

Position Paper

EASA/FAA Annual Safety Conference (Vienna, 13-16 June 2011)

Workshop on Performance Monitoring (14th June, 4 pm- 5h30 pm)

Moderator: John Vincent/EASA

Panel:

Reinhard Menzel/EASA, Ryan Hunninghaus, Maciej Rodak/CANSO, Vincent De Vroey/AEA and Tony Ferrante/FAA

AEA intervention for Performance Monitoring Panel

The European air traffic management (ATM) system has suffered from fragmentation and inefficiencies for decades. According to Eurocontrol studies, the current European ATM system consist of annual inefficiencies of nearly 5 bEuro (2 bEuro related to fragmentation, 1.4 bEuro related to horizontal flight inefficiencies and 1 beuro related to delays). Through the creation of a Single European Sky, safety could be enhanced, flight efficiency could be improved and therefore CO2 emissions per flight and other environmental impacts could be significantly lowered (aviation related Co2 emissions could be reduced by 12% per flight) whereas costs could be significantly decreased. The creation of a Single European Sky is also essential to ensure the competitiveness of the EU aviation industry in the global market place. Furthermore, the current ATM system will be unable to cope with the traffic demands forecasted for the period between now and 2030 (according to the latest Eurocontrol Long Term Forecast traffic will grow to 16.9 million flights by 2030 (1.8 times current traffic levels)).

The Single European Sky (SES II) package was therefore put in place after nearly 50 years of failed attempts to establish an SES. The core element of the SES II is the performance scheme for ANS provision. The successful implementation of the Performance Scheme based on ambitious targets for safety, cost efficiency, capacity/delays and flight efficiency is the most important tool to realize the Single European Sky. This will require continuous political commitment to ensure a swift delivery of the benefit.

In the view of the AEA, safety is paramount and it will not be traded off with other performance areas. This is even truer since safety will be

- Adria Airways
- Aegean Airlines
- AeroSvit
- airBaltic
- airberlin
- Air France
- Air Malta
- Alitalia
- Austrian
- British Airways
- British Midland International
- brussels airlines
- Cargolux
- Croatia Airlines
- Cyprus Airways
- Czech Airlines
- DHL
- Finnair
- Iberia
- Icelandair
- Jat Airways
- KLM
- LOT
- Lufthansa
- Luxair
- Malev
- Montenegro Airlines
- Olympic Air
- SAS Scandinavian Airlines
- SWISS
- TAP Portugal
- TAROM
- TNT Airways
- Turkish Airlines
- Ukraine International Airlines
- Virgin Atlantic Airways

regulated independently from the SES performance scheme through the extended scope of the EASA system. However, safety should not be used as an excuse for not improving performance in the area of cost efficiency. In our view, it should be possible to continue to improve ATM safety while reducing the direct and indirect cost of ATM. The airlines have shown that this is possible: since liberalization has taken place, airlines have been able to drastically reduce their unit cost while continuing to improve safety.

In our view safety indicators should be kept simple. Good examples of safety indicators in the field of ATM are separation minima infringements per flight hours, and number of runway incursions with ATM contribution. Of course the establishment of safety indicators cannot be isolated from the need for a ‘just culture’ In interest of aviation safety, it is essential to provide a legal framework in which all parties involved in accidents or incidents can share information and speak freely and in confidence. More action is required at the EU level to ensure that all Member States amend their national legal penal system ensuring a just culture. In those Member States where there is no ‘just culture’, there might be a false sense of the actual safety performance achieved.

A clear roadmap should be developed to drastically reduce the direct and indirect costs of the EU ATM system in the longer term and as a consequence to drastically reduce ATC charges billed to the airlines and other airspace users. Such a roadmap should take into account the goal to halve the cost of air navigation service per average commercial flight from €800 to €400 (to close the performance gap with the US ATM system).

The performance scheme should address both en-route and terminal charges. This is essential to ensure meaningful benefits to the airlines and passengers based on the gate-to-gate concept.

It is essential to ensure consistency between the Community wide performance targets and the national/FAB targets. This will require the development of a system for resolution of inconsistencies between those targets and always keeping in mind the end goal to halve the ATC costs and to close the huge performance gap with the US ATM system. In practice this also means that the worst performers will need more ambitious cost reduction targets than those who are better performers. The Eurocontrol Performance Review Commission ATM performance bench-marking (ACE) reports should be used for setting the detailed targets for individual ATM providers.

- Adria Airways
- Aegean Airlines
- AeroSvit
- airBaltic
- airberlin
- Air France
- Air Malta
- Alitalia
- Austrian
- British Airways
- British Midland International
- brussels airlines
- Cargolux
- Croatia Airlines
- Cyprus Airways
- Czech Airlines
- DHL
- Finnair
- Iberia
- Icelandair
- Jat Airways
- KLM
- LOT
- Lufthansa
- Luxair
- Malev
- Montenegro Airlines
- Olympic Air
- SAS Scandinavian Airlines
- SWISS
- TAP Portugal
- TAROM
- TNT Airways
- Turkish Airlines
- Ukraine International Airlines
- Virgin Atlantic Airways

Environmental targets in ATM are closely linked to fuel burn and associated CO₂ emissions and therefore do not require separate targets from those needed for delays and flight efficiency.

In this context, it is also important to stress the importance to safeguard the independence of the National Supervisory Authorities (NSAs) from the ANSPs as well as from political interference which is essential to ensure a successful implementation. The European Commission should closely monitor the strict adherence to those principles through making use of the tools available within the SES II package. Moreover, the NSAs should be consolidated within the context of Functional Airspace Blocks (FABs) to ensure economies of scale and to prevent an increase of supervision costs.

Finally the SES II performance scheme should be linked with a well developed incentive scheme for all key performance indicators except those related to safety. The biggest incentive will be the abolishment of the full cost recovery system in ATM as already agreed through the SES II package and to replace it with a determined cost system. Penalties for not meeting performance targets should be paid to those airlines/airspace users who face the economic damage related to the non-adherence to performance targets.

So in conclusion, we believe the SES performance framework is the cornerstone of the SES. Performance targets should be the driver for change and should therefore not be watered down. Safety remains paramount.