

Gate One Position on RP3 the third reference period (2020-2024)

This document is the position of Gate One cooperation reflecting on the evolution of the third reference period – 2020-2024 (RP3) preparation preceding the target setting by the European Commission foreseen to be published in June 2018. It has been prepared and consulted by Gate One members representing the common view of 13 ANSPs on this issue in order to stress its importance, being fully consistent with positions communicated so far by CANSO, the Civil Air Navigation Services Organisation.

Status

In preparation for the RP3 starting from 2020, targeting the amendment of Performance and Charging Schemes the European Commission launched a consultation process with the involvement of the affected stakeholders. Although the work has started already in 2016, first concrete options for these amendments were presented during an ad-hoc SSC in March 2017. Member states provided their comments on these options individually, whereas CANSO also sent a position to DG MOVE representing the view of its member ANSPs. This position paper raises elements to the attention of policy and decision makers where state and ANSP level opinions within Gate One are consistent.

Position

GATE ONE members are of the opinion that following elements should be taken into consideration while shaping the Performance and Charging Scheme regulations for RP3:

1. **SIMPLIFYING** – the performance and charging framework should be simplified through standardisation, i.e. implement clear rules and avoid institutional and formal duplication (e.g. while setting the targets for each State or in the revision process), mandatory for the States, with the benefit of greater transparency.
2. **FOCUS ON LOCAL LEVEL** – the contribution of each state to the European SES targets should be defined based on individual assessment in order to not jeopardize the pace of the transition and ensure sustainable growth of the entire sector. Performance plans and targets are preferred to be set at national level instead of FAB level. Considerable additional burden and increased complexity is not counterweighted by demonstrable benefits.
3. **TACKLING CAPACITY CONSTRAINTS** – performance cannot be focused mainly on cost effectiveness which is the case in RP2. The emphasis should be put on rational utilization of ATS routes, FRA and airspace structure in general, especially when unexpected and unpredictable traffic changes occur. The remedy for such undesirable, yet unavoidable situations could be more local air traffic flow and capacity management with in-depth knowledge of complex regional airspace.
4. **PERFORMANCE OF THE WHOLE NETWORK IS THE SUM OF INDIVIDUAL ELEMENTS** – instead of focusing mainly on the core area, the European ATM network should give more importance to the complex feeding area (out of the core) since even minor issues outside the core area may affect the performance of the whole network. Moreover, FIR bordering with non-IFPS (Initial Flight Plan Processing System) area should be treated respectively with regard to complexity and capacity.
5. **FROM INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS TO REAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS** – (based on experience from RP1 and RP2) it is now clear that more operational cooperation, especially through industrial partnerships and operations-related arrangements along with FABs, generate more benefits tangible for both ANSPs and Airspace Users.
6. **MORE AUTOMATIC AND SIMPLER REVISION OF PERFORMANCE PLANS AND TARGETS** – States (FABs) should be allowed to revise their performance plans based on clearly defined terms and conditions. Current charging scheme is not flexible enough to absorb rapid changes such as shift of traffic flows or macroeconomic changes, therefore more automated approach is required. In order to control the number of applications for revision it is necessary to consider a more local approach while setting the targets (meaning: “one size does not fit all”).