

Hereby amendments to the Danish-Swedish Performance Plan

14/11-2014

Please note changes in the following areas:

- Safety regarding RAT.
- Additional comments with regard to capacity.
- Corrected figures (minor corrections) with regard to cost efficiency.



Allan Hansen Ekstrand

Chairman of the Performance Charging Group under Danish-Swedish FAB Board



FAB Performance Plan

DK-SE FAB

Second Reference Period (2015-2019)

Signatories

Performance plan details	
FAB Name	DK-SE FAB
Version number	13
Date of issue	14.11.14
Date of adoption	

Member State	Name, title and signature of representative
Denmark	Niels Remmer, Director 
Sweden	Staffan Widlert, Director General 

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
- 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

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	3.1.(a).(i)	RT 1 (All)	AI 4 a)	

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). (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)			
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	According to the rules and procedure of the Danish-Swedish FAB Board having the Performance/Charging group is responsible for preparing the Danish-Swedish Performance Plan. The NSAs in the Danish-Swedish FAB are: Danish Transport Authority - Trafikstyrelsen and Swedish Transport Agency - Transportstyrelsen
NSA responsible for the coordination within the FAB	The Chairmanship in the FAB is changing every year between Denmark and Sweden. In even years Denmark is chairing the FAB Board and Sweden in uneven years.
List of accountable entities	Danish Transport Authority Naviair DMI Swedish Transport Agency LFV SMHI Aviation Capacity Resources AB (ACR) Swedish Maritime Administration ESNX
Geographical scope	The airspace within Danish-Swedish FAB is treated as one continuum. The Danish-Swedish FAB is defined as København FIR and Sweden FIR. The day to day Air Traffic Services are however provided within a total volume of airspace consisting of the said FAB and a number of cross-border airspace blocks of defined dimensions, where Air Traffic Services are provided as agreed between States, in order to satisfy operational needs/requirements in and around that particular area.

Additional comments	<p>Naviair and LFV as the designated providers have entered into an agreement regarding the operations of the air traffic control center (ATCC) units including provision of operational support, in Copenhagen, Malmoe and Stockholm with a certified subcontractor, NUAC HB. The Operating agreement describes the operational services to be delivered by NUAC HB, and the provision of personnel and infrastructure to be delivered by Naviair and LFV.</p> <p>NUAC HB is a partnership equally owned by Naviair and LFV. Naviair and LFV are, as designated ANSPs, part of the national en-route cost base in Denmark and Sweden. Cost efficiency improvements that arise as a consequence of NUAC HB deliverables will have effect on Naviair and LFV contribution to the national cost base.</p> <p>On the basis of, and in combination with the above mentioned overall agreements, (State-, NSA-, ANSP- and NUAC HB Partnership Agreement), the Danish-Swedish FAB rests on a solid legal and operational/technical foundation and serves as a tool to enable the partners in Danish-Swedish FAB to reach the performance targets. Besides the NUAC HB, Naviair and LFV have various other tools in place with regard to optimisation of service provision, extending beyond the Danish-Swedish FAB partners (e.g. Training of ATS personnel and ATS systems development/maintenance).</p> <p>In addition to this solid, operational foundation for a functional airspace block, the Free Route Airspace (FRA) concept was implemented in the Danish-Swedish FAB during 2011, providing a flight efficient airspace within the Danish-Swedish FAB, to allow benefits for the airspace users, such as reduced costs and less CO2 emission.</p> <p>DMI and SMHI are the designated MET service providers in the Danish-Swedish FAB.</p>
---------------------	--

1.2 - Description of the macroeconomic scenario including overall assumptions

The economy in Denmark and Sweden is recovering from the crisis arising from the financial crisis starting in 2008. According to the OECD economic outlook for Denmark:

Growth is projected to continue to pick up as domestic demand, supported by low interest rates and improved confidence, gains momentum, and as exports accelerate on the back of strengthening external demand. Employment growth will gradually increase in 2014, contributing to a fall in the unemployment rate. Fiscal policy is expected to be broadly neutral in 2014, although the effects of past measures will continue to support private demand. Given the large automatic stabilisers, further discretionary stimulus is not warranted. To limit the risks arising from high household debt, financial supervision and macro-prudential policies should continue to be strengthened.

According to the OECD economic outlook for Sweden:

The economy has lost momentum, but is set to recover gradually as world trade picks up and as stronger exports and improving business confidence spark a revival in business investment. The unemployment rate is projected to continue to fall, but with ample spare capacity inflation will remain subdued. Monetary policy should therefore remain accommodative while measures to enhance financial stability and address risks linked to high household debt need to be developed further. Fiscal policy, against the backdrop of sound public finances, is set to be appropriately slightly stimulative in 2014. Efforts to avoid unemployment becoming entrenched should continue.

1.3 - Stakeholder consultation

Number of Meetings	3
Meeting #1	
Name of meeting	FAB DK SE DK Consultation on Cost Efficiency
Date	05.05.2014
Type of event	National Consultation
Level	National
Stakeholders	<p>Material was published at the website www.eusinglesky.eu 16th April which gave the interested stakeholders almost one month to prepare themselves for the joint consultation 12th May.</p> <p>Invited stakeholders were a combination of email addresses provided to the PRB chairman and a list of stakeholders that the PRB chairman had. The list provided by the Danish and Swedish NSAs contained several social partners. However none of them attended the consultations.</p> <p>The following participated in the consultation meeting: Naviair, DMI, Scandinavian Airlines System, Lufthansa, KLM, British Airways, IATA, Copenhagen Airports A/S.</p>
Deadline for responses	16.05.2014
Main issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic forecast: the airspace users found the traffic forecast used in the performance plan too low and asked the NSAs to update the performance plan when the latest traffic forecast from STATFOR was available. 2. Cost evolution: the airspace users asked various specific questions on the evolution in other operating costs (Naviair and DMI) and supervision costs (NSA). 3. Cost of capital: airspace users wanted more explanations on the evolution in cost of capital for Naviair and asked for more information on the risk assessment. 4. Cost allocation between en-route and TNC: airspace users wanted more explanations on why the NSA had no costs allocated to TNC.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic forecast <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experience from the first reference period where the base case scenario turned out to be too high. • The EU-wide targets are based on the September low case scenario from STATFOR. • Latest forecast from STATFOR (May 2014) shows a downward adjustment for 2014 and 2015. Denmark will however not adjust the low case scenario for 2016-2019 accordingly. • The NSA reminded the airspace users that the traffic risk sharing mechanism is reducing the negative effect for the airspace user should the actual traffic turn out to be higher than expected. • Traffic forecast for TNC has been adjusted upwards.

Actions agreed upon	<p>2. Cost evolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Naviair: During RP1 the lower levels of traffic made Naviair implement cost containment measures for our costs, incl. Other operating costs. The implementation measures had effect in terms of both short term savings as well as structural changes. The new level, including the structural changes is expected to be kept in RP2. • DMI: The development in staff costs as opposed to other operational costs was discussed. The staff costs are to a large extent driven by costs for manual production of forecasts. DMI has and will continue to automate the production. Automation will result in lower growth of staff costs, but often in increased other costs due to expenses for software and systems. The same goes for integration with other service providers where the staff costs will benefit from the more efficient division of work, but the Service providers will still need the tools. • Danish Transport Authority: After the merge of three entities now having the Danish Transport Authority it has been possible to make significant saving in 2012 and 2013 especially on supervision costs. The savings are already partly being paid back to the airspace user by a reduction in the unit rate for 2014. Cost are expected to recover during RP2 however not more than at a level that allows the Danish Transport Authority to meet the EU-wide targets while absorbing the cost increase coming from contributions to Eurocontrol.
	<p>3. Cost of capital</p> <p>Requirements for the cost of capital for Naviair were set at the conversion of Naviair into a state-owned company. For Naviair as a whole, the business activities are under the same statutory account. Assets to either en route, TNC CPH or a third activity are allocated based upon the entire asset base of Naviair. Therefore Naviair does not use the Capital Asset Pricing Model to compute the Cost of Capital.</p> <p>1. Cost of Capital: The total cost of capital is a distribution of the combined amount of return on equity, interest payment on debt, and the deduction of capitalised indirect production costs. The cost of capital is then distributed to individual business activities.</p> <p>1.1 Cost of Debt: The payments of interests cover the external debt/financing, incl. the sub-ordinated loan. The interest payments are distributed according to a proportion of the amount of fixed assets allocated to either en route, TNC CPH or a third activity.</p> <p>1.2 Cost of Equity: When Naviair in 2010 was converted into a state-owned company the owner (Ministry of Transport/Transportministeriet) stated a requirement for an equity ratio of 55 per cent (incl. sub-ordinated loan) and a return on equity of 6.7 per cent before tax. The return on equity for Naviair covers all activities of Naviair, and is allocated to the individual internal business activity by a risk based assessment. Hence a portion of the required return on equity is allocated to either en route or TNC CPH. Despite the fact that en route and TNC are exposed to traffic risk sharing Naviair considers the en route business to have less risk than TNC CPH. This is reflected in the allocation to en route, TNC and the rest of Naviair.</p>
	<p>4. Cost allocation between en-route and TNC</p> <p>All NSA ANS-costs have been allocated to en-route all years of the SES regulation. In Denmark, no oversight costs are allocated to either en route or TNC. Costs that the NSA could allocate to TNC are very few and to setup a TNC cost allocation for the NSA-part is deemed to be disproportionate.</p>
Points of disagreement and reasons	
Additional comments	

Meeting #2	
Name of meeting	FAB DK SE SE Consultation on Cost Efficiency
Date	07.05.2014
Type of event	National Consultation
Level	National

Stakeholders	<p>Material was published at the website www.eusinglesky.eu 16th April which gave the interested stakeholders almost one month to prepare themselves for the joint consultation 12th May.</p> <p>Invited stakeholders were a combination of email addresses provided to the PRB chairman and a list of stakeholders that the PRB chairman had. The list provided by the Danish and Swedish NSAs contained several social partners. However none of them attended the consultations.</p> <p>The following participated in the consultation meeting: LFV, ACR, Swedavia, Swedish Maritime Administration, SMHI, Scandinavian Airline System, IATA, AOPA, KLM, Swedish Aviation Industry Group (SFB).</p>
Deadline for responses	16.05.2014
Main issues	<p>The airspace users expressed opinion on the following main issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. STATFORs low case scenario is a too low estimate. 2. The cost-efficiency target for Determined cost could be more ambitions for the Swedish charging zone. The air space users asked the NSA to consider the cost-efficiency development during the period of 2009-2019. 3. Regarding investments the NSA has to ensure that the ANSP does not include any funds already given in the first reference period. 4. ANSPs should be able to present a cost benefit analysis (CBA) for their investments. 5. LFV argued that Swedish ANSPs should not absorb cost increases due to Eurocontrol. 6. Swedish Maritime Administration stated that they would have significant problems to handle the cost-efficiency targets, and that it may lead to impaired activities within the area of Search and Rescue (SAR).
Actions agreed upon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Swedish Transsport Agency (STA) has considered this issue. STA has asked for a statement and a clarification from the ANSP (LFV). Sweden do not find it motivated to make further adjustments due to this issue. 5. Sweden has considered this issue and agree that the Swedish ANSP's should not absorb increased Eurocontrol-costs, which is the same principle that Sweden applied during RP1. This has resulted in an adjusted average cost-efficiency target for the Swedish entites amounting to -2,1 % during the second reference period, and -1,9 % if the increased membership contribution fee to Eurocontrol is included. 6. The Swedish Transport Agency has been conducting a further dialogue with the Ministry of Enterprise regarding this issue. Because of difficulties with alternative financing, and because of the large risks associated with impaired SAR operations in Swedish airspace, some reallocation of the cost efficiency target has been made within the Swedish cost base. This has resulted in a lower cost efficiency target for the Swedish Maritime Administration. Sweden nevertheless still contribute to the cost efficiency target with 2,1 %, Eurocontrol contribution fee excluded.

Points of disagreement and reasons	<p>1. Sweden has chosen to use February 2014 Low case STATFOR forecast for 2015-2019. The main reasons for this are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The experience from the first reference period where the base case scenario turned out to be too high. • The EU-wide targets are based on the September low case scenario from STATFOR. • Latest forecast from STATFOR (May 2014) shows a downward adjustment for 2014 and 2015. Sweden will however not adjust the low case scenario for 2016-2019 accordingly. <p>2. The Swedish Transport Agency (STA) has considered the opinion from the air space users regarding a more ambitious cost-efficiency target. STA does not see a -22,5 per cent reduction of the Determined Unit Cost between 2009-2019 as a realistic approach.</p> <p>4. STA consider cost benefit analysis (CBA) to be a possible tool for evaluating investments. However it is not clarified that it is appropriate to make the ANSPs CBAs public. This would require a further investigation and if appropriate it would have to be implemented during a longer time period and can therefore not be included in the performance plan for the second reference period.</p>
Additional comments	

Meeting #3	
Name of meeting	FAB DK SE Consultation Event
Date	12.05.2014
Type of event	FAB Consultation
Level	FAB
Stakeholders	<p>Material was published at the website www.eusinglesky.eu 16th April which gave the interested stakeholders almost one month to prepare themselves for the joint consultation 12th May.</p> <p>Invited stakeholders were a combination of email addresses provided to the PRB chairman and a list of stakeholders that the PRB chairman had. The list provided by the Danish and Swedish NSAs contained several social partners. However none of them attended the consultations.</p> <p>The following participated in the consultation meeting: Naviair, LFV, IATA, AOPA Danmark, Scandinavian Airlines System, Swedavia AB, SFB - Svenska FlygBranschen, Irish Aviation Authority, Danish Aviation Association (DAA), SMHI, DMI, Copenhagen Airports A/S.</p>
Deadline for responses	16.05.2014

<p>Main issues</p>	<p>Safety - users were questioning coordination between Denmark and Sweden,</p> <p>Environment - the conflict between shortest routes and cheapest routes fuel burn wise was discussed. Users appreciated the evolution in Danish-Swedish FAB and NEFAB concerning Free Route Airspace (FRA). No investment is needed in relation to FRA in Danish-Swedish FAB.</p> <p>Capacity - ANSP said that their internal target was zero delay, the targets in the Performance Plan are equal to reference values coming from the Network Manager. All stakeholders were in general satisfied with the incentive scheme, however airspace users would like to see even lower levels of bonus and penalty. At local level it was recognised that incentive scheme was not applied due to little amount of data and that the great part of delays are caused by weather conditions. LFV wanted the capacity targets to be limited to only apply to the traffic forecast, in case of increased traffic the target should be revised.</p> <p>Cost-efficiency - it was recognised that all targets were adequately contributing to and were consistent with the EU wide target of cost-efficiency for RP2. However the airspace users were expecting to see even more cost reductions. Especially the traffic forecast scenario chosen was discussed, users wanted to see a higher level of expected traffic. Airspace users asked for more information concerning cost savings stemming from the NUAC cooperation.</p>
<p>Actions agreed upon</p>	<p>Safety - the targets EoSM, RAT and Just Culture have been synchronized and the performance plan has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Environment - we agreed that we should remain ourself that lack of consistency with the target might be because of the conflict between cheapest and the shortest route. From an environmental point of view it doesn't have to be negative to fly on most beneficial winds as it can save a lot of fuel and thereby also a lot of CO2 emissions. This can contribute to making it difficult to achieve the FAB-target in 2019 as the KPA only takes the actual distance flown in account and not the percentage of consumed fuel.</p> <p>Capacity - The NSA appreciated the high ambition from the ANSPs having internal targets with zero delay. On the background of users comments the NSA agreed to lower the bonus and penalty level in the incentive scheme to maximum 0.50%. The NSA will reconsider an incentive scheme on local level from 2017 where more information is available.</p> <p>Cost-efficiency - Part of the cost savings that LFV and Naviair have achieved are stemming from the close cooperation set up for NUAC as well as other cooperations as COOPANS and EPN. Further information see local consultation above.</p>
<p>Points of disagreement and reasons</p>	<p>Capacity - The NSAs did not see any reason to accept LFV's request regarding revision of capacity targets in case of increased traffic.</p> <p>Traffic forecast - The NSA did not find it appropriate to change the traffic forecast. More details can be found above in the sections regarding the national consultations. However, in the COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION of 11 March 2014 setting the Union-wide performance targets for the air traffic management network and alert thresholds for the second reference period 2015-19, whereas (13) it reads that the Commission should, by 2016, review the traffic assumptions in light of the most recent available forecast from STATFOR. If appropriate the NSAs may decide to revise the targets in the Danish-Swedish Performance Plan for 2017-2019.</p>
<p>Additional comments</p>	

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	1
-------------------	---

<i>SO5 - Improved Civil/Military Airspace operational coordination</i>	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Planned date of entry into operation	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented	Implemented
Description	Shared airspace situation available at network and FAB level				
Reference to NSP and evidence of compliance					
Contribution to reaching the performance targets	Denmark and Sweden do not see a further need shared military-military or civil-military airspace within the FAB.				
Additional comments					

1.5 - List of airports for RP2

List of airports submitted to the Performance and Charging Regulations						
Number of airports	2					
ICAO code	Airport name	State	IFR air transport movements			
			2011	2012	2013	Average
EKCH	KOEBENHAVN / KASTRUP	Denmark	253.690	243.019	244.934	247.214
ESSA	STOCKHOLM-ARLANDA	Sweden	212.946	210.049	219.838	214.278

List of airports exempted from the Performance and Charging Regulations	
<p>Danish exempted airports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BILLUND • BORNHOLM/RONNE • ESBJERG • KARUP • ODENSE – HCA AIRPORT • SONDERBORG • AALBORG • AARHUS • STAUNING • VAMDRUP • SINDAL • THYRA <p>Swedish exempted airports:</p> <p>ESNX Arvidsjaur, ESSD Borlänge, ESSU Eskilstuna, ESGK Falköping, ESNG Gällivare, ESSK Gävle, ESGG Göteorg/Landvetter, ESGP Göteborg/Säve, ESOH Hagfors, ESMT Halmstad, ESUT Hemavan Tärnaby, ESGJ Jönköping, ESMQ Kalmar, ESOK Karlstad, ESNQ Kiruna, ESNK Kramfors-Sollefteå, ESMK Kristianstad, ESSL Linköping/SAAB, ESTL Ljungbyhed, ESPA Luleå/Kallax, ESNL Lycksele, ESMS Malmö, ESKM Mora/Siljan, ESSP Norrköping/Kungsängen, ESUP Pajala-Ylläs, ESDF Ronneby, ESNS Skellefteå, ESGR Skövde, ESSB Stockholm/Bromma, ESKN Stockholm/Skavsta, ESOW Stockholm/Västerås, ESUD Storuman, ESNN Sundsvall/Timrå, ESND Sveg, ESST Torsby, ESGT Trollhättan/Vänersborg, ESNU Umeå, ESNV Vilhelmina, ESSV Visby, ESMX Växjö/Kronoberg, ESNZ Åre/Östersund, ESTA Ängelholm, ESOE Örebro, Örnsköldsvik</p>	

Additional comments

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

2

LFV

Number of capex

7

Name of capex 1	COOPANS Upgrade			
Description	The development of the ATM System (Top Sky) within COOPANS has now reached the implementation phase. The situation is that all members within the COOPANS from spring 2014 runs on the same platform with the same HW and SW. In the coming years there will be a continuous and harmonised upgrade of the system in order to secure a well functioning system both in terms of functional as well as capacity improvements keeping the same level of safety. The common investment, shared between the COOPANS members will secure a cost effective upgrade as well as a harmonised approach against the arriving SES requirements.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	Upgrade of existing system. Upgrades of the main ATM system are generally significant in terms of costs, even though the cost for LFV is shared between five ANSP's.		
Replacement investment	<i>No</i>			
Common project	<i>Yes</i>	The upgrades proposed for the reporting period will include not only LSSIP/ESSIP investment but also the six AF steaming from the PCP.		
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>Yes</i>	The following ref to the Level 3 of the ATM Master Plan exists. ATC02.7, ATC17, COM09 (2014), FCM 03, ITY-AGDL, ITY-COTR, ITY-FMTP (2014), ITY-SPI and SAF10.		
Joint investment	<i>Yes</i>	There are five partners in COOPANS, LFV, Austro Control (ACG), IAA, Naviair and Croatia Control (CCL), where the investment is shared.		
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Yes</i>	There are three FAB concerned in this, the IAA/NATS, DK/SE and the CE FAB.		
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Yes</i>	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.		
Decision-making process	<i>Yes</i>	CBA performed by external consulting company showing the benefit of doing this kind of cooperative investment, sharing the development, integration and maintenance costs.		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Yes</i>	Airspace Intrusion Warning, SAF 10	During 2015	En-Route
Environment	<i>No</i>			
Capacity	<i>Yes</i>	Through the implementation of the ESSIP objectives	In the period 2016-2018	En-Route

Cost efficiency	Yes			
-----------------	-----	--	--	--

Name of capex 2	Contingency			
Description	The subject with this investment is to be able to provide a business continuity in the situation where there is an outage at any of the present centres at ATCC Malmoe or Stockholm.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>New system</i>	New System
Replacement investment	<i>No</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>	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>No</i>	
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Yes</i>	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.
Decision-making process	<i>Yes</i>	Internal with the possibility fo MSB fundings

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>No</i>			
Environment	<i>No</i>			
Capacity	<i>Yes</i>	A continuity system will in case of outage of one centre be able to keep a certain capacity level. TBD	TBD	En-Route
Cost efficiency	<i>Yes</i>	An outage will cost significantly and will have a major effect on Air-transportation in and out of Sweden.	TBD	En-Route

Name of capex 3	SUPS			
Description	SUPS (Surveillance Upgrade Programme Sweden) is a nationwide coverage programme with WAM systems as a replacement/complement to existing MSSR radars enabling the possibility to use Mode S information. All benefits will be continously implemented as the program develops through the years. Nationwide completion can be expected during 2016.			

Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	As stated both replacement and complement since coverage in new areas is also established.		
Replacement investment	Yes	Existing surveillance infrastructure has to be replaced due to age and this was considered to be the most cost efficient way to meet the operational requirements on surveillance.		
Common project	No			
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	WAM systems are supported in the European ATM MP where it is a part of the surveillance roadmap in chapter 4.3.3. Also refer to level 3 of the MP, ITY-SPI		
Joint investment	No			
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No			
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.		
Decision-making process	Yes	A reduced CBA has ben performed showing that replacing existing Radars with WAM stations is the most economic scenario.		
KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	Enables full Mode S, creates coverage in uncovered airspace, better accuracy, faster update in major TMA	2015-2017	En-route
Environment	Yes	Better predicatbility and awareness will enable the possibility to shorter routes	2015-2017	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Increases tha capacity and enables new services in certain areas.	2015-2017	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	cheapest possible solution that meet the operational requirements.	2015-2017	En-route

Name of capex 4	PSR/SSR Mode S TMA SA			
Description	Replacement of an existing primary radar for Stockholm TMA enhanced with a co-mounted SSR Mode S radar.			
Accountable entity	ANSP			
Justification of the cost, nature and contribution				
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	The investment is replacing the existing PSR and MSSR for Stockholm TMA located in Uppsala. The requirement on surveillance coverage remains unchanged and this is required to fulfil the requirements.		
Replacement investment	Yes			
Common project	No			

Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	PSR and SSR Mode S systems are supported in the European ATM MP where it is a part of the surveillance roadmap in chapter 4.3.3. Also refer to level 3 of the MP, ITY-SPI
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	No	
Consultation with stakeholders	Yes	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.
Decision-making process	No	

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	Yes	PSR is a requirement in major TMA due to safety and this is as replacement of an older PSR radar.	01-03-2015	En-route
Environment	Yes	A better physical location of the new radar will bring coverage advantages that can enable better handling of traffic in TMA on lower altitudes.	01-03-2015	En-route
Capacity	Yes	Faster update rate will enable higher capacity even if one sources is out of order in Stockholm TMA.	01-03-2015	En-route
Cost efficiency	Yes	Cheapest possible solution to fulfil requirement where existing old sites are reused.	01-03-2015	En-route

Name of capex 5	RTC
Description	This implementation project aims to reduce the costs of providing ATC services for TWR at small and medium sized airports by the use of a remotely operated tower concept. A pilot project will establish a Remote Tower Centre (RTC) with connections to two airports in the northern part of Sweden: Sundsvall and Örnsköldsvik. The project objective is to be the first (worldwide) to be certified for remote aerodrome control service for an airport with regular live traffic for permanent use. The main benefit is reduced cost (for ATS provisions) as well as possibility for improved/extended service.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	New system	
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	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.
Decision-making process	Yes	LFV internal decision process (Executive board decision). CBA (classified) exist

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	YES	Continuous safe operation	01-01-2015	Enroute and Airport
Environment	NO			
Capacity	NO			
Cost efficiency	YES	The project is an enabler for future cost-effectiv provision of ATS	01-01-2017	Enroute and Airport

Name of capex 6	VHF
Description	Replacement of older VHF radio equipment to enable 8,33 channel separation in mid and northern parts of Sweden.
Accountable entity	ANSP

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Replacement</i>	
Replacement investment	NO	
Common project	NO	
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	NO	The following ref to the Level 3 of the ATM Master Plan exist. ITY-AGVCS2.
Joint investment	No	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	NO	
Consultation with stakeholders	YES	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.
Decision-making process	YES	LFV internal decision process (Executive board decision). No CBA

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	YES	Continuous safe operation	2013-06-30 ongoing	Enroute

Environment	NO			
Capacity	NO			
Cost efficiency	YES	Lower maintenance costs	2013-06-30 ongoing	Enroute

Name of capex 7	ADQ			
Description	<p>Part of the LFV Group is the management of aeronautical information. In an increasingly automated business where ATM systems, airport systems and aircraft are inherently dependent on accurate flight information at all times the EU has for a few years, decided on the so-called ADQ Regulation. ADQ is a comprehensive regulatory framework that will ensure that aeronautical data and aeronautical information has a certain quality, delivered in certain format and that the risk to it being distorted are minimized. All manual handling of Aeronautical Information shall cease and the quality of information should be secured early in the chain. Regulation has come into force and be implemented gradually until 30 June 2017.</p> <p>Two different types of activities in LFV are affected by the ADQ. These are the Aeronautical Information Services (AIS Aeronautical Information Service) as well as the activities that create information (eg, procedure design and infrastructure support). An ADQ-adaptation involves a change of the business and its systems support.</p>			
Accountable entity	ANSP			

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Replacement</i>	System upgrades and replacements.
Replacement investment	NO	
Common project	YES	The ADQ implementation for the reporting period will include not only LSSIP/ESSIP investments but also one of the AFs stemming from the PCP (AF 4 ATM Functionalities).
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	NO	Level 3 of the ATM Master Plan, ITY-ADQ and EC regulation 73/2010
Joint investment	<i>No</i>	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	NO	
Consultation with stakeholders	YES	Investments are discussed during yearly charging consultations hosted by the NSA.
Decision-making process	NO	Regulation

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	YES	Improved consistency , reliability and integrity	Gradual up to June 30th 2017	Enroute

Environment	NO			
Capacity	NO			
Cost efficiency	YES	Avoidance of repair, correction and re-work activities at data provider and data user level.	Gradual up to June 30th 2017	Enroute

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>COOPANS Upgrade</i>	862	27	35	35	35	35	SW 12 years	100% En-Route	Yearly updates as pre planned releases
<i>Contingency</i>	100	5	25	25	25	20	HW only 8 years	100% En-Route	From 2020+
<i>SUPS</i>	75	16	2	2			15 years	100% En-Route	Gradually fom 2014-10-01
<i>PSR/SSR Mode S TMA SA</i>	40		3				15 years	100% En-Route	01-03-2015
<i>RTC</i>	130	47	32					75% Enroute, 25% Airport	First site in OPS 2015
<i>VHF</i>	50	3	4	4				100% En-Route	Gradually from 2013 and onwards
<i>ADQ</i>	22	12						100% En-Route	01-07-2017
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	1.278	110	101	66	60	55			
Sub-total other Capex (2)		10	19	54	60	65			
Total capex (1) + (2)	1.278	120	120	120	120	120			

Additional comments

NAVIAR

Number of capex	3
-----------------	---

Name of capex 1	ATM
-----------------	-----

Description	The ATM area consists of investments to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, replacements of End of Life (EoL) equipment and reduction of costs related to system development. COOPANS is the main investment in the ATM area. The objective of COOPANS alliance is to establish a single FDP system that would be deployed by the COOPANS partners (currently IAA, LFV, NAVIAIR, CCL and Austro Control). Build 1 was deployed into operation in Denmark in 2012. The overarching aim of the COOPANS cooperation is to achieve financial savings and reduced investment risks for every ANSP by harmonising, standardising and consolidating activities related to development, safety, training, integration and maintenance among others.
Accountable entity	Naviar (ANSP)

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	COOPANS consist of upgrades which are deployed once or twice a year.
Replacement investment	<i>Click to select</i>	SES IRs: (EC) No 29/2009 - Data link services (EC) No 262/2009 - Coordinated allocation and use of Mode S interrogator codes
Common project	<i>Yes</i>	Naviar's ATM investments over the RP2 period amounts to approximately M DKK 221
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>Click to select</i>	
Joint investment	<i>Click to select</i>	ESSIP objectives: ITY-AGDL - Initial ATC air-ground data link services above FL285
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Yes</i>	If Naviar was not partner of the COOPANS alliance our system development costs would be approximately more than 30 per cent higher.
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>No</i>	
Decision-making process	<i>No</i>	Part of a previously agreed ongoing development programme.

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Click to select</i>	The enhanced functionalities deployed by COOPANS are expected to have a positive effect on safety.	Continuous	En-route and Terminal
Environment	<i>Click to select</i>	COOPANS implements functionality which supports operational environment friendly initiatives.	Continuous	En-route and Terminal
Capacity	<i>Click to select</i>	The enhanced functionalities deployed by COOPANS are expected to provide potential improvements to capacity.	Continuous	En-route and Terminal
Cost efficiency	<i>Click to select</i>	If Naviar was not partner of the COOPANS alliance our system development costs would be approximately more than 30 per cent higher.	Continuous	En-route and Terminal

Name of capex 2	CNS
-----------------	-----

Description	The Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) programme and related projects primarily represent the investments on the CNS area. The VoIP programme will update relevant existing communication equipment to support VoIP while at the same time making the modifications necessary to ensure timely compliance with regulatory requirements and ESSIP objectives on voice channels spacing and VoIP respectively.
Accountable entity	Naviar (ANSP)

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	The VoIP programme consists of a number of projects where most of them are overhaul and replacements of current systems to support VoIP.
Replacement investment	<i>Click to select</i>	SES IRs: (EU) No 1079/2012 - Voice channels spacing
Common project	Yes	Naviar's CNS investments over the RP2 period amounts to approximately M DKK 67.
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	No	
Joint investment	<i>Click to select</i>	ESSIP objectives: COM11 - Implementation of Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) in ATM
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Click to select</i>	
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Click to select</i>	
Decision-making process	<i>Click to select</i>	

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Click to select</i>			
Environment	<i>Click to select</i>			
Capacity	<i>Click to select</i>	Compliance with (EU) No 1079/2012 on Voice channels spacing will provide for increased capacity with regards to number of channels available on the	12/2018	En-route and Terminal
Cost efficiency	<i>Click to select</i>			

Name of capex 3	Other
Description	This area contains investments related to buildings, building systems and administrative IT upgrades. The investments will provide for an up to date infrastructure and a reduction in CO2 and energy costs. The latter will primarily be accomplished by the establishment of groundwater cooling which will be established in the period up to 2017.
Accountable entity	Naviar (ANSP)

Justification of the cost, nature and contribution		
Differentiation	<i>Overhaul of existing system</i>	A number of projects are replacements where as others are new such as groundwater cooling.
Replacement investment	<i>Click to select</i>	
Common project	<i>No</i>	Other Naviair investments over the RP2 period amounts to approximately M DKK 88.
Other investment (in line with interoperability Regulations, the IDP, Master Plan essentials or the NSP)	<i>Click to select</i>	
Joint investment	<i>Click to select</i>	
Synergies achieved at FAB level or other MS	<i>Click to select</i>	
Consultation with stakeholders	<i>Click to select</i>	
Decision-making process	<i>Click to select</i>	Necessary replacement of our current cooling system which is due to be upgraded on account of both its age and official requirements.

KPA	Impact	Expected benefits per KPA	Date of expected benefits	Area <En-route/ Terminal/ Airport/ Phases
Safety	<i>Click to select</i>			
Environment	<i>Yes</i>	A preliminary investigation on groundwater cooling has shown that we will be able to reduce the CO2 produced by our heat and electricity	Continuous	All
Capacity	<i>Click to select</i>			
Cost efficiency	<i>Yes</i>	A preliminary investigation on groundwater cooling has shown that we will be able to cut our energy costs by DKK 1-1.5 million annually.	Continuous	All

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>ATM</i>	221	36	36	49	50	50	10 - 20 years HW: 6 years	91/9	Continuous
<i>CNS</i>	67	11	13	17	13	13	10 - 15 years	87/13	Continuous
<i>Other</i>	88	23	19	16	15	15	10 - 15 years	87/13	Continuous
Sub-total of main capex above (1)	376	70	68	82	78	78			
Sub-total other Capex (2)									
Total capex (1) + (2)	376	70	68	82	78	78			

Additional comments

Note regarding Lifecycle: Each category consist of different projects with different lifecycles. For the each category the range of the portfolio of investments is provided. For further explanation, see "Accounting policies" in Naviair audited annual report

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

FAB level	Regulatory authorities	B	C	C	C	C
	Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets	NSA targets consistend with Union-wide targets.				
	Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	-				
	ANSPs (for Safety Culture MO)	C	C	C	C	C
	ANSPs (for all other Mos)	C	C	C	C	D
	Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets	ANSP targets consistend with Union-wide targets				
	Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	-				

Select Number of States >>	2
----------------------------	---

National level	<i>Denmark</i>	B	C	C	C	C
	<i>Sweden</i>	B	C	C	C	C

Select Number of ANSPs for Safety Culture MO >>	4
---	---

National level	<i>ACR</i>	C	C	C	C	C
	<i>ESNX</i>	C	C	C	C	C
	<i>LFV</i>	C	C	C	C	C
	<i>NAVIAIR</i>	C	C	C	C	C

Select Number of ANSPs for all other MOs >>	4
---	---

National level	<i>ACR</i>	C	C	C	C	D
	<i>ESNX</i>	C	C	C	C	D
	<i>LFV</i>	C	C	C	C	D
	<i>NAVIAIR</i>	C	C	C	C	D

Additional comments						
Naviar already comply with the EU wide target level D for the effectiveness of the SMS and has taken the necessary initiatives to reach the highest score E in 2017.						

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	SIMs	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
	RIs	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
	ATM-S	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
FAB level	SIMs			80,00%	80,00%	100,00%
	RIs			80,00%	80,00%	100,00%
	ATM-S			80,00%	80,00%	100,00%
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		FAB targets consistent with Union-wide targets				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency		-				

Select Number of ANSPs >> 2

National level	LFV	SIMs	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%
	NAVIAIR	SIMs	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

Naviair and LFV already comply with the 100% union wide target for year 2019 for all the categories.
 ACR and ESNX are not included in the National level with refer to commission regulation (EU) No 1216/2011 as Sweden has decided not to apply the method at airports with less than 70 000 IFR air transport movements per year.

Overall Score		2015 Target	2016 Target	2017 Target	2018 Target	2019 Target
Union-wide targets	SIMs	-	-	>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%
	RIs	-	-	>= 80%	>= 80%	>= 80%
	ATM-S	-	-	>= 80%	-	100%
FAB level	SIMs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
	RIs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
	ATM-S	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
Description of the consistency between local and Union-wide targets		FAB targets consistent with Union-wide targets.				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency		-				

Select Number of States >> 2

National level	Denmark	SIMs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
		RIs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
		ATM-S	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
	Sweden	SIMs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
		RIs	-	-	80,00%	80,00%	80,00%
		ATM-S	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%

Additional comments

Concerning ATM-S occurrences, only occurrences which have a potential to impact the safety are RAT-classified.

3.1.(a).(iii) - Safety KPI #3: Just Culture

		2019 Target
FAB level	Regulatory authorities	Have you established a common FAB approach in certain areas for Just Culture improvements?
		NO
	If YES, please specify details and level of presence. If NO, please specify any impediments, intent for common FAB approach.	
	-	
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.	
	Within the FAB the ANS providers Naviair and LFV has implemented a harmonized Safety Management System (SMS). As part of the SMS the providers have also harmonized a written common Safety Culture and Just Culture.	

Number of States	2
------------------	---

National level	Denmark	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>The just culture concept is considered as an essential part of safety management and just culture is applied throughout the industry. The culture is part of the safety policy laid down in the state safety program. The culture is supported by the requirement for mandatory non punitive reporting of safety occurrences by certified organizations and individuals in order to ensure that events and minor malfunctions, that may affect flight safety, is reported in full. Such reports are analyzed and the results forms part of safety oversight preparation and is also used in the overall analysis of safety performance, thus contributing to the improvement of aviation safety. The state safety program and plan will provide for education, awareness and dialogue about safety risks and relevant information to support the development of a positive organizational culture that fosters safe practices, encourages safety communications and actively manages safety.</i></p>
	Sweden	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>There is no explicit just Culture policy endorsed by the state but there is a state safety program including safety Culture. Just Culture is a part of safety Culture and there is a high level of willingness to report all kinds of safety related matters. Just Culture is a natural way to handle safety issues in the aviation sector.</i></p>

Number of ANSPs	4
-----------------	---

National level	ACR	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>A revised Safety Policy has been adopted to strengthen the safety culture.</i></p>
	ESNX	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>Just Culture is implemented and included in the operational handbook. An audit of the safety manangement system has been performed and findings has been taken care of. A digital reporting system has been put in place to allow anonymous reporting.</i></p>
	LFV	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>Just Culture-related issues within the organisation are continuously monitored and appropriate actions are taken in order to continuously improve Safety Culture in general and Just Culture in specific. The Safety Policy is endorsed by the management and made public.</i></p>
	NAVIAIR	<p>What actions have you undertaken to optimise Just Culture?</p> <p><i>Naviair has formulated and implemented Safety and Just Culture procedures that is periodically audited to ensure that it is followed by all the relevant personnel. The procedure is further more monitored annually to ensure that the procedure is improved when necessary.</i></p>

Additional comments

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	1,20%	1,20%	1,20%	1,20%	1,19%
-----------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

FAB level	1,20%	1,20%	1,20%	1,20%	1,19%
------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Description of the consistency between FAB targets and FAB reference values	FAB targets consistent with EU-wide targets.				
---	--	--	--	--	--

Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	-				
---	---	--	--	--	--

ANSP contribution to local targets	<p>Both the Danish and Swedish ANSPs have already done a lot to improve the environmental performance and shorten the flight routes in the Danish-Swedish FAB.</p> <p>During Reference period 2 there will be a continuous review of the route network in order to further improve it. According to the European ATS Route Network (ARN) Version 7, the Danish-Swedish FAB will focus on ensuring network consistency in the interface with other FAB:s. This will be done through the deployment of a number of interface projects that will ensure an overall network consistency.</p> <p>The continuous review of the network together with the work that has already been done to shorten the flight routes in the Danish-Swedish FAB could be seen as making the Danish and Swedish contribution to the EU wide target already fulfilled. It can also be seen as a major step towards achieving the FAB target of a horizontal en route efficiency of 1,19 % by 2019.</p> <p>The 2012 DK-SE FAB-achievement for actual average horizontal en route efficiency of the actual trajectory is reported as 1.20 % being the most efficient Union-wide. Implementing Free Route Airspace in DK-SE FAB and tactical optimisation of flights has resulted in very low average route extensions. However limited route extensions will exist onwards due to reserved airspace activities (e.g. military).</p>				
------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

Description of the process to improve route design

Since November 2011 Free Route Airspace (FRA) is fully implemented within the Danish-Swedish FAB. FRA includes the airspace in the Danish-Swedish FAB above FL285. The principle of FRA is that the airlines can plan the flight routes, and subsequently enable the aircraft to fly from entry point to exit point in the airspace regardless of the existing route structure. Above all, the purpose is to make it possible for the airlines to plan the shortest possible route through the airspace thus reducing the required amount of aircraft fuel. This will lead to reduced CO2 emissions as well as cost savings for the airlines due to less fuel consumption.

As FRA is fully implemented in the Danish-Swedish FAB, there is a great potential for big reductions of CO2 emissions within the FAB.

During Reference Period 2 the overall aim when it comes to FRA is to provide a framework for the implementation of seamless FRA in DK/SE FAB and NEFAB, enabling airspace users to flight plan trajectories regardless of the FIR/AoR boundaries. The seamless FRA, called NEFRA (North European Free Route Airspace), will be a strong contributor to the improvement of the overall European network performance. There is a political decision that NEFRA is to be implemented by 2015.

Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA) is also a reason why the flight routes in the Danish-Swedish FAB are almost as direct as possible, and no further major distance savings can be expected. Sweden is a role model for the most advanced FUA concept called "Advanced Flexible Use of Airspace".

The use of Advanced FUA in Sweden can be seen as the foundation for the successful implementation of FRA in the Danish-Swedish FAB and Sweden has since 1978 fully integrated a civilmilitary airspace solution. The on-going "harmonization" of the FUA concept thru out Europe can be seen as an impediment to achieve the target of a horizontal en route efficiency of 1,19 % by 2019 as it means a huge setback for Sweden in terms of flying direct routes through military activated PCAs (Prior Coordination Areas with defined priority routes) and thereby having the opportunity to make significant environmental benefits.

Additional comments

To reach the target of a horizontal en route efficiency of 1, 19 % by 2019 is challenging for the ANSP:s as FRA already is fully implemented in the Danish-Swedish FAB. Sweden also has an advanced flexible use of airspace. This, along with that LFV has optimized the en route network in Sweden, makes it difficult to optimize the system further as there is only room for very small additional improvements.

To reach the FAB target it's crucial that the airlines use the opportunity to fly the most direct route through the DK/SE FAB, which is not always the case. Instead the pilots plan trajectories due to beneficial winds and they also choose to fly through airspace where the unit rate is the lowest. From an environmental point of view it doesn't have to be negative to fly on most beneficial winds as it can save a lot of fuel and thereby also a lot of CO2 emissions. This can contribute to making it difficult to achieve the FAB-target in 2019 as the KPA only takes the actual distance flown in account and not the percentage of consumed fuel. This leads to longer flight routes and a difficulty to reach the target. The ANSP:s can't affect the situation as it is up to the pilots to set the trajectories, the ANSP:s in DK/SE FAB can only offer FRA and hope for the pilots to take the opportunity to use it.

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	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,09
FAB level	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,09	0,09
Description of the consistency between FAB targets and FAB reference values	FAB targets consistent with EU-wide targets.				
Detailed justification in case of inconsistency	-				

Select Number of ANSPs >>	2
---------------------------	---

National level	LFV					
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	Targets are only set at FAB-level.				
	NAVIAIR					
	ANSP contribution to FAB targets	Targets are only set at FAB-level.				

Additional comments																																		
<p>The target level leaves room for minor technical disruptions resulting in ATFM measures. With the high stability in Naviair's and LFV's ATM-systems it is considered to be achievable to meet the target.</p> <p>The NSAs only want FAB targets for en-route capacity. However reference values (not targets) at ACC level could be provided:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2019</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Naviair</td> <td>København</td> <td>0,08</td> <td>0,08</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LFV</td> <td>Stockholm</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,06</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LFV</td> <td>Malmö</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,07</td> <td>0,06</td> <td>0,06</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>									2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Naviair	København	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,07	0,06	LFV	Stockholm	0,07	0,06	0,07	0,07	0,07	LFV	Malmö	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019																												
Naviair	København	0,08	0,08	0,07	0,07	0,06																												
LFV	Stockholm	0,07	0,06	0,07	0,07	0,07																												
LFV	Malmö	0,07	0,07	0,07	0,06	0,06																												
Source: European Network Operations Plan 2014-2018/19																																		

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

Number of States	2
------------------	---

Denmark	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,11	0,11
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance					

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

Airport level	EKCH (KOBENHAVN / KASTRUP)	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
	Airport contribution to national targets					

Additional comments
<p>The target level leaves room for minor technical disruptions resulting in ATFM measures. With the high stability in Navair's ATM-system it is considered to be achievable to meet the target.</p> <p>The Danish and Swedish NSA found it incorrect to setup an incentive scheme for airport capacity for two main reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Navair and LFV are performing at almost zero delay in Copenhagen and Stockholm if you take away weather as parameter. 2. We have very little data in this field which provides some uncertainty on the right levels. <p>In order to stay in line with the aim of SES (decreasing cost and delays) it is important not to create something that increase financial uncertainty and which would not provide any advances for capacity.</p> <p>As already stated in the Performance Plan the NSAs will reconsider an incentive scheme in 2017.</p>

Sweden	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
National level	0,35	0,35	0,35	0,35	0,35
Contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance					

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

Airport level	ESSA (STOCKHOLM-ARLANDA)	2015 Value	2016 Value	2017 Value	2018 Value	2019 Target
	Airport contribution to national targets					

Additional comments
<p>Since there is limited statistical material it is difficult to set up the right target for Airport Capacity. Pending environmental judgment which could negatively affect the capacity.</p> <p>The Danish and Swedish NSA found it incorrect to setup an incentive scheme for airport capacity for two main reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Navair and LFV are performing at almost zero delay in Copenhagen and Stockholm if you take away weather as parameter. 2. We have very little data in this field which provides some uncertainty on the right levels. <p>In order to stay in line with the aim of SES (decreasing cost and delays) it is important not to create something that increase financial uncertainty and which would not provide any advances for capacity.</p> <p>As already stated in the Performance Plan the NSAs will reconsider an incentive scheme in 2017.</p>

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:	3.1.(d).1.B 3.1.(d).2.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,			AI 4 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)	

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;

3.1.(d) - Cost Efficiency

List of En Route Charging Zones

Number of en route charging zones	2
-----------------------------------	---

- 1 *Denmark*
- 2 *Sweden*

List of Terminal Charging Zones

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

- 1 *Denmark Copenhagen*
- 2 *Sweden Arlanda*

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

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

in DKK

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average pct variation p.a.				
		2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 D	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2014 D	2009A-2019D	2014F-2019D	2011A-2019D	2014D-2019D	
Denmark																		
Local currency (Nominal and 2012)	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	753.447.826	726.861.455	710.162.626	714.334.705	716.407.426	710.518.134	726.872.134	724.495.393	735.983.926	749.032.040	750.157.741	798.077.234	0,0%	1,1%	0,7%	-1,2%	
	Inflation %		2,20%	2,70%	2,40%	0,50%	1,50%	1,80%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%						
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	93,04	95,09	97,66	100,00	100,50	102,01	103,84	106,13	108,46	110,85	113,29	102,0	2,0%	2,1%	1,9%	2,1%	
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	809.793.861	764.402.396	727.206.529	714.334.705	712.843.210	696.535.190	699.967.922	682.660.620	678.557.501	675.721.637	662.169.435	779.199.679	-2,0%	-1,0%	-1,2%	-3,2%	
	Total en route Service Units (TSU) (FEB 14 LOW)	1.358.804	1.410.791	1.470.012	1.428.735	1.524.000	1.539.000	1.553.000	1.571.000	1.589.000	1.608.000	1.628.000	1.605.336	1,8%	1,1%	1,3%	0,3%	
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	595,96	541,83	494,69	499,98	467,74	452,59	450,72	434,54	427,03	420,22	406,74	485,38	-3,7%	-2,1%	-2,4%	-3,5%	
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164					
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	108.819.274	102.719.615	97.721.272	95.991.570	95.791.144	93.599.689	94.060.976	91.735.238	91.183.866	90.802.785	88.981.654	104.708.059	-2,0%	-1,0%	-1,2%	-3,2%	
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		-5,6%	-4,9%	-1,8%	-0,2%	-2,3%	0,5%	-2,5%	-0,6%	-0,4%	-2,0%						
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	80,08	72,81	66,48	67,19	62,86	60,82	60,57	58,39	57,38	56,47	54,66	65,23	-3,7%	-2,1%	-2,4%	-3,5%	
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-9,1%	-8,7%	1,1%	-6,4%	-3,2%	-0,4%	-3,6%	-1,7%	-1,6%	-3,2%						
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100,00	102,20	104,96	107,48	108,02	109,64	111,61	114,06	116,57	119,14	121,76	109,64					
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337					
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	101.224.019	95.550.098	90.900.624	89.291.650	89.105.213	87.066.715	87.495.806	85.332.397	84.819.509	84.465.026	82.771.005	97.796.185	-2,0%	-1,0%	-1,2%	-3,3%	
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		-5,6%	-4,9%	-1,8%	-0,2%	-2,3%	0,5%	-2,5%	-0,6%	-0,4%	-2,0%						
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	74,49	67,73	61,84	62,50	58,47	56,57	56,34	54,32	53,38	52,53	50,84	60,92	-3,7%	-2,1%	-2,4%	-3,6%	
Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-9,1%	-8,7%	1,1%	-6,4%	-3,2%	-0,4%	-3,6%	-1,7%	-1,6%	-3,2%							

Description of the consistency between local and Union wide targets	
---	--

B - Inflation assumptions

Denmark	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				2,40%	0,50%	1,50%	1,80%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100,00	100,50	102,01	103,84	106,13	108,46	110,85	113,29
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)				2,41%	0,80%	1,90%	1,80%	2,00%	2,00%	2,00%	2,00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF				100,00	100,80	102,72	104,56	106,66	108,79	110,96	113,18
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	-0,01	-0,01	-0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references											

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Denmark	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)				1.428.735	1.524.000	1.539.000	1.553.000	1.571.000	1.589.000	1.608.000	1.628.000
Year on Year variation TSU					6,7%	1,0%	0,9%	1,2%	1,1%	1,2%	1,2%
Baseline	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)			1.428.735	1.523.724	1.580.892	1.624.877	1.675.085	1.717.132	1.761.646	1.807.235
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR				6,6%	3,8%	2,8%	3,1%	2,5%	2,6%	2,6%
	Difference in percentage points				0,00	-0,03	-0,02	-0,02	-0,01	-0,01	-0,01
	Cumulative difference in percentage points				0,00	-0,03	-0,04	-0,06	-0,07	-0,09	-0,10
Low	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)			1.428.735	1.523.724	1.539.194	1.553.290	1.571.456	1.588.962	1.608.420	1.627.633
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR				6,6%	1,0%	0,9%	1,2%	1,1%	1,2%	1,2%
	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											

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Denmark	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

		Historical data (actual 2009-2013, latest 2014 forecast)						RP2 Performance Plan					RP1 PP	Average pct variation p.a.			
Sweden		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)	1.735.916.574	2.033.398.394	1.988.440.902	2.250.263.627	1.932.040.001	2.064.666.706	1.951.544.485	1.974.263.091	1.970.314.688	1.964.628.986	1.958.887.595	2.100.445.079	1,2%	-1,0%	-0,2%	-1,4%
	Inflation %		1,20%	1,40%	0,90%	0,40%	0,38%	1,63%	2,40%	2,10%	2,00%	2,00%					
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	96,58	97,74	99,11	100,00	100,4	100,78	102,42	104,88	107,08	109,23	111,41	108,41	1,4%	2,0%	1,5%	0,5%
	Total en route actual/forecast/determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	1.797.374.118	2.080.422.765	2.006.336.870	2.250.263.627	1.924.342.630	2.048.656.049	1.905.353.779	1.882.358.069	1.839.954.427	1.798.671.474	1.758.250.073	1.937.501.226	-0,2%	-3,0%	-1,6%	-1,9%
	Total en route Service Units (TSU)	2.906.484	2.950.000	3.184.522	3.126.197	3.208.684	3.208.000	3.257.000	3.303.000	3.341.000	3.383.000	3.425.000	3.393.000	1,7%	1,3%	0,9%	0,2%
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	618,40	705,23	630,03	719,81	599,73	638,61	585,00	569,89	550,72	531,68	513,36	571,02	-1,8%	-4,3%	-2,5%	-2,1%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	206.599.476	239.134.551	230.618.735	258.656.938	221.193.893	235.483.120	219.011.216	216.367.970	211.493.877	206.748.600	202.102.356	222.706.410	-0,2%	-3,0%	-1,6%	-1,9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		15,7%	-3,6%	12,2%	-14,5%	6,5%	-7,0%	-1,2%	-2,3%	-2,2%	-2,2%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	71,08	81,06	72,42	82,74	68,94	73,40	67,24	65,51	63,30	61,11	59,01	65,64	-1,8%	-4,3%	-2,5%	-2,1%
	Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		14,0%	-10,7%	14,3%	-16,7%	6,5%	-8,4%	-2,6%	-3,4%	-3,5%	-3,4%					
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	100,00	101,20	102,62	103,54	103,95	104,35	106,05	108,60	110,88	113,09	115,36	112,25				
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102				
	Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	163.608.280	189.373.146	182.629.382	204.833.128	175.165.752	186.481.540	173.437.267	171.344.053	167.484.207	163.726.374	160.046.964	176.362.244	-0,2%	-3,0%	-1,6%	-1,9%
	Trend in total en route costs in real terms %n/n-1		15,7%	-3,6%	12,2%	-14,5%	6,5%	-7,0%	-1,2%	-2,3%	-2,2%	-2,2%					
	Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	56,29	64,19	57,35	65,52	54,59	58,13	53,25	51,88	50,13	48,40	46,73	51,98	-1,8%	-4,3%	-2,5%	-2,1%
Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		14,0%	-10,7%	14,3%	-16,7%	6,5%	-8,4%	-2,6%	-3,4%	-3,5%	-3,4%						
Description of the consistency between local and Union wide targets	<p>Sweden has used a top-down approach to ensure that each party in Sweden contributes towards the objective for cost-efficiency appropriately.</p> <p>In the presented performance plan the determined cost is reduced by an average of -2,1 per cent per year for the accountable Swedish entities during the second reference period which is consistent with the Union-wide cost-efficiency target. However, the total Swedish cost base contributes with -1,9 % to the cost-efficiency target due to the fact that the Swedish membership contribution to Eurocontrol is increasing during RP 2. Sweden does not consider that it is reasonable that accountable Swedish entities should compensate for an increased membership contribution to Eurocontrol.</p> <p>The determined unit cost is reduced by an average of -3,4 per cent during the second reference period based on the adopted STATFOR traffic forecast from March 2014, increased membership contribution excluded. However, If the increasing Eurocontrol membership contribution is included the determined unit rate is reduced by an average of -3,2 %.</p>																

B - Inflation assumptions

Sweden	2009 A	2010 A	2011 A	2012 A	2013 A	2014 F	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %				0,90%	0,40%	0,38%	1,63%	2,40%	2,10%	2,00%	2,00%
Inflation index (2012=100)				100,00	100,40	100,78	102,42	104,88	107,08	109,23	111,41
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					0,00	0,00	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02	0,02
Cumulative difference in percentage points					0,00	0,01	0,02	0,05	0,07	0,09	0,11
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references				N/A							

C - Service Units forecast for en route

Sweden	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)				3.126.197	3.208.684	3.208.000	3.257.000	3.303.000	3.341.000	3.383.000	3.425.000
Year on Year variation TSU					2,6%	0,0%	1,5%	1,4%	1,2%	1,3%	1,2%
Baseline	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Baseline scenario)			3.126.197	3.208.684	3.260.246	3.357.183	3.472.282	3.565.224	3.660.943	3.762.979
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR				2,6%	1,6%	3,0%	3,4%	2,7%	2,7%	2,8%
	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	-0,06	-0,08	-0,09
Low	STATFOR en route service units forecast (Low scenario)			3.126.197	3.208.684	3.207.876	3.257.135	3.302.634	3.341.452	3.382.635	3.425.402
	Year on Year variation TSU STATFOR				2,6%	0,0%	1,5%	1,4%	1,2%	1,2%	1,3%
	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
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source				N/A							

D - Alert thresholds (en route service units)

Sweden	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				N/A							

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).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
Total en route Service Units (TSU)	4.265.288	4.360.791	4.654.534	4.554.932	4.732.684	4.747.000	4.810.000	4.874.000	4.930.000	4.991.000	5.053.000	4.998.336	1,7%	1,3%	1,0%	0,2%
Trend in Total en route Service Units (TSU)%n/n-1		2,24%	6,74%	-2,14%	3,90%	0,30%	1,33%	1,33%	1,15%	1,24%	1,24%					
Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	315.418.749	341.854.166	328.340.007	354.648.507	316.985.037	329.082.809	313.072.192	308.103.209	302.677.742	297.551.385	291.084.009	327.414.469	-0,8%	-2,4%	-1,5%	-2,3%
Trend in total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		8,38%	-3,95%	8,01%	-10,62%	3,82%	-4,87%	-1,59%	-1,76%	-1,69%	-2,17%					
Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	73,95	78,39	70,54	77,86	66,98	69,32	65,09	63,21	61,40	59,62	57,61	65,50	-2,5%	-3,6%	-2,5%	-2,5%
Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)%n/n-1		6,01%	-10,01%	10,37%	-13,98%	3,50%	-6,11%	-2,88%	-2,88%	-2,90%	-3,37%					
Total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	264.832.299	284.923.243	273.530.006	294.124.777	264.270.965	273.548.255	260.933.073	256.676.450	252.303.716	248.191.400	242.817.968	274.158.430	-0,9%	-2,4%	-1,5%	-2,4%
Trend in total en route costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		7,59%	-4,00%	7,53%	-10,15%	3,51%	-4,61%	-1,63%	-1,70%	-1,63%	-2,17%					
Real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	62,09	65,34	58,77	64,57	55,84	57,63	54,25	52,66	51,18	49,73	48,05	54,85	-2,5%	-3,6%	-2,5%	-2,6%
Trend in real en route UCs/DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)%n/n-1		5,23%	-10,06%	9,88%	-13,52%	3,20%	-5,86%	-2,92%	-2,82%	-2,83%	-3,37%					

Description of benefits and synergies achieved at functional airspace block level

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

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

		RP2 Performance Plan					Avg pct var p.a.
Denmark Copenhagen		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	180.631.201	176.790.835	179.242.261	183.226.026	186.756.637	0,8%
	Inflation %	1,80%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	103,84	106,13	108,46	110,85	113,29	2,2%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	173.945.376	166.582.344	165.256.572	165.293.050	164.851.377	-1,3%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	150.479	151.768	153.069	154.381	155.704	0,9%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	1.155,95	1.097,61	1.079,62	1.070,68	1.058,75	-2,2%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	7,44164	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	23.374.602	22.385.166	22.207.010	22.211.912	22.152.560	-1,3%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-4,2%	-0,8%	0,0%	-0,3%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	155,33	147,50	145,08	143,88	142,27	-2,2%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-5,0%	-1,6%	-0,8%	-1,1%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	112,57	114,82	117,11	119,46	121,85	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	7,44337	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	21.558.349	20.686.276	20.561.879	20.606.744	20.591.979	-1,1%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-4,0%	-0,6%	0,2%	-0,1%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	143,27	136,30	134,33	133,48	132,25	-2,0%
Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-4,9%	-1,4%	-0,6%	-0,9%		

Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network	Since 2011 Denmark has achieved a stable level of costs in nominal terms for TNC which have resulted in at least a flat evolution in the TNC-Copenhagen Unit Rate in nominal terms. For RP2 the target for the Danish TNC Determined Unit Cost (DUC) is to continue this evolution or even achieve a decrease of the DUC in nominal terms.
--	--

B - Inflation assumptions

Denmark Copenhagen	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	1,80%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%
Inflation index (2012=100)	103,8	106,1	108,5	110,8	113,3
Eurostat HICP (actuals) and IMF CPI (forecasts)	1,80%	2,00%	2,00%	2,00%	2,00%
Inflation index (2012=100) HICP and IMF	103,84	105,92	108,04	110,20	112,40
Difference in percentage points		0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
Cumulative difference in percentage points		0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references					

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Denmark Copenhagen	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	150.479	151.768	153.069	154.381	155.704
Year on Year variation TNSU		0,9%	0,9%	0,9%	0,9%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	154.072	156.663	158.844	162.193	165.795
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		1,7%	1,4%	2,1%	2,2%
Difference in percentage		-0,01	-0,01	-0,01	-0,01
Cumulative difference in percentage		-0,03	-0,04	-0,05	-0,06
Explanation of the differences (if any), justification, rationale and source					

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Denmark Copenhagen	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

		RP2 Performance Plan					in SEK
Sweden Arlanda		2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D	Avg pct var p.a. 2015D-2019D
Local currency (Nominal and 2012)	Total terminal determined costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	169.678.803	170.109.786	172.098.429	175.956.588	178.967.182	1,3%
	Inflation %	1,63%	2,40%	2,10%	2,00%	2,00%	
	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2012)	102,4	104,9	107,1	109,2	111,4	2,1%
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in national currency at 2012 prices)	165.662.710	162.190.911	160.712.026	161.093.061	160.636.609	-0,8%
	Total terminal Service Units (TSU) used for the determined unit cost	136.600	141.700	146.100	150.000	153.500	3,0%
	Real terminal DUCs (in national currency at 2012 prices)	1.212,76	1.144,61	1.100,01	1.073,95	1.046,49	-3,6%
€2012 prices	2012 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	8,6998	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	19.042.129	18.643.062	18.473.071	18.516.869	18.464.403	-0,8%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-2,1%	-0,9%	0,2%	-0,3%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices)	139,40	131,57	126,44	123,45	120,29	-3,6%
	Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₁₂ prices) %n/n-1		-5,6%	-3,9%	-2,4%	-2,6%	
€2009 prices	Inflation index (Base = 100 in 2009)	106,05	108,60	110,88	113,09	115,36	
	2009 average exchange rate (1EUR=)	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	10,6102	
	Total terminal determined costs in real terms (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	15.079.660	14.763.635	14.629.018	14.663.702	14.622.153	-0,8%
	Trend in total terminal determined costs in real terms %n/n-1		-2,1%	-0,9%	0,2%	-0,3%	
	Real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices)	110,39	104,19	100,13	97,76	95,26	-3,6%
Trend in real terminal DUCs (in € ₂₀₀₉ prices) %n/n-1		-5,6%	-3,9%	-2,4%	-2,6%		
Description and justification of how the local targets contribute to the performance of the European ATM network		No European cost efficiency target has been determined so far. The STA has determined a minimum cost efficiency to not allow an increase in the costs in nominal terms during the reference period. The Swedish providers has delivered terminal cost data that meet and surpasses these targets. The STA has approved of the delivered cost data.					

B - Inflation assumptions

Sweden Arlanda	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Inflation %	1,63%	2,40%	2,10%	2,00%	2,00%
Inflation index (2012=100)	102,4	104,9	107,1	109,2	111,4
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		0,05	0,07	0,09	0,11
Justification and data source in case of deviation from inflation references	N/A				

C - Service Units forecast for terminal

Sweden Arlanda	2015 D	2016 D	2017 D	2018 D	2019 D
Total terminal service units (TNSU)	136.600	141.700	146.100	150.000	153.500
Year on Year variation TNSU		3,7%	3,1%	2,7%	2,3%
STATFOR terminal service units forecast (Baseline scenario)	136.554	141.735	146.088	150.028	153.516
Year on Year variation TNSU STATFOR		3,8%	3,1%	2,7%	2,3%
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	N/A				

D - Alert thresholds (terminal service units)

Sweden Arlanda	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	N/A				

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

There are clear interdependencies between the 4 KPAs covered by performance plans. Safety is clearly an element which must not be compromised while the other three elements bearing on flight efficiency, delay and cost efficiency are factors which can be weighed up from the perspective of users based on largely

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	1
<i>Incentive for Environment KPI 1 (KEA)</i>	
	<i>Naviair and LFV</i>
KPI description	KEA
Type of incentive	<p>Non-financial incentive attached to horizontal flight efficiency to adress underperformance in relation to the adopted FAB targets.</p> <p>The environmental reference values will be monitored once a year 2015-2018 and the adopted FAB target once in 2019. If the reference values or the target value will exceed the set levels the NSA in Sweden and Denmark will require an actionplan from the ANSP in question that must include what the ANSP will do to improve the performance and when, and also who is responsible for the action.</p>
Formula	-
Justification	<p>Given the fact that FRA is fully implemented in the Danish-Swedish FAB as well as Advanced Flexible Use of Airspace it is difficult to optimize the system even further. There is only room for very small additional improvements and the target at 1.19% by 2019 will be difficult to meet. The FAB is often seen as a role model for Advanced Flexible Use of Airspace.</p> <p>It should also be noted that to reach the target it is crucial that the airlines use the opportunity to fly the most direct route through DK/SE FAB.</p> <p>Still it is important to address underperformance in relation to the adopted FAB-target which is why a non-financial incentive has been included.</p>
Description of performance variation levels and the applicable level of bonuses and penalties	-
Additional comments	-

4.1 - Incentive schemes for the capacity targets

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

<i><Insert Incentive Scheme #1></i>																																																															
Entity being incentivised	<i>Naviair and LfV</i>																																																														
KPI description	<i>ATFM delay for en-route</i>																																																														
Type of incentive	Financial																																																														
Formula	<i>The incentive scheme covers the ACCs in both charging zones in the Danish-Swedish FAB (Denmark and Sweden). The approach chosen is symmetric around the target and the maximum bonus or penalty is 0.50 pct. of the revenue. The area around the target is defined as dead band. Results within the limits of the dead band do not lead to any bonus or penalty.</i>																																																														
Justification	The NSAs in Denmark and Sweden have chosen this model because the performance on the Capacity is very close to being perfect – zero delay.																																																														
Description of performance variation levels and the applicable level of bonuses and penalties	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> <th>2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0,00</td> <td>0,50%</td> <td>0,50%</td> <td>0,50%</td> <td>0,50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,01</td> <td>0,25%</td> <td>0,25%</td> <td>0,25%</td> <td>0,25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,02</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,07</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Target</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Target</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Target</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Target</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,12</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Dead band</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,17</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,18</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,19</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> <td>-0,25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0,20</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> <td>-0,50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2015	2016	2017	2018	0,00	0,50%	0,50%	0,50%	0,50%	0,01	0,25%	0,25%	0,25%	0,25%	0,02	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	0,03	0,04	0,05	0,06	0,07	Target	Target	Target	Target	0,08	0,09	0,10	0,11	0,12	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	0,13	0,14	0,15	0,16	0,17	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	0,18	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%	0,19	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	0,20	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%
		2015	2016	2017	2018																																																										
	0,00	0,50%	0,50%	0,50%	0,50%																																																										
	0,01	0,25%	0,25%	0,25%	0,25%																																																										
	0,02	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band																																																										
	0,03																																																														
	0,04																																																														
	0,05																																																														
	0,06																																																														
	0,07	Target	Target	Target	Target																																																										
	0,08																																																														
	0,09																																																														
	0,10																																																														
	0,11																																																														
	0,12	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band	Dead band																																																										
	0,13																																																														
	0,14																																																														
	0,15																																																														
	0,16																																																														
	0,17	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%																																																										
0,18	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%																																																											
0,19	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%	-0,25%																																																											
0,20	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%	-0,50%																																																											
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 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

Civil-Military cooperation and Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA) at FAB level:

In both Denmark and Sweden there are fully integrated civil/military provision of Air Navigation Services and already established and functioning cooperation by the Air Navigation Service Providers with the military authorities of the two States – taking the national military requirements into consideration.

The FAB governance structure includes representatives of the military authorities besides representatives from the competent authorities, ANSPs and other stakeholders. Under the established FAB Board a Civil-Military Coordination Group is defined and Terms of Reference for the group is agreed upon between the Danish and Swedish authorities. The group also provides for the establishment of a joint civil-military airspace coordination body for resolving matters of common civil-military interest.

By provisions of the State-level Agreement the two CAA/NSAs (the appointed competent authorities) are mandated to "jointly design and manage the airspace in the FAB" and, "taking national military requirements into consideration", to "jointly ensure the implementation of ATFM". The Danish and Swedish Military are directly involved in any further development of the FAB based on the existing agreements and arrangements for civil-military cooperation and coordination in the two States.

The FUA Concept is already implemented in Danish and Swedish airspace based on Article 8 of the FUA Regulation and Danish and Swedish Military are directly involved in the EUROCONTROL processes for consolidated European airspace development via participation and contributions to the ARN Version 7 through the RND SG EUROCONTROL processes. Denmark and Sweden does not see a further need of shared military – military or civil – military airspace within the FAB.

Denmark:

In order to fulfill our obligations Denmark supports NDOP in the development of European Route Network Improvement Plan (ERNIP). Denmark operate the ATM-system in accordance with the deliverables stemming from NDOP and NET OPS.

Sweden:

There are no military air traffic controllers in Sweden. The service is fully integrated since 1978 and civil air traffic controllers also control the military traffic. Therefore, in the LSSIP no goals are set according to establish coordination procedures to permit direct communication of relevant information to resolve specific traffic situations where civil and military controllers are providing services in the same airspace.

Therefore Advanced FUA can be seen as already implemented in Sweden. Civil Use of Released airspace is always 100% possible since civil and military traffic share the same airspace in activated PCAs. Sweden has TRAs and PCAs (Prior Coordinated Areas with defined priority roles) but no TSAs. Several TMA's regularly lend sectors to military users, regulated in MoCs.

However, the civil parts cooperate with the military on all levels in accordance with the FUA concept as follows:

Level 1: Between the civil and military authorities concerning strategic airspace planning.

Meetings at level 1 are held twice a year with participation from Head of ATM, Air Force Department, Swedish Armed Forces HQ, Swedish Military Aviation Authority MAA (Swedish Military Aviation Safety Inspectorate) and Swedish Transport Agency (Civil Aviation Authority). The meetings are both decision and informative concerning subjects as for example new flight routes, planned exercises, new regulations, FAB's and CBA's. Currently an oversight of either increasing the TMAs or lowering controlled airspace is ongoing in order to meet the needs of modern aircraft fleet and actual and coming navigation structures to meet requirements that IFR flights shall be possible to perform in controlled airspace regarding CDA and CCD and APV procedures

Level 2: An AMC function is established, AMC Sweden, located at Malmoe ATCC (civil part) and MFC (military part).

AMC has from March 2014 tasks in addition from (EG) 2150/2005 FUA, Eurocontrol SPEC-0112; 10 January 2009, European Network Improvement Plan part 3 Airspace Management Guidelines – The ASM Handbook for the application of the concept of the Flexible Use of Airspace chapter 4 edition 5 and AMC/CADF Operational manual ed 5.1.

Among these are:

- Alerting Restricted or Danger Areas beyond office hours
- Coordinate Cross Border Operations in published CBA with affected AMC according LoA
- Interact and direct civil users of Restricted and Danger areas
- Frame LoAs with adjacent AMCs

Sweden has two annual meetings at Level 2, tactical meetings, where the Armed forces present their coming exercise planning and where LFV, as the En-route provider, presents planned changes in the production, sectorisation and infrastructure where the Armed forces can be affected. There is also an annual meeting at Director General level between LFV and the Armed forces where more strategic, long term, matters are discussed.

Level 3: Daily operations and cooperation in the airspace, performed directly between civil controllers and military fighter controllers using the same airspace blocks which allows the civil traffic, in most cases, to be coordinated through the military exercise areas.

Sweden does not see a further need of shared military – military or civil – military airspace within the FAB. CBA Finland is a shared Swedish – Finnish military – military airspace.

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

--

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 PER

6.1 - Sensitivity to external assumptions

The Danish-Swedish ANS system seems at present to have excess capacity. Thus it seems achievable to meet the capacity targets even though the traffic should increase a little more than forecasted for RP2. However increasing traffic, Free Route Airspace concept and changed traffic flows due to political or economical instability may impact the providers ability to provide enough capacity. Rapid increased demand for capacity or changes in the flow patterns might take one year to accomodate.

We see uncertainty regarding the cost-efficiency target in both Denmark and Sweden due to several factors. One factor is the currency, since neither Denmark nor Sweden is part of the Euro-zone. Because of the strong Danish and Swedish currencies, there is a risk for a downturn that could increase the costs. However the uncertainty is reduced for Denmark because Denmark has a stable exchange rate against the euro. Another important factor is inflation which applies to the all cost base elements. This could affect the accountable entities' ability to meet the cost efficiency targets.

6.2 - Comparison with previous performance plan

The main difference between RP1 and RP2 is the gate to gate approach - including targets at the airport level. The local safety target that was used only for the Danish-Swedish FAB in RP1 has been replaced by the new Union-wide safety targets.

SECTION 7: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE

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

The FAB Performance Charging Group, which reports to the Danish-Swedish FAB board will monitor the implementation of the Plan. The NSAs will monitor the performance of the accountable entities. This will include the use of the ANSP annual plans, reports and 5-year business plans. Where a KPI is not met, an action plan from the accountable entity will be required.

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
<i>The dataflows needed are already implemented.</i>

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

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. Additional material