

**Performance Review Body**

designated by  
the European Commission



**Stakeholder comments on RP2 EU-Wide Targets – Indicative Performance Ranges**

*Informal consultation February 2013*

**Comment Register**

<b>Country</b>	
<b>Name of your organisation or company</b>	
<b>Last name</b>	
<b>First Name</b>	
<b>Job Title</b>	
<b>E-mail address</b>	

The purpose of this comment register is to gather Stakeholders comments and proposals on the target ranges for the KPIs proposed in the and not the propose changes / amendments to the KPIs themselves, for which other for a have been established.

Any proposed modification to the target ranges should be quantified, if possible, in order for the proposals to be understandable and unambiguous (e.g. it is not enough to state “lower” or “higher” but also the “how much” is needed).

Please fill in the comments in the area as you feel appropriate. If you have no comment you may leave the field blank. If you think the question is not relevant for you please select "N/A" in the combo box "Yes/No".

Once finished, please press the “Submit form” button at the top right of the page to send the form to Mr. Massimo Bernacconi ([Massimo.bernacconi@eurocontrol.int](mailto:Massimo.bernacconi@eurocontrol.int)) no later than Wednesday 20 February 2013

METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH	
<b>Q01: Do you support the scenario based approach introduced in this section and used throughout the document?</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
If not, please specify why and what are your proposals	
<b>Q02: Do you consider that PRB has taken into account of all the relevant tools and information you would expect being considered in the formulation of proposals for EU-wide targets?</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
If not, please specify those you would like to be included	

<p><b>Q03: Do you have evidence, facts or views in relation to the achievable level and speed of performance improvements?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
<p>If yes, please provide them.</p>	
<p><b>SAFETY</b></p>	
<p><b>GENERAL</b></p> <p><b>Q04: Do you agree with the overall approach to target setting for safety in RP2?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
<p>If not, please specify what in your opinion should be considered.</p>	

<p><b>EFFECTIVENESS OF SAFETY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p><b>Q05: Do you agree that the EoSM targets are sufficiently ambitious?</b></p> <p>If not, please specify what you consider being an adequate level.</p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q05	
<p><b>EFFECTIVENESS OF SAFETY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p><b>Q06: Do you agree with the PRB proposal of having target for EoSM at ANSP level in 2019 only (and not intermediate targets)?</b></p> <p>If not, please specify what you consider being an adequate intermediate target.</p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q06	

<b>APPLICATION OF RAT METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
<p><b>Q07: Do you agree that a high level of application of the RAT methodology must be achieved during RP2?</b></p> <p>If not, please specify how it should be modified.</p>	
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>	
<b>GENERAL</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
<p><b>Q08: Do you agree with the approach for this KPA?</b></p> <p>If not, please specify which additional evidence you would take into consideration.</p>	

<p><b>KEP: AVERAGE HORIZONTAL EN ROUTE FLIGHT EFFICIENCY (LAST FILED FLIGHT PLAN)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
<p><b>Q09: Do you agree with the RP2 target range?</b> If not, please specify how it should be modified.</p>	
<p><b>KEA: AVERAGE HORIZONTAL EN ROUTE FLIGHT EFFICIENCY (ACTUAL TRAJECTORY)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
<p><b>Q10: Do you agree with the RP2 target range?</b> If not, please specify how it should be modified.</p>	

CAPACITY	
<b>GENERAL</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
<b>Q11: Do you agree with the approach for this KPA?</b>	
If not, please specify how it should be modified.	
<b>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
<b>Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach for delays due to weather and network disruption?</b>	
If not, please specify how it should be modified.	

<b>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Yes/No</b>
<p><b>Q13: Is it reasonable to expect that ANSPs should be able to resolve all structural and staffing issues to provide the required capacity in RP2?</b></p> <p>If not, please state why.</p>		
<b>COST EFFICIENCY</b>		
<b>GENERAL</b>		<b>Yes/No</b>
<p><b>Q14: Do you agree with the approach developed to support the “Minimum” scenario for this KPA?</b></p> <p>If not, which additional evidence would you take into consideration?</p>		



<p><b>GENERAL</b></p> <p><b>Q15: Do you agree with the key assumptions (letters “A” to “D”) for this KPA?</b></p> <p>If not, which ones would you propose?</p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q15	
<p><b>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b></p> <p><b>Q16: Have uncertainties about the trends in traffic (Service Units) being sufficiently reflected in the ranges?</b></p> <p>If not, what are your proposals?</p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q16	

<p><b>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b></p> <p><b>Q17: Do you agree that ‘stretch’ effects on top of the “Minimum” scenario for RP2 (including technology shift and/or structural changes) should be included in the en route EU-wide DUC target?</b></p> <p>If not, please state why</p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q17	
<p><b>SPECIFIC QUESTIONS</b></p> <p><b>Q18: What would you need to implement (in terms of regulation, organization, airspace, procedures technology and human factors) to achieve the more ambitious “Accelerated Stretch – HLG 2025” scenario?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes/No</b></p>
Empty response area for Q18	

INDICATIVE RANGES FOR CONSULTATION	
<b>Q19: Do you agree with the indicative ranges for each KPI?</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>
If not, what suggestions do you have and evidence to support the changes?	