



| ICAO PARIS

UNITING AVIATION

Air Navigation Performance Framework Results from the 2024 data collection exercise

(reflecting State submissions up to 22. October 2024)

EASPG/07

Paris, France

November 2025





Contents

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Contextual data (Table A)
- Performance data (Table B)
- Participation KPA



Executive Summary





- The year 2024 serves as a milestone with the general increase in air traffic and associated demand reaching or about to reach pre-pandemic levels in many places within the EUR Region. While traffic recovery ranges and trends vary significantly locally, the associated performance indicators for 2024 need to be evaluated considering the overall recovery of air traffic. Despite the overall positive traffic development, the EUR Region also witnessed a high level of constraints due to geo-political developments that impacted a share of connections and traffic flows. It is also becoming prevalent that pre-pandemic service provision constraints are re-emerging with the increased traffic load.
- The EUR Region is characterised by a wide variety in the size of the airspace as well as of traffic density. The top 5 States included in the report cover 50% of the continental airspace. With about half of the reporting States, 95% of the continental airspace is served.
- The overall airspace organisation remained stable across the years. More than half of the States have a single continental FIR. A smaller number has 2 (often a division between upper and lower), while 7 reporting States have 4 or more FIRs. The number of FIRs is associated with volume of airspace and number of control unit.



- Traffic in 2024 increased continuously in comparison to previous years. About 50% of the total IFR flight hours were serviced by 8 States similar to 2019 levels.
This shows that traffic levels reach pre-pandemic levels, however, changes in terms of network connections exists across the EUR Region.
- Five reporting States are accountable for about two third of all en-route ATCO hours on duty in the EUR Region. The top 6 States accounted for 52% of all ATCOs in operations at Terminal Facilities, i.e. combined APP and Towers.
Oceanic service provision is handled by a small number of States within the EUR Region (i.e. 3 States reporting).
- The average flight hour per IFR flight remained constant ranging at about 0,43 hour per IFR flight. This shows that flights are served along similar network connections within the different States requiring broadly the same 'service time' within their national airspace. This suggests that similar flight patterns re-emerged.
- About 50% of all airport IFR movements were observed within 6 reporting States. The average national IFR airport movements ranges around 390.500 while the top 3 States observed airport movement numbers higher than a factor of 4.

- The year 2024 is also characterized by a significant level of ATFM delay. The magnitude was comparable to the pre-pandemic year. A variety of drivers contributed to the overall high level of ATFM delay seeing a surge in capacity related delays, but also a higher share of weather and industrial action related ATFM delays across the regions.
 - 2 States account for about 40% of the observed en-route ATFM delay in the EUR Region; while
 - the vast majority of States does not generate any significant delay.
- Flight efficiency followed broadly the pattern of the previous years. This suggests that – with the increase in air traffic – further efficiencies due to restructuring of the network, removal of operational/procedural constraints/routing have been limited. The overall total achieved IFR distance observed across the EUR Region in 2024 increased as a function of the number of flights operated (i.e. more km flown).
 - Given the dimensions of the EUR Region and the different airspace volumes, about 60% of the total achieved IFR distances is measured for flights within 7 States
- The environmental contribution of air navigation to the footprint of air transport is strongly scale-dependent on the level of inefficiencies in terms of additional flight time (~ engine time ~ emission time). The average en-route fuel consumption factor for the participating States remained constant over the past years further evidencing the effect of constant service times, similar traffic patterns/airspace structures.
 - Note: A better level of numerical quantification of the environmental effect is planned for future editions.



- From a cost-effectiveness perspective, the continual increase in post-pandemic traffic numbers can be observed as well while size and scale aspects see a concentration.
Five reporting States are providing about 60% of all en-route ATCO hours on duty in the EUR Region.
The increasing traffic also resulted in a shift of ATCO hours on duty in APP + TWRs with an expansion of contributing states: 6 States service airport movements accounting for 52% of all terminal & aerodrome ATCO hours on duty in the EUR Region.
- The participation of States and Stakeholders to the ICAO activities (e.g. workshops, meetings, reports) varies greatly and is still impacted by post-pandemic procedures or organizational traffic / mission constraints.




Introduction



ICAO Performance Framework Document

ICAO EUR Doc 030 describes the performance Framework
(available in English/Russian language)


- Introduction
- Background
- Relationship with ICAO Global developments
- Relationship with the EU Performance Scheme
- Geographical scope
- Roles and responsibilities
- KPAs/KPIs/Metrics
- Monitoring and reporting at regional/national level
- Guidance material




KPA	OBJECTIVES	FOCUS AREAS	INDICATORS
SAFETY	Ensure safety continuous improvement through reduction of ATM related safety occurrences and implementation of uniform safety standards		Effectiveness of Safety Management (Safety Maturity Questionnaire)
			Level of State Safety Culture (Safety Culture Questionnaire)
			Adoption of harmonized occurrences severity classification methodology
CAPACITY	Capacity meets demand for en-route and at airports	En-route ATFM Delay	Average en-route ATFM delay generated by airspace volume
		Airport ATFM Delay	Average ATFM delay per flight in the main airports (to be identified by States)
EFFICIENCY	Ensure users may use most efficient routes	Horizontal Flight Efficiency	Average horizontal en route flight efficiency (length of the en route part of the actual trajectory/last flight planned route vs great circle)
ENVIRONMENT	Contribute to the protection of environment (fuel/CO2 emissions reduction)		CO2 emissions related to inefficiencies in route extension
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Contribute to optimization of costs for ANS	ATCO Productivity	IFR Flights (en-route) per ATCO hour duty
			IFR flight hours per ATCO hour on duty
			IFR movements per ATCO hour on duty
PARTICIPATION BY ATM COMMUNITY	Ensure States' participation to Regional planning and implementation activities		Level of participation to meetings
			Level of responses to planning activities
			Level of provision of performance results

No longer Doc 030
Regional Safety reporting









ICAO PARIS

UNITING AVIATION

Level of participation

😊 34 submissions

Status on 22-10-2025

ICAO EUR/NAT Office accreditation (56 States)

ICAO EUR Region (55 States)

ECAC (44) – Iceland (1) = 43 States

EUROCONTROL (41 States)

SES Performance Scheme RP3 (30 States)

EU (27 States)

MUAC	😊 Austria	😊 Italy	Norway	😊 Albania	Azerbaijan	😊 Algeria	Iceland
	Belgium	😊 Latvia	😊 Switzerland	😊 Armenia	San Marino	Andorra	
	Bulgaria	Lithuania		😊 Bosnia and Herzegovina		Belarus	
	Croatia	😊 Luxembourg		😊 Georgia		Israel	
	😊 Cyprus	Malta		😊 North Macedonia		😊 Kazakhstan	
	😊 Czech Republic	😊 Netherlands		😊 Republic of Moldova		😊 Kyrgyzstan	
	Denmark	😊 Poland		Monaco		Morocco	
	😊 Estonia	😊 Portugal		😊 Montenegro		Russian Federation	
	😊 Finland	😊 Romania		😊 Serbia		Tajikistan	
	😊 France	😊 Slovakia		Türkiye		Tunisia	
	😊 Germany	😊 Slovenia		Ukraine		Turkmenistan	
	Greece	😊 Spain		😊 United Kingdom		😊 Uzbekistan	
	Hungary	😊 Sweden					
	😊 Ireland						

ECAA Member

Pre-filled template available,
No support requested

Support requested,
Pre-filled template provided



ACE data available



Template submitted





- Participation to monitoring exercise for 2024: 34 submissions (on time)
- Participation varied over the past years
 - organisational changes during pandemic with ripple effects on staffing levels / priorities in post-pandemic setup
 - SES process for EU Member States; during summer 2025: continued RP4 Process
- States actively benefitting from support through prefilling (e.g. reduction of replication, consistency, quicker turnaround) → many «thank you»(s)
- Deconflicted timeline with SES process and increased engagement (check-in on submission) was positively received
- Potential to increase participation through targeting non-reporting States

Processing and presentation of results

- Data is collected in one Excel reporting template per State
- Data of individual States is collated into a single data set
 - Basis for graphical representation of results
 - Combination of prefilled and submitted data
 - Grey bars: data as submitted by the State
 - Red bars: prefilled data where available, for States which did not submit a template
 - In some cases the number of States in the graphs is smaller than the number of pre-filled + submitted templates. Reason: for some States the template is only partially filled.
 - Results are anonymised
 - But each State can see where it stands in comparison to all States in the Region
 - Each State knows its own values and can therefore position itself in the graphs

Explanation of graphs

- **Title**
 - Identifies the data: year, scope (geographical and/or KPA), name of the data item, identifier code in the template
- **X-axis**
 - The list of anonymised States for the State- and ANSP-based data items (MUAC included as an ANSP), and the list of anonymised airports for the airport-based data items (± 180 airports). Note that the labels are ranking numbers, not State/airport identifiers: in principle the mapping between numbers and States/airports is different for each graph.
- **Left y-axis**
 - The value of the data item, with the measurement units in the bottom left corner (blank means it is simply a count).
- **Grey line**
 - The average value (arithmetic mean), based on the number of States/ANSPs for which results are available for this data item (the length of the line indicates for how many States/ANSPs data is available). This value is a proxy for the regional average: it will change as data for more States/ANSPs is available.
- **A series of grey and/or red bars**
 - The profile of individual State/ANSP/airport values in descending order. This provides a good picture of the differences within the region. The bars do not show the difference between a reported value of zero and the value not being reported, but this can be deduced from the brown line (absence of a bar below the grey line means value zero or a value too small to be visible in the graph).
- **A red dotted line**
 - For data items which are aggregatable over States/ANSPs/airports: the cumulative profile of the blue bars in percent (see right-hand axis).






Contextual data (Table A)



Continental Area		
	Airspace	
A8	Number of FIRs	Number
A9	Size of the area	km ²
A10	Radar Surveillance Coverage at FL 290	km ²
	Traffic	
A11	Total number of IFR flights controlled (=A12+A13+A14)	Flights/year
A12	Number of domestic IFR flights controlled	Flights/year
A13	Number of international IFR flights controlled	Flights/year
A14	Number of IFR overflights controlled	Flights/year
A11b	Total number of IFR flights controlled (use only if A12+A13+A14 not available)	Flights/year
A15	Number of IFR flight-hours controlled	hrs/year
A16	Number of IFR airport movements controlled (departures+arrivals)	Mov/year
A17	Number of VFR airport movements controlled (departures+arrivals)	Mov/year
A18	Average flight hours per IFR flight (=A15/A11)	hrs/flight
A19	Average IFR traffic density (=A15/A9)	hrs/km ² /year
	ATC facilities	
A20	Number of ACCs	Number
A21	Number of co-located ACC/Approach Facilities	Number
A22	Number of Approach Control Facilities	Number
A23	Number of co-located Tower/Approach Facilities	Number
A24	Number of stand-alone Towers	Number
A25	Number of co-located ACC/Tower/Approach Facilities	Number
	ATCOs in operations	
A26	Number of ATCOs in operations at ACCs	FTE
A27	Number of ATCOs in operations at Terminal Facilities (APP+TWRs)	FTE


Oceanic Area (for States having an Oceanic Area)		
	Airspace	
A28	Number of FIRs	Number
A29	Size of the area	km ²
A30	Radar Surveillance Coverage at FL 290	km ²
	Traffic	
A31	Number of IFR flights controlled (=A32+A33+A34)	Flights/year
A32	Number of domestic IFR flights controlled	Flights/year
A33	Number of international IFR flights controlled	Flights/year
A34	Number of IFR overflights controlled	Flights/year
A31b	Number of IFR flights controlled (use only if A32+A33+A34 not available)	Flights/year
A35	Number of IFR flight-hours controlled	hrs/year
A36	Average flight hours per IFR flight (=A35/A31)	hrs/flight
A37	Average IFR traffic density (=A35/A29)	hrs/km ² /year
	ATC facilities	
A38	Number of OACs	Number
	ATCOs in operations	
A39	Number of ATCOs in operations at OACs	FTE

2024 - Continental Area: Number of FIRs (A8)




- Continental airspace in the EUR region varies across the different States, including the organisation of service provision and organisation in form of established FIRs.
- Smaller States / airspaces organise their air navigation service regions as a single FIR while larger nations (and their associated airspace) is structured in a multitude of FIRs.
- 7 reporting states have 4 or more FIRs accounting for almost 60% of all FIRs.
- A high share of states operates 2 FIRs, while the majority of states (size-dependent) provide services within 1 FIR

2024 - Continental Area: Size of the area (A9)





- The top 5 States included in the report cover over 50% of the continental airspace. Two third of the continental airspace is served including another 4 States (= total 9 States).
- Airspace sizes vary widely across the EUR region performance framework participants.
- With about 50% of the States, 95% of the continental airspace is covered.
- The EUR region is characterised by a wide variety in the size of the continental airspace. Oceanic airspace and service provision is largely concentrated and provided by a small number of States, i.e., 3.



- Traffic in 2024 increased in comparison to previous years and the continued recovery of air transport from COVID19. However, across the year, traffic levels still were impacted by local and global post-pandemic impacts and geo-political developments.
- The average controlled IFR traffic across the region accounts to about 750.000 flights.
- About 50% of the total IFR flight hours are accrued by 8 States showing a continual return to the pre-pandemic concentration in a smaller number of States).
- In line with the overall IFR traffic in the European region, service provision varies across the States.
- Oceanic traffic (primarily long-range international traffic) increased with the global recovery of air traffic.




2019 - Continental Area: Total number of IFR flights controlled (=A12+A13+A14) (A11)




- Comparing traffic levels in 2019 vs 2021 and 2024, the overall recovery of air traffic becomes apparent.
- While in 2019 traffic ranged from just under 3.4 million flights to under 100,000 flights; the level per state increased following the decline in 2020 in 2021. Current traffic levels followed a rebound starting in 2022.
- During the pandemic, total annual traffic ranged on average 55-85% of pre-pandemic levels across the region.
- With traffic levels about to reach the pre-pandemic levels, the EUR region shows a steady recovery of air transport demand. However, it must be noted that traffic levels between States (and airports) may differ significantly.

2024 - Continental Area: Number of IFR flight-hours controlled (A15)



- About 60% of the IFR flight hours within the continental airspace in 2024 is serviced by 8 participating States. Four of these States serviced more than 1.5 million of flight hours.
- Most States serviced at or below 400k flight hours in 2024.
- IFR hours are associated with the overall IFR traffic serviced by the States and their associated airspace (FIR) size
- The oceanic traffic is served by 3 States with 2 participating States handling most of the oceanic flights


2024 - Continental Area: Average flight hours per IFR flight (=A15/A11) (A18)




- Despite the higher number of participants and associated variety of the number of served traffic and respective airspace sizes, the average flight hour remained constant in comparison to the previous year and ranges now around 0.43 hr/flight.
- About two-third of the participating States observed an average flight time within their airspaces of 30 mins or less. This is strongly correlated with the size of the national airspace volume.
- For the oceanic traffic, the values depend strongly on the serviced traffic flows and range between 0.75 - 1.8 hr/flight



2019 - Continental Area: Average flight hours per IFR flight (=A15/A11) (A18)




2024 - Continental Area: Average flight hours per IFR flight (=A15/A11) (A18)




- Comparing average flight hours per IFR flight in 2019 vs 2024 – average flight hours are consistent with the pre-pandemic years.
- On average the average flight hour per IFR flight ranges around 0.43 hr/flight – similar to 2019.
- On a per country basis, the observed average flight hour per flight, however, ranges in the same order of magnitude.


2024 - Continental Area: Average IFR traffic density (=A15/A9) (A19)



2024 - Oceanic Area: Average IFR traffic density (=A35/A29) (A37)




2024 - Continental Area: Number of IFR airport movements controlled (departures+arrivals) (A16)




- Based on the overall traffic trends, IFR movements at airports increased compared to the previous years.
- Across, the EUR region these traffic levels may vary widely locally as the traffic recovery at several airports depends on various factors.
- A concentration of airport IFR movements is observable. About 50% of all movements were observed within 6 reporting States. The average national number of IFR airport movements ranges around 390,500 while the top 3 States observed airport movement numbers higher than a factor of 4 (ranging about + 1,200,000 flights higher).
- VFR movements were concentrated within a smaller number of States within the European region. The reporting varies and suggests that VFR movements are mostly operated in/at un-controlled airspace/aerodromes.

2024 - Continental Area: Number of FIRs (A8)




- More than half of the States have a single continental FIR. A smaller number has 2 (often a division between upper and lower), while 7 reporting States have 4 or more FIRs.
- The number of FIRs is associated with volume of airspace and number of control units.
- Oceanic service provision is typically organised in 1 FIR.

2023 - Continental Area: Number of ACCs (A20)







2023 - Continental Area: Number of Approach Control Facilities (A22)



2023 - Continental Area: Number of co-located ACC/Approach Facilities (A21)




2023 - Continental Area: Number of co-located Tower/Approach Facilities (A23)




ATSU / facility numbers have not changed significantly over the past years.

Continental Area: Number of stand-alone Towers (A24)




- The top-6 States account for 50% of all Towers in the EUR Region.
- The remaining States operate under 20 towers.
- The average number of stand-alone towers per State ranges just above 10.

Continental Area: Number of ATCOs in operations at ACCs (A26)



- Just under two-third of all ATCOs in operations at ACCs are deployed in 6 reporting States.
- There is only a small subset of States operating oceanic traffic with associated staffing levels.

Continental Area: Number of ATCOs In operations at Terminal Facilities (APP+TWRs) (A27)



Performance data (Table B)




KPA	Capacity
Objective	Ensure that Air Navigation Service capacity meets demand in en-route airspace and at airports
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Average ATFM delay per flight generated by the airspace volume (en-route)- Average ATFM delay per flight in the main airports (to be identified by States in advance and based on the regional relevance)

Please note


- Indicators measure
 - The location where the problem (capacity bottleneck) is, not where the delay is taken (departure airport)
 - Performance of airspace volumes and airports, not flights
 - Despite the expression as a value “per flight”
 - Within the Capacity KPA
 - Demand/capacity imbalance
 - Not capacity itself
- Limitations
 - Not designed to measure excess capacity
 - No data if airspace or airport does not participate in a centralised ATFM process

Capacity		
En-route ATFM delays (continental airspace)		
B35	Total en-route ATFM delay generated in the State (all causes) (=B37+B38+B39+B40)	Min/year
B36	Average ATFM delay per flight (=B35/A11)	Min/flight
B37	En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (ATC capacity causes)	Min/year
B38	En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (ATC other causes)	Min/year
B39	En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (Weather causes)	Min/year
B40	En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (All other causes)	Min/year
B35b	En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (Cause unknown, use only if B37, B38, B39 & B40 not available)	Min/year
Airport ATFM delays		
	Airport identifier	ICAO code
B41	Total number of IFR arrivals at the airport	Arrivals/year
B42	Total airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (all causes) (=B44+B45+B46+B47)	Min/year
B43	Average ATFM delay per arrival (=B42/B41)	Min/arrival
B44	Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (ATC & aerodrome capacity causes)	Min/year
B45	Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (ATC other causes)	Min/year
B46	Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (Weather causes)	Min/year
B47	Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (All other causes)	Min/year
B42b	Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (Cause unknown, use only if B44, B45, B46 & B47 not available)	Min/year

2024 - Continental Area: Total en-route ATFM delay generated in the State (all causes) (=B37+B38+B39+B40) (B35)




2024 - Continental Area: Average ATFM delay per flight (=B35/A11) (B36)




- The EUR region observed a high level of ATFM delay throughout the past 2 years (ranging at / above pre-pandemic levels).
- The overall pattern across the EUR region is relatively constant over the years. This suggests systemic causes (e.g. general capacity / staffing situation, susceptibility to weather)
- Looking at the indicator and the identified concentration of delay triggering airspace volumes, improvements should primarily focus on the 4 States with the highest value. One of these States accrued more than 2.7 min / flight of average ATFM delay, with 3 other States trailing with 1.3-1.5 min / flight of ATFM delay. However, for prioritisation of improvements the total amount of delay (item B35) should be considered as well.


2024 - Continental Area: En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (ATC capacity causes) (B37)




2024 - Continental Area: En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (ATC other causes) (B38)




2024 - Continental Area: En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (Weather causes) (B39)




2024 - Continental Area: En-route ATFM delay generated in the State (All other causes) (B40)







2024 - Average ATFM delay per arrival (=B42/B41) (B43)




2024 - Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (Weather causes) (B46)




2024 - Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (ATC & aerodrome capacity causes) (B44)



2024 - Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (All other causes) (B47)



2024 - Airport ATFM delay generated by the airport (ATC other causes) (B45)




On average, ATC other causes is the smallest contributor to airport ATFM delay

KPA	Efficiency
Objective	Ensure that users [can?] use the most efficient routes – focussing on the horizontal flight-efficiency
Indicator	Average horizontal en route flight efficiency, defined as the difference between the length of the en route part of the actual trajectory (where available) or last flight planned route and the great circle.

- O, D, N, X: **O**rigin, **D**estination, **N**try, **X**it
- “Corresponding portion of the great circle distance OD” = **achieved distance N’X’** (needed to calculate the indicator at State level)
- Calculation of **achieved distance N’X’** for flight segment NX:
(distance-closer-to-destination + distance-away-from-departure)/2
- Important properties
 - Sum of achieved distances of flight segments is always equal to total direct (great circle) distance from O to D
 - Actual, achieved and excess distances for flight segments are aggregatable (bottom-up from State level to regional level)


Iso-achieved-distance lines



In the example to the left:

Extra distance: $85 - 60 = 25$


Inefficiency = $25 / 60 = 0.42 = 42\%$



Processing of domestic flights and overflights



Domestic flight

Measured area (State FIRs)



Overflight


Reference area (eg EUR region)



- Required inputs: Trajectory and the coordinates of points O, D, N, X (Origin, Destination, eNtry, eXit)
- Computed: Trajectory distance (NX), achieved distance (N'X')
- For the NX parts of all trajectories of IFR flights domestic, departing, arriving, or overflying IFR flights

Flight Efficiency		
	Horizontal en-route flight efficiency	
B48	Name of selected reference area (provide list of FIRs in annex)	Text
B50fpl	Total planned IFR distance (flight plan)	km/year
B51fpl	Total achieved IFR distance (flight plan)	km/year
B50sur	Total actual IFR distance (surveillance data)	km/year
B51sur	Total achieved IFR distance (surveillance data)	km/year
B49	Data source for B50 - B53 (surveillance data or flight plan)	SUR or FPL
B49b	SUR/FPL achieved distance ratio (<95% = incomplete coverage)	%
B50	Total flown IFR distance	km/year
B51	Total achieved IFR distance	km/year
B52	Total extra IFR distance (=B50 – B51)	km/year
B53	Horizontal en-route flight efficiency (=B52/B51)	%

SUR/FPL achieved distance ratio (<95% = incomplete coverage) (B49b)



FSA, FDI, CPR, FAM Operational Status 2019

Legend:

- Fully Operational (FAM+CPR+FSA) on 30 sec
- Fully Operational (FAM+CPR+FSA) on 1 min
- FSA Only
- CPR on 30sec and FSA Only
- Oceanic Clearance (FNM + MFS)
- FDI Only
- No Data


Inset: USA CONTINENTAL


Inset: BRAZ

Inset: OMAE


Maintained by : NMD/NOS Date: 27-MAR-2019

2024 - Flt. Efficiency: Total achieved IFR distance (B51)






Note: Total flown IFR distance (=actual distance) fused from SUR and FPL data sources and adjusted to compensate for insufficient surveillance data coverage.



Note: Total extra IFR distance (=excess distance flown) based on fused SUR and FPL data sources and adjusted to compensate for insufficient surveillance data coverage.


- With traffic levels recovering from the COVID19 related decline, an immediate conclusion from the observed horizontal en-route flight efficiency performance cannot be drawn. We observe also some high levels of inefficiency resulting from the airspace measures surrounding the Russian invasion of Ukraine.
- Looking at the indicator, improvements should primarily focus on the 6 States with the highest value and nominal traffic patterns. However, for prioritisation of improvements the total amount of extra IFR distance (item B52) should be considered as well.



KPA	Environment
Objective	Contribute to the protection of the environment – focussing on fuel savings and CO2 emission reductions
Indicator	CO2 emissions deriving from inefficiencies in flight efficiency (conversion of additional distance into CO2 emissions based on standard values formula)

Definition of indicator

- Reference excess fuel consumption:
Total additional distance flown in the airspace volume (i.e. State) multiplied by a standard fuel consumption factor (value chosen by each State)
- Reference excess CO₂ emission:
Reference excess fuel consumption multiplied by 3.15 (net carbon content of kerosene)



Remarks

- Indicator
 - Has low data requirements and is therefore easy to implement
 - Because mostly based on “additional distance” already computed
 - Publishes an approximation of excess CO₂ emission, resulting from horizontal flight inefficiency
 - The optimum indicator value is not equal to zero
 - Value is influenced by many different factors (including traffic volume, fleet characteristics etc.)
 - Indicator does not cover everything (missing: vertical flight efficiency, TMA inefficiencies, surface movement inefficiencies)
 - Hence the absolute value of the indicator should not be interpreted as representing the CO₂ emissions caused by ANS.
 - Indicator to be used for “general purpose” and trend analysis only

Environment		
	CO2 emissions deriving from inefficiencies in flight efficiency	
B54	Average en-route fuel consumption factor for the State (provide source and computation method in annex)	kg/km
B55	Average en-route CO ₂ emission factor for the State (=B54 * 3.15)	kg/km
B56	Theoretical CO ₂ emissions deriving from inefficiencies in horizontal en-route flight efficiency (=B52 * B55 / 1000)	Tonnes/year




B54 – Average en-route fuel consumption factor


- State can choose method/value
 - Global standard value from ICAO
 - Average fuel burn per nautical mile (NM) of flight = 11 kg/NM = 5.9 kg/km
 - Source: Doc 9750 3rd ed. page App H-8
 - Used for the prefiling of the template
 - State-specific standard value: the standard kerosene consumption per kilometer of a typical jet aircraft type
 - States can select their own “typical aircraft type”, reflecting the composition of traffic in their airspace
 - State-specific measured value: a calibrated average fuel consumption per kilometre flown,
 - computed from the State’s average annual traffic composition in terms of aircraft types, vertical traffic distribution and distance flown
 - using the ICAO Fuel Savings Estimation Tool (IFSET)
 - or any other modeling tool, if available
 - recalibration needed every couple of years to take into account changes in traffic composition



2021 - Average en-route fuel consumption factor for the State (provide source and computation method in annex) (B54)





2024 - Average en-route CO2 emission factor for the State (=B54 * 3.15) (B55)



- The average en-route fuel consumption factor for the participating States remained constant over the past years. This reflects the reported stability of the observed en-route flight efficiency benefit pool reported above.
- The associated average en-route CO2 emission factor represents then the estimated emission per km flown, i.e. B54-factor * 3,15.
- The EUR region network is characterised by a certain stability of the network traffic (in-)efficiency. Accordingly, the benefit pool for CO2 emissions – expressed per km flown – remained constant.


Thoughts regarding this indicator and its associated coverage issues



- Indicator is an absolute value
 - Susceptible to coverage issues
 - Geographical, time, flight category filtering
- Coverage checks & corrections
 - SUR data available
 - Sufficient match with FPL data (achieved distance comparison >95%)
 - Use additional distance from SUR data as is
 - Insufficient match with FPL data
 - Upscale additional distance from SUR data to 95% of additional distance from FPL data
 - SUR data not available
 - Use additional distance from FPL data
- Future work could include gate-to-gate emission estimation to improve the level of reporting for states where the surveillance data is available.

KPA	Cost effectiveness
Objective	Contribute to optimize the cost for air navigation services
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- IFR flights (en-route) per ATCO hour on duty- IFR flight hours (en-route) per ATCO hour on duty- IFR movements (airport) per ATCO hour on duty

Origin of indicators



Doc 9161 Figure 4-2


Remarks

- Indicators
 - Focus on an important component of ANSP costs
 - However with the limitation that working hours per ATCO, employment cost per ATCO, and support cost are not covered
 - Reuse data reporting already in place for many States
 - Also reuse existing data definitions and terminology
 - EUROCONTROL Specification for Economic Information Disclosure (SEID)
 - Have relatively simple reporting requirements
 - Only traffic volume and ATCO hours on duty
 - Avoid entering into financial information disclosure issues for the initial implementation of the framework


Cost effectiveness		
	ATCO productivity (Continental Area)	
B57	Number of ATCO hours on duty (ACCs)	hrs/year
B58	Number of ATCO hours on duty (APP+TWRs)	hrs/year
B59	IFR flights (en-route) per ATCO hour on duty (ACCs) (=A11/B57)	Flights/hr
B60	IFR flight hours per ATCO hour on duty (ACCs) (=A15/B57)	hrs/hr
B61	IFR movements (airport) per ATCO hour on duty (APP+TWRs) (=A16/B58)	Mov/hr




2023 - Continental Area: Number of ATCOs in operations at ACCs (A26)



Note: This graph is repeated here for ease of reference and comparison with the next graph (ATCO hours on duty).
 ATCO data is available based on reporting year – 1 data.




2023 - Continental Area: IFR flights (en-route) per ATCO hour on duty (ACCs) (=A11/B57) (B59)



En-route


- In terms of number of movements handled per en-route ATCO hour on duty, there is a large variation between the top ACCs and the majority of other ACCs.
- The metric does not take into account the time flown within the area of responsibility. It should therefore be considered in combination with earlier density measures.
- Across the region a clear pattern of IFR flight per ATCO hour can be observed consistent with the traffic handled and underlying airspace configuration.
- The average across the EUR region remained constant over the past year, i.e., just under 4 flights per ATCO hour.

2023 - Continental Area: IFR flight hours per ATCO hour on duty (ACCs) (=A15/B57) (B60)



Item B60 is a better indicator for en-route ATCO productivity than item B59. The data suggest that about a dozen States at the tail end of the distribution need to work on improving their ATCO productivity. Lessons can be learned from the dozen States on the left side of the graph which perform better than average.


2023 - Continental Area: Number of ATCOs In operations at Terminal Facilities (APP+TWRs) (A27)



Terminal & Aerodrome

Note: This graph is repeated here for ease of reference and comparison with the next graph (ATCO hours on duty).

2023 - Continental Area: Number of ATCO hours on duty (APP+TWRs) (B58)





Participation KPA





- The year 2024 marks a subtle return to the pre-pandemic phase with air traffic levels continuously increasing over the past years and in many instances reaching or about to reach the pre-COVID levels. However, there are still limitation in terms of conducting larger participation events.
- Following up on the pandemic must for online interactions, the primary stakeholder interaction mechanism is still through a series of online/virtual events and only minor in-person events.
- Note: submissions are cross-checked for comments on in-person or virtual events.



ICAO PARIS

UNITING AVIATION



ICAO

North American
Central American
and Caribbean
(NACC) Office
Mexico City

South American
(SAM) Office
Lima

ICAO
Headquarters
Montréal

Western and
Central African
(WACAF) Office
Dakar

European and
North Atlantic
(EUR/NAT) Office
Paris

Middle East
(MID) Office
Cairo

Eastern and
Southern African
(ESAF) Office
Nairobi

Asia and Pacific
(APAC) Sub-office
Beijing

Asia and Pacific
(APAC) Office
Bangkok



THANK YOU