspace block level

En-route planned determined costs aggregated at FAB level reduce by an average of 0.5% per year in real terms over RP2. The forecast en-route determined unit cost aggregated at FAB level in 2014 is €50.61 and this reduces over time to €42.83 in 2019 (€2009 prices). This is lower than the EU-wide en-route determined unit cost target for 2019, which is €49.10. The average reduction is 3.3% per year in real terms over RP2.

Analysis undertaken at the end of 2012 estimated that FAB CE projects would deliver performance benefits in the key performance areas of safety, cost-efficiency, environment and capacity over the RP1 period. FAB synergies are expected from:

- A consolidated approach to operational planning through the FAB CE network operations plan and coordinated airspace planning delivered delay savings, flight efficiency and environmental improvements. The conceived benefits in delay savings through a reduction of the aggregated average ATFM en-route delay per flight from 0.41 minutes per flight at the start of RP1 to 0.33 minutes per flight by the end of RP1 could be outreached by the end of 2013 achieving 0.16 minutes per flight. The main reasons for this success were consequent capacity improvements, refined ATFCM measures at FAB level and finally a marginal traffic increase. Consequent cost savings for airspace users and further benefits are expected in RP2.
- Through a FAB approach to airspace planning, including route improvements and the planned implementation of free route airspace, it was estimated that flight efficiency improvements delivered over the RP2 period would result in shortening of flown routes resulting in 15 million km saved per annum by 2019 (compared to the reference scenario of March 2013). The cost saving for users are estimated at around €77m per annum by 2019. Consequent savings of CO2 emissions were estimated at 172 kilotonnes per annum by 2019.
- Projects are already delivering tangible benefits in the area of implementation of new technologies, by taking a coordinated approach at the FAB level. These implementations are either responses to regulatory compliance or where Europe-wide infrastructure is required to be updated. FAB CE projects in FMTP implementation and technical services harmonisation exploited the synergies of using common templates for service level agreements and coordinated planning to deliver cost savings of around €0.12m over RP1. A coordinated approach to the implementation of regional communications infrastructure delivered FAB wide benefits of up to around €1.6m over RP1. Further benefits may be expected from the coordinated approach to air-ground datalink over the RP2 period.

Benefits in cost-efficiency and safety are being achieved or are expected in other areas, notably airspace management and flow management integrated processes, fluent and flexible transfer of responsibility, training, harmonised safety management and contingency processes, although these are not presently quantified. These activities are also enablers for the future operational concepts for the FAB. In addition, the ANSPs are cooperating closely on financial and business planning, through the ANSP charging activity and performance review process. These will facilitate and encourage greater cooperation in the FAB.

FAB CE is already evaluating the potential benefits from FAB synergies in the area of CNS infrastructure. A study in 2013 evaluated the potential synergies from:

- Common development or harmonisation of technical specifications;
- Common procurement;
- Harmonisation and integration of implementation and maintenance procedures;
- Exchange of best practices;
- Common planning of CNS infrastructure needs.

The study concluded that there are potential synergies in the CNS domain and although not all benefits are expected to be delivered during RP2, synergies are expected to have long term effects over RP3 and beyond. Additional benefits for the RP3+ timeframe strongly rely on common technical functionalities and specifications, in alignment with SESAR.

The order of magnitude for the identified potential is up to around 2% of the planned CNS investment costs in RP2 from the cooperation activities. Up to a further 5% saving could be expected from smart/intelligent procurement processes, assuming the necessary prerequisites are in place. Further benefits can be expected in RP3.

FAB CE has taken concrete steps in 2013 and 2014 to enable quick wins in this area, including an agreement on sharing technical specifications, shared procurement specifications for navigation aids, and a planned pilot activity in communications for common procurement.

The study concluded that a number of obstacles will need to be overcome in order to achieve several key benefits. FAB CE has tasked their legal experts to consider these issues and prepare proposals for resolving these.

Several areas have been identified where FAB CE would benefit from the implementation of different organizational arrangement such as common procurement, program support, centralised/consolidated development of the operational and technical domains, and more. Current ANSP Agreement among all the seven ANSPs created the cooperation governance (i.e. decision-making and working bodies with no permanent presence) on the broad scope of activities as set forth therein, however the benefits to enhance and deepen such intensive and internal cooperation in certain areas by creating the common legal entity (with own legal personality of the such common entity separate from the ANSPs) were recognized by the CEOC/7 (13 September 2012) who tasked the working structures to assess and propose a legal vehicle appropriate for common procurement by the ANSPs in particular under in-house exemption rules.

A call for strengthening and enhancement of the cooperation among FAB CE members is very strong, which resulted in the common legal entity set-up. After extensive deliberations and in accordance with conclusions of the CEOC, the draft incorporation documents (i.e. Memorandum of Association and Shareholders Agreement) for the establishment of common legal entity called the FABCE Aviation Services, Ltd. (hereinafter as “FCE”) by all seven ANSPs were approved by the CEOC/16 on 8 April 2014 to be released for internal approvals.

Initial design of the FCE therefore concentrates on:

- the project support services to the ANSPs;
- the cooperation tool for the ANSPs through pooling of the internal experts (FCE employees posted or otherwise recruited from the ANSPs staff) or being common outsourcing platform to engage the external sources;
- overcoming the legal barriers in implementation of the cross border public procurement through establishment of the “in-house entity” recognized by the CJEU case law as an entity, providing services to its shareholders (including via subcontractors) without necessity of the public procurement procedures in relationship between the ANSPs and the FCE;

Establishment of the FCE will also support the position of the FAB CE States towards the EU in demonstrating the deployment of the cooperation and coordination of the ANSPs activities on a FAB wide level in order to facilitate ongoing compliance with EU wide targets and SES requirements calling for FABs implementation.

FAB CE CEOs are also discussing a number of ideas for future cooperation where there are potential for significant cost savings in centralising services within the FAB. Ideas on the table include cross-border ATS services in the upper area, consolidated ATS reporting offices, consolidated approaches to AIM and AMHS, FAB strategy for multilateralisation, common procurement, shared selection and training and shared flight calibration services. FAB CE has initiated studies to assess the feasibility of these.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #1

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

		RP2 Performance Plan					in EUR
Austria		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	40,988,200	41,904,780	43,085,180	43,978,980	44,912,680	2.3%
	Inflation %	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	106.95	108.88	110.84	112.83	114.86	1.8%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	38,323,339	38,487,551	38,871,996	38,976,812	39,100,504	0.5%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	181,000	187,900	193,100	199,400	205,500	3.2%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	211.73	204.83	201.31	195.47	190.27	-2.6%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	38,323,339	38,487,551	38,871,996	38,976,812	39,100,504	0.5%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		0.4%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	211.73	204.83	201.31	195.47	190.27	-2.6%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-3.3%	-1.7%	-2.9%	-2.7%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	115.84	117.93	120.05	122.21	124.41	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	35,381,972	35,533,581	35,888,520	35,985,290	36,099,489	0.5%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		0.4%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	195.48	189.11	185.85	180.47	175.67	-2.6%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-3.3%	-1.7%	-2.9%	-2.7%	
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network		Austria's performance plan shows a yearly reduction of the DUC by -2.6%, which is connected to the development of enroute DUC. Determined costs will almost stay on the same level (+0.5%) despite an expected traffic growth (STATFOR) of 3.2%. The underlying traffic growth is in line with the assumptions on enroute traffic growth taking into account the moderate traffic growth for the FAB CE region.					

B - Inflation assumptions

Austria	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%	1.80%
Inflation index (2012=100)	107.0	108.9	110.8	112.8	114.9
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.09	0.11	0.13	0.15
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references					

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Austria	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	181,000	187,900	193,100	199,400	205,500
Year on Year variation TNSU		3.8%	2.8%	3.3%	3.1%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	181,033	187,891	193,147	199,415	205,549
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		3.8%	2.8%	3.2%	3.1%
Difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source					

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Austria	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
 - A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.
2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:
 - The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
 - The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #2

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

						in HRK
						Avg pct var p.a.
						2015D-2019D
Croatia						
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
		27,584,800	28,943,790	30,297,562	31,103,893	32,672,900
	Inflation %	2.70%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	2.50%
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	108.41	111.56	114.90	118.35	121.31
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	25,444,206	25,945,324	26,367,815	26,281,128	26,933,516
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	15,900	16,049	16,547	17,010	17,911
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	1,600.26	1,616.63	1,593.56	1,545.06	1,503.71
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523	7.51523
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	3,385,686	3,452,366	3,508,584	3,497,049	3,583,858
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		2.0%	1.6%	-0.3%	2.5%
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	212.94	215.11	212.04	205.59	200.09
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		1.0%	-1.4%	-3.0%	-2.7%
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	115.94	119.30	122.88	126.57	129.73
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804	7.33804
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	3,242,362	3,306,220	3,360,058	3,349,011	3,432,145
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		2.0%	1.6%	-0.3%	2.5%
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	203.92	206.01	203.07	196.89	191.62
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		1.0%	-1.4%	-3.0%	-2.7%
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network		Croatia is applying Performance and Charging Regulation provisions over the Zagreb terminal zone (Zone 1). DC and DUC development is based on the STATFOR base traffic forecast published in Feb 2014 for Zagreb terminal.				

B - Inflation assumptions

Croatia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	2.70%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%	2.50%
Inflation index (2012=100)	108.4	111.6	114.9	118.4	121.3
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.12	0.15	0.18	0.21
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references	Croatian inflation assumptions are in line with IMF projections for 2014-2018, and in line with local expert expectations for 2019.				

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Croatia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	15,900	16,049	16,547	17,010	17,911
Year on Year variation TNSU		0.9%	3.1%	2.8%	5.3%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	15,864	16,027	16,526	16,990	17,883
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		1.0%	3.1%	2.8%	5.3%
Difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source	Croatian traffic development assumptions are in line with STATFOR base scenario forecast published on Feb 2014.				

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Croatia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):

- The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
- The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #3

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

		RP2 Performance Plan					in CZK
Czech Republic		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D- 2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	550,800,000	575,960,000	606,559,000	641,239,000	684,080,000	5.6%
	Inflation %	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	105.50	107.61	109.76	111.95	114.19	2.0%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	522,102,332	535,246,521	552,629,939	572,771,123	599,056,670	3.5%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	81,000.00	84,700.00	89,200.00	94,300.00	100,600.00	5.6%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	6,445.71	6,319.32	6,195.40	6,073.92	5,954.84	-2.0%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	25.1016	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	20,799,564	21,323,203	22,015,726	22,818,112	23,865,278	3.5%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		2.5%	3.2%	3.6%	4.6%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	256.78	251.75	246.81	241.97	237.23	-2.0%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-2.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	113.15	115.42	117.73	120.08	122.48	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	26.4147	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	18,428,657	18,891,462	19,504,743	20,216,388	21,144,432	3.5%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		2.5%	3.2%	3.6%	4.6%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	227.51	223.04	218.66	214.38	210.18	-2.0%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-2.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%	-2.0%	
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network		The local target was set with an aim to maintain the level of UR (in nominal terms) as in previous years. This target reacts to the significant decrease of airport traffic by -23% (2013/2008). Despite this traffic decrease the level of terminal DUC falls by -2.0% annually (in €2009 prices).					

B - Inflation assumptions

Czech Republic					
2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	
Inflation %	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Inflation index (2012=100)	105.5	107.6	109.8	112.0	114.2
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.08	0.10	0.12	0.14
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references					

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Czech Republic					
2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	81,000	84,700	89,200	94,300	100,600
Year on Year variation TNSU		4.6%	5.3%	5.7%	6.7%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	74,959	81,559	86,059	92,908	97,873
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		8.8%	5.5%	8.0%	5.3%
Difference in percentage		-0.04	0.00	-0.02	0.01
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.04	0.04	0.01	0.03
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source					

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Czech Republic	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):

- The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
- The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #4

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

		RP2 Performance Plan					in HUF
Hungary		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	5,646,167,336	5,903,448,244	6,170,937,944	6,421,924,937	6,323,596,184	2.9%
	Inflation %	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	107.89	111.13	114.46	117.90	121.44	3.0%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	5,233,091,675	5,312,184,289	5,391,148,905	5,447,009,698	5,207,386,676	-0.1%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	51,589	54,323	56,713	58,925	61,635	4.5%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	101,438.92	97,789.23	95,060.20	92,440.01	84,487.02	-4.5%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	288.876	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	18,115,356	18,389,151	18,662,502	18,855,875	18,026,374	-0.1%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	-4.4%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	351.15	338.52	329.07	320.00	292.47	-4.5%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-3.6%	-2.8%	-2.8%	-8.6%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	124.30	128.03	131.87	135.82	139.90	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	279.699	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	16,240,575	16,486,034	16,731,096	16,904,456	16,160,801	-0.1%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		1.5%	1.5%	1.0%	-4.4%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	314.81	303.48	295.01	286.88	262.20	-4.5%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-3.6%	-2.8%	-2.8%	-8.6%	
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network		The Hungarian terminal determined cost base shows an annual reduction of 0.1% over the second reference period. Significant variances could be observed between the years the main drivers of these variances are the depreciation cost effect of the new investments and the ATCO training costs incurred in certain years. Hungary applies the baseline scenario of the February 2014 STATFOR forecast. As a result of the above mentioned figures the Hungarian terminal DUC trend is an average reduction of 4.5% per annum.					

B - Inflation assumptions

Hungary					
2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	
Inflation %	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Inflation index (2012=100)	107.9	111.1	114.5	117.9	121.4
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.11	0.14	0.18	0.21
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references		The Hungarian inflation forecast is in line with IMF World Economic Outlook October 2013 and also with the forecast of the Hungarian National Bank.			

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Hungary					
2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	51,589	54,323	56,713	58,925	61,635
Year on Year variation TNSU		5.3%	4.4%	3.9%	4.6%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	51,568	54,294	56,705	58,942	61,674
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		5.3%	4.4%	3.9%	4.6%
Difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source		The Hungarian traffic forecast is in line with the STATFOR base scenario.			

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Hungary	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):
 - The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
 - The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
 - The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
 - A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.
2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:
 - The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
 - The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation,.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #5

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

		RP2 Performance Plan					in EUR
Slovakia		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	2,413,602	2,572,630	2,678,613	2,828,263	2,873,991	4.5%
	Inflation %	2.10%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	106.43	108.77	111.27	113.83	116.45	2.3%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	2,267,821	2,365,210	2,407,280	2,484,625	2,468,032	2.1%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	9,500	10,200	10,800	11,400	12,000	6.0%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	238.72	231.88	222.90	217.95	205.67	-3.7%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	2,267,821	2,365,210	2,407,280	2,484,625	2,468,032	2.1%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		4.3%	1.8%	3.2%	-0.7%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	238.72	231.88	222.90	217.95	205.67	-3.7%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-2.9%	-3.9%	-2.2%	-5.6%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	115.70	118.24	120.96	123.74	126.59	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	2,086,171	2,175,758	2,214,459	2,285,609	2,270,345	2.1%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		4.3%	1.8%	3.2%	-0.7%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	219.60	213.31	205.04	200.49	189.20	-3.7%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-2.9%	-3.9%	-2.2%	-5.6%	

Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network	Slovakia have used STATFOR forecast base scenario from February 2014.

B - Inflation assumptions

Slovakia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	2.10%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%
Inflation index (2012=100)	106.4	108.8	111.3	113.8	116.4
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.09	0.11	0.14	0.16
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references					

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Slovakia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	9,500	10,200	10,800	11,400	12,000
Year on Year variation TNSU		7.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.3%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	9,506	10,248	10,764	11,427	12,015
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		7.8%	5.0%	6.2%	5.1%
Difference in percentage		0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source					

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

<i>Slovakia</i>	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):

- The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
- The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.1.(d).3 - Terminal Charging Zone #6

A - Cost efficiency KPI #2: Determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

		RP2 Performance Plan					in EUR
Slovenia		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012 prices)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	3,231,700	3,251,224	3,284,767	3,312,784	3,331,213	0.8%
	Inflation %	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	105.18	107.39	109.64	111.95	114.30	2.1%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	3,072,558	3,027,543	2,995,865	2,959,273	2,914,530	-1.3%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	12,589	12,665	12,797	12,925	13,054	0.9%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	244.07	239.04	234.11	228.97	223.27	-2.2%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	3,072,558	3,027,543	2,995,865	2,959,273	2,914,530	-1.3%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-1.5%	-1.0%	-1.2%	-1.5%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	244.07	239.04	234.11	228.97	223.27	-2.2%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-2.1%	-2.1%	-2.2%	-2.5%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	112.38	114.74	117.15	119.61	122.12	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	1	1	1	1	1	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	2,875,633	2,833,503	2,803,856	2,769,609	2,727,733	-1.3%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-1.5%	-1.0%	-1.2%	-1.5%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	228.43	223.72	219.11	214.29	208.96	-2.2%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-2.1%	-2.1%	-2.2%	-2.5%	
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network							

B - Inflation assumptions

Slovenia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.10%
Inflation index (2012=100)	105.2	107.4	109.6	111.9	114.3
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Difference in percentage points		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0.07	0.10	0.12	0.14
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references					

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Slovenia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	12,589	12,665	12,797	12,925	13,054
Year on Year variation TNSU		0.6%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	11,298	11,637	12,107	12,589	13,344
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		3.0%	4.0%	4.0%	6.0%
Difference in percentage		-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.05
Cumulative difference in percentage		0.09	0.06	0.03	-0.02
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source					

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Slovenia	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Local thresholds	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Local thresholds set by the European Commission	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Detailed justification in case of deviation					

IMPORTANT NOTE

The data and justifications for the cost-efficiency targets at local level are split into two distinct parts of the performance plan, aiming at optimising workload and avoiding duplication of reporting. They comprise:

1. In the body of the performance plan document, the information to be presented at charging zone level (some of the data requested being pre-filled by the PRB):

- The targets with a description of the contribution to, and consistency with, the EU-wide target and/or their contribution to the performance of the European ATM network;
- The entries and justification requiring data from external sources i.e.
 - The traffic forecast used and, if applicable, their justification against STATFOR
 - The inflation assumptions used and, if applicable, their justification against Eurostat/ IMF.
- The local alert thresholds, if any, and their justification.
- A presentation of the consolidation of the targets at FAB level.

2. In Annex C, the information needed at the level of the entities submitted to the performance scheme within the charging zones (ANSPs including MET providers, National authorities...), as follows:

- The data and justifications in the reporting tables and additional information, as per Annexes II, III, VI and VII of the charging Regulation, at entity level plus a consolidation at charging zone level;
- The data and justifications relating to cost-efficiency required at entity level for the purpose of the Performance Plans, as per Article 11 (3) and Annexes II and IV of the performance Regulation.

Annex C forms an integral part of the performance plan and will be used to carry out the assessment of the performance plan.

3.2 - Consistency of the performance targets with the relevant Union-wide performance targets or, when there is no Union-wide target, contribution to the performance of the European ATM network

This section has been integrated within each individual KPI.

3.3 - Description of KPAs interdependencies and trade-offs

It is evident that there are existing interdependencies between different performance areas. Safety, without discussion, will not be compromised. Nevertheless formulating safety targets has to take into consideration the impact of improving measures on performance areas like cost and capacity. Balancing the four elements of performance regulation will be the challenge. The offer of 100% capacity is not fundable and will not be meaningful under economic perspectives. So every ANSP has to trade off capacity versus costs. Depending on the local situation (complexity of airspace, traffic streams, topographic situation, etc.) it might be necessary to reduce one of the parameters against the other.

During the preparation of the common performance plan, and when setting targets, FAB CE has focused on reaching the applicable targets in each of the KPA, to the possible extent. By doing this, FABCE has also taken into account FABCE's current position with regard to cost efficiency, and forecast performance over RP2, which shows that the FAB CE determined unit cost target in 2019 is lower than the EU-wide target. FABCE used this financial window for meeting targets, based on forecasted traffic in the other KPA's. The current plan can be interpreted only in its entirety, i.e. changing targets, assumptions in any field would lead to compromises on others.

3.4 - Contribution of each air navigation service provider

This section has been integrated within each individual KPI.

SECTION 4: INCENTIVE SCHEMES

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
4. INCENTIVE SCHEMES	4			
4.1. Description and explanation of the incentive schemes to be applied on air navigation service providers.	4.1			

4 - INCENTIVE SCHEMES

4.1 - Incentive schemes for the environment targets

Number of incentive schemes	0
-----------------------------	---

4.1 - Incentive schemes for the capacity targets

Number of incentive schemes	1
-----------------------------	---

<i>FAB CE Capacity incentive scheme</i>	
Entity being incentivised	ANSPs
KPI description	3.1 (c) (i) Capacity KPI#1: En route ATFM delay per flight
Type of incentive	Capacity incentive scheme
Formula	The bonus/penalty is dependent on both an ANSP's and FAB CE performance using the following formula: $\text{Bonus/Penalty} = \text{FAB PONDER} \times \text{NATIONAL ANSP ELEMENT} \times 1\% \text{ ANSP EN-ROUTE REVENUE}$ For more detail see Annex E.
Justification	FAB CE proposes the common incentive mechanism to be applied to en route air traffic flow management (ATFM) delay per flight. The aim of common FAB CE incentive scheme is keeping a high quality of the service on national and FAB CE level with developing further improvements in the Capacity performance area through common FAB CE projects. FAB CE Incentive mechanism includes six countries: Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia. Considering different specificity and diversity of national states the FAB CE incentive mechanism aims to boost team spirit towards the common goal of fostering further improvements in the Capacity performance area.
Description of performance variation levels and the applicable level of bonuses and penalties	The incentive mechanism will have financial implication on ANSP's cost base and will be applied yearly on each ANSP in the FAB CE with following principles: • The common aim in incentive mechanism calculation for FAB CE is to calculate bonuses/penalties each year on FAB CE level but final result depends on the national ANSP's performance; • The level of bonuses and penalties are the same – symmetrical model; • The targets for en route KPI target capacity on national and FAB CE level are given in the chapter Performance targets at local level number 3.1 (c) (i) Capacity KPI#1: En route ATFM delay per flight and they are summarized in the following table; • Incentive mechanism will be calculated each year during RP2 period and it will be paid in year n+2 according to the Article 15 Commission Regulation No 391/2013 laying down a common charging scheme for air navigation services; • The FAB CE en route ATFM delay per flight (Capacity KPI#1) is based on the Network Operations Plan of the Network Manager; (NOP) for RP2 and it will be also referent for actual calculation on yearly basis; • The national en route ATFM delay per flight (Capacity KPI#1) are based on national capacity performance planes but the referent actual calculation of Capacity KP#1 on yearly basis will be taken from official PRB online performance monitoring dashboard. Please, see Annex E for further details.
Additional comments	

4.1 - Incentive schemes for the cost-efficiency targets

The parameters used by the Member States in the setting of the risk-sharing mechanism defined in Article 13 and 14 of the charging Regulation will be detailed under lines 3.13 and 3.14 of Reporting Table 2 as per Annex VI of the same Regulation. Therefore, the information is included in the Reporting Tables attached in Annex C.

SECTION 5: MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
5. MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN	5			
Description of the civil-military dimension of the plan describing the performance of FUA application in order to increase capacity with due regard to military mission effectiveness, and if deemed appropriate, relevant performance indicators and targets consistent with the indicators and targets of the performance plan.				

5 - MILITARY DIMENSION OF THE PLAN

The implementation of FAB CE is expected to improve civil-military cooperation and coordination. In order to address civil-military cooperation at FAB level, FAB CE States agreed to establish a Joint Civil Military Airspace Coordination Committee (JCMACC) at the FAB CE Strategic level. Through the JCMACC, the FAB CE States shall aim at, inter alia, strategic coordination of their national ASM and Airspace Design policies and ATFCM processes and civil-military cooperation, within the remit of the FAB CE Agreement and in accordance with the SES regulations.

The FABCE Military Advanced Concept of Operations (FAB CE MA CONOPS) is intended to improve civil/military coordination and also military/military cooperation,. Specifically, the objectives of the FAB CE MA CONOPS are as follows:

- More efficient use of the airspace through enhanced application of the FUA Concept in order to better satisfy civil and military needs.
- Efficient provision of ATS, without the constraints of national borders.
- Safeguarding national security and national and international defence requirements, while respecting the sovereignty of each State.

FAB CE MA CONOPS describes in detail FAB CE airspace management principles and principles of FUA application. Airspace management will be coordinated at FAB level. This will include:

(i) Widespread cooperation at strategic level

Administrative support shall be provided to support the work of JCMACC. Detailed composition, tasks and responsibilities will be defined as appropriate.

(ii) Regional pre-tactical management of airspace

To improve the current process, the integration of ASM/ATFCM functions will be achieved through different phases.

The first phase (2015-2019) will be the integration of the ASM and ATFCM functions at national level ensuring an enhanced cooperation and coordination between national AMCs and FMPs. It should be accomplished by the end of the second reference period.

The second phase (2020+) will be based on dedicated bilateral or multilateral agreements, in order to support the management of cross-border airspace structures and/or operations along major traffic flows. Integration of ASM and ATFCM processes will be completed using the existing AMC and FMP functions at ATS units and, whenever required, the establishment of a sub-regional solution based on the Lead AMC concept as described in the ASM Handbook. The implementation of the second phase requires a comprehensive operational, safety and legal assessments. The assessment should be done during the second reference period supported by appropriate cost benefit analysis

The third phase (2020+) will focus on the integration of ASM and ATFCM processes at FAB level. Appropriate ASM and ATFCM organisation will be implemented based on operational requirements and cost benefit analysis.

Planned improvements of FAB CE FUA measures:

Application of FUA among FAB CE States: Coordination and harmonisation of civil-military procedures and integration of pre-tactical ASM/AFTCM processes, including priority criteria and protocols to consider for supporting the respective decision-making process.

ASM/ATFCM Process: Ongoing coordination among FAB CE States on the effective application of the FUA concept, including harmonization of civil and military terms and definitions for a common application of FUA at the FAB CE level and the progressive establishment of new flexible airspace structures, where appropriate.

Cross-Border Activities: Development of one common set of standards for separation between civil and military flights for cross-border activities, as well as procedures for tactical crossing of shared airspace, including the specific conditions under which the responsibility for separation between civil and military flights rests on the ATS units or controlling military units.

ASM System Requirements: Coordination for the identification of tools enabling civil and military airspace requirements and their updates to be captured for all planning phases and real-time operations. Identify common user requirements of ASM System supporting FUA application at FAB CE level.

Most of these activities go beyond the requirements of the Performance Regulation and other legislation and will bring additional benefits to the benefits described in other parts of this Performance Plan. Although mandatory performance targets in this area are not foreseen at the moment, this has no impact on meeting the targets in other KPAs

Additional (Key) Performance Indicators (and targets) relevant to civil military performance

The FABCE objective, in regard to FUA application, is to improve the efficiency of SUA booking procedures which should contribute to ATC capacity and flight efficiency at FAB CE level. The objective should be to monitor at national and FABCE level by performance indicator the effectiveness of booking procedures for flexible use of airspace (FUA). The performance targets are not foreseen at the moment.

The integration of military mission effectiveness measurements with other performance measurements within the civil-military dimension of the performance plan is essential for the establishment of a civil-military performance-based partnership. Performance monitoring in connection with how an ATM system affects military mission effectiveness is an optional feature of the performance plan under the national responsibilities. Due to the Member States' diversity as regards combat tactics, type of airborne platforms and weapon systems, the application of common military mission requirements is virtually impossible to achieve. However, the application of a common assessment methodology on how an ATM system affects military mission effectiveness should be applied.

The agreed FABCE performance objective relevant to military mission effectiveness is to ensure allocation of an optimum airspace dimension for training within an acceptable distance from an airbase during the whole reference period. The objective should be monitored (except for Slovenia) by two performance indicators:

- Optimum SUA dimension vs. allocated SUA structure and
- Average transit time

Performance targets are not foreseen at the moment. Without prejudice to the template, states may include performance targets within a national section of the performance plan. A detailed description of the performance indicators is available in Annex F.

SECTION 6: ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE PLAN

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
6. ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE PLAN	6			
6.1. Sensitivity to external assumptions.	6.1			
6.2. Comparison with previous performance plan.	6.2			

6 - ANALYSIS OF SENSITIVITY AND COMPARISON WITH THE PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE PLAN

6.1 - Sensitivity to external assumptions

1) The most important underlying external assumption for the traffic and service unit forecast is the GDP forecast from Oxford Economics. Simply explained, in the medium-term the forecasted GDP figures get multiplied with appropriate (depending on the traffic region) GDP multipliers to derive the traffic and the service unit forecast. For better understanding, in RP2 the European GDP growth rate is 2%, so every year of economic stagnation leads roughly to a 4% lower service units level for all the following RP2 years. Even in the low-growth scenario it is not assumed, that the European economy will stagnate or decline in the coming years.

2) The design of the low- and high-growth scenarios (includes the assumptions) is chosen to be with a statistical probability of 50% within this range. Many different reasons can lead to a traffic development out of this range (listed and described in detail in the STATFOR forecast document chapter 'risk to the forecast growth'.

3) Traffic flows (origin to destination) depend on the availability of appropriate ANSP capacities and ANS charges. For deriving ANSP traffic figures historic traffic patterns are applied on the traffic flows. The present plan is based on specific traffic scenarios and should the actual traffic differ from these assumptions, this could have an effect on actual costs, capacity and unit costs. Variations in traffic from planned would then need to take into account the trade-offs between cost and capacity.

4) The need to achieve regulatory compliance over RP2 may result in unforeseen changes to investment plans. Future SESAR requirements may also affect the planned investments. Changes in national regulations pertaining to pensions may also affect the cost efficiency inputs.

5) Not being member of the Monetary Union, Hungary, Croatia and Czech Republic have to face exchange rate risk. For example, most of the incomes of HungaroControl are in EUR, but most of the costs appear in national currency, although 5%-10% of the cost base is denominated in foreign currency such as Eurocontrol costs, aviation liability insurance and some of the investment related depreciations. Additionally for Croatia long term financial debt (which even though not a cost), could prove to put a significant liquidity pressure if the adverse foreign exchange risk materialize. Assuming normal market circumstances, a moderate change of exchange rate would not cause any significant impact on the cost base.

6) Due to the inflation adjustment methodology which compensates the differences between planned and actual inflation rate the aim is to link the cost items to the inflation in order to reduce risk. For example, as not all of the costs could be linked with the inflation especially depreciation and other significant cost elements (e.g. EUROCONTROL cost), 1 percentage point of difference in the inflation rate causes 0.3%-0.5% change of the actual Hungarian cost base and at least 0.5% change in the Croatian cost base.

7) At the moment, the transition of BiH airspace is divided in two phases. In the first phase BiH ANS Authorities will take over the lower BiH airspace (up to FL325) in the project which includes the participation of Network Manager, as well as CCL and SMATSA. Uncertainties in respect to traffic and capacity development are evaluated in the simulation that is performed in cooperation with Network Manager. A significant impact on CCL's performance indicators is not expected from the first phase and, therefore, it will not have a great influence on this performance plan. This impact is supposed to happen from October 2014.

The second phase, in which BiH ANS Authorities would take over the upper BiH airspace, has not been planned and has no defined timescales. The impact of the second phase of transition of BiH airspace is not specified and not yet assessed in the current version of European Network Operations Plan 2014-2018/19, dated March 2014, therefore the effect of those changes are not included and not taken into account in this Performance Plan. As a result of the second phase, a significant impact is expected on traffic development, CCL's performance indicators as well as on the FAB CE performance indicators. If the second phase happens during RP2, CCL shall be allowed to revise its RP2 performance data in order to mitigate the effects caused by the decisions which are beyond CCL influence.

6.2 - Comparison with previous performance plan

- 1) In RP1 the assumption was basically the same. The economy in Europe was in difficulties and there was no European economic growth in 2012 and 2013 (stagnating years), the resulting overall air traffic growth observation was a moderate decline of -2.4% in 2012 and -1.1% in 2013 in Europe.
- 2) The statistical scenario design was the same and the actual traffic figures are below the low-growth scenario and hence out of the scenario-assumed 50% probability. Many reasons contributed to this development, some of them are economic difficulties, big airline restructurings and unrests in Middle East (Tourism).
- 3) No severe and lasting ANSP capacity constraints had influenced the traffic development.
- 4) Croatia did not participate in the RP1, thus Croatia's data cannot be compared with RP1 data.

SECTION 7: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN

Mapping between the template for the FAB performance plan and Annex II of the performance Regulation				
Structure of ANNEX II of the performance Regulation	Link with PRB Performance Plan template			
	Body of Performance Plan	Annex C For cost-efficiency		Other annexes
		RT ref.	AI ref.	
7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN	7			
Description of the measures put in place by the national supervisory authorities to achieve the performance targets, such as:				
(i) monitoring mechanisms to ensure that the ANS safety programmes and business plans are implemented;				
(ii) measures to monitor and report on the implementation of the performance plans including how to address the situation if targets are not reached during the reference period.				

7 - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN

Each NSA within the FAB CE Member states is the body responsible for monitoring the performance targets at national level and will continuously oversee the accountable entities within the scope of the performance plan. Each NSA shall also establish processes for data collection, data assessment and data validation with respect to performance targets set in this performance plan. The monitoring at national level shall in addition include ANSP's annual plans, 5-years business plans, uncontrollable costs, reaching of alert thresholds and other obligatory requirements determined in Annex V of the Performance Regulation.

In case that any target is not met at national level, the responsible NSA shall identify potential causes, apply corrective measures designed to rectify the situation and subsequently inform the European Commission. In this case the responsible NSA shall also inform NSA CC, the FAB CE body responsible for monitoring the performance at FAB level.

Based on the inputs of all NSAs and the Network Manager (CAP, ENV KPA), FAB CE will prepare an annual monitoring report and after approval NSA CC will submit them to the European Commission via PRB until 1st June at the latest.

NSA commitment for data provision

	Active			Inactive
	Date of implementation	Periodicity	Focal point	
Airport dataflow				
Civil Military dataflow				

Number of other dataflows	Click to select number of other dataflows
---------------------------	---

Additional comments

8 - ANNEXES

The following annexes should be provided as part of the local performance plans. These should be completed with any other documentation relevant for the targets justifications.

Annex A. Public consultation material

Annex B. Relevant documentation in line with the NSP

(FAB CE Network Operations Plan, FAB CE Airspace Plan)

Annex C. Reporting Tables

Reporting Table 1 (Total costs) and Table 2 (Unit rate calculation) and “additional information” as per Article 9 of the charging Regulation (Transparency of costs and of the charging mechanism) for each entity and consolidated at national/charging zone/FAB level from June 2014.

Annex D. ANSPs investment plans

Annex E. FAB CE Capacity Incentive Scheme

Annex F. Additional Key Performance Indicators relevant to civil military performance