

ETF views on the RP2 targets

François Ballestero, ETF Political Secretary

FABEC Performance Plan RP 2 Consultation Meeting

Brussels, 23th May 2014



Introduction

- EU-wide performance targets for the 2nd reference period (2015 – 2019) adopted by the SSC on 4 February 2014 with narrow majority
- Unrealistic targets mainly based on cost reductions
- EU wide protest : ETF action days on 12th June 2013 on 30th January 2014

General

- interdependencies between the 4 KPAs are ignored => risk to create unbalanced approach and unrealistic targets (cost vs. capacity, capacity vs. flight efficiency, safety)
- targets should not be based on "wishful thinking", but rather on consistent data, fact and figures
- Commission disregarded the negative social consequences when defining performance targets

Safety

- ETF agrees that safety should be a primary objective
- however, it seems to be the weakest KPA in the performance scheme
- just culture target only at national/FAB level
- safety has a cost, which is in contradiction to cost-cutting; if this will be neglected, the whole system will be dominated by economic interest
- high level goal of SES Commission declaration in 2050: "multiplication of safety by a factor of ten" – but how do we measure this "magic formula" in reality?!

Capacity

- ETF supports efforts to improve capacity to deal with future traffic growth
- however, the proposed targets for en route ATFM delay at FABEC level are very ambitious and will request investments in Human Resources and equipment
- Capacity targets will be bargained by direct cost cutting

Environment

- ETF supports efforts to limit environmental impact of ATM within FABEC
- the proposed targets for ENV are very ambitious and will request real cooperation between FABEC ANSPs to enable network optimization
- ENV targets have a real economic impact that must be assessed by users.

Cost-efficiency

- Cost-efficiency targets adopted at EU level for the ANSP costs of 2.5% yearly (11.89% in total over 5 years) and unit rate reduction of 4.49% yearly (22.41% in total over five years) are not realistic
- The adopted target of 10.08 % ANSP cost reduction and 15% unit rate reduction over 5 years is still too challenging
- Pressure on Cost-efficiency will endanger FABEC capacity to achieve targets on other performance areas
- Big pressure from the Commission and some stakeholders on unbundling of support services – ETF is against it

Conclusions

- ETF supports improvements on performance only if the targets are realistic
- Targets adopted at EU level were a political compromise
- Targets adopted at FABEC and national levels have to be compliant with the FABEC situation
- Permanent cost-efficiency is not possible because the traffic is not increasing as much as expected
- Social consequences of performance targets have to be correctly assessed at national and FABEC levels during the whole process (with a possible revision of the performance plans).



www.etf-europe.org