Performance Plan

Denmark

Fourth Reference Period (2025-2029)

Status: Revised draft performance plan (Art. 14(3) of IR 2019/317)

Date of issue: 14. August 2025

Table of Contents

Signatories

Performance plan details	
State name	Denmark
Status of the Performance Plan	Revised draft performance plan (Art. 14(3) of IR 2019/317)
Date of issue	14. August 2025
Date of adoption of revised Draft Performance Plan	14. August 2025
Date of adoption of Final Performance Plan	

We hereby confirm that the present performance plan is consistent with the scope of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2019/317 pursuant to Article 1 of Regulation (EU) No 2019/317 and Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 549/2004.

Name, title and signature of representative	
Lars Korsholm Deputy Director General Danish Civil Aviation and Railway Authority	 *(electronically signed)*

Additional comments	

Document change record		
Version	Date	Reason for change
2	15. November 2024	Completeness check
3	13. December 2024	Completeness check
4	14. August 2025	Revised draft performance plan
5	1. October 2025	Completeness check

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 The situation

1.1.1 - List of ANSPs and geographical coverage of services
1.1.2 - Other entities in the scope of the Performance and Charging Regulation as per Article 1(2) last para.
1.1.3 - Charging zones (see also 1.4-List of Airports)
1.1.4 - Other general information relevant to the plan

1.2 - Traffic Forecasts

1.2.1 - En route
1.2.2 - Terminal

1.3 - Stakeholder consultation

1.3.1 - Overall outcome of the consultation of stakeholders on the performance plan
1.3.2 - Specific consultation requirements of ANSPs and airspace users on the performance plan
1.3.3 - Consultation of stakeholder groups on the performance plan

1.4 - List of airports subject to the performance and charging Regulation

1.4.1 - Airports as per Article 1(3) (IFR movements ≥ 80 000)
1.4.2 Other airports added on a voluntary basis as per Article 1(4)

1.5 - Services under market conditions

1.6 - Process followed to develop and adopt a FAB Performance Plan

1.7 - Establishment and application of a simplified charging scheme

1.7.1 - Scope of the simplified charging scheme
1.7.2 - Conditions for the application of the simplified charging scheme

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX C. CONSULTATION
ANNEX D. LOCAL TRAFFIC FORECASTS
ANNEX L. JUSTIFICATION FOR SIMPLIFIED CHARGING SCHEME
ANNEX Y. RESPONSES TO COMPLETENESS VERIFICATION

1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 - The situation

NSA(s) responsible for drawing up the Performance Plan	Trafikstyrelsen (Danish Civil Aviation and Railway Authority)

1.1.1 - List of ANSPs and geographical coverage and services

Number of ANSPs	2

ANSP name	Services	Type of entity	Geographical scope
NAVIAIR	ATM/ANS	ATSP/CNSP	Copenhagen FIR and CPH TNC
DMI	MET services	METSP	Copenhagen FIR and CPH TNC

Cross-border arrangements for the provision of ANS services*

** To be reported in the performance plan: any cross-border area or group of adjacent cross-border areas of a size above 500 km ^{2} , unless the area or group of areas concerned has fewer than 7,500 controlled flight movements on average per year*

Number of cross-border area(s) where the ANSP(s) of the Member State provide(s) services in another State's charging zone(s)	8

Cross-border service provision in the charging zone(s) of another State		
ANSP Name	Name of the cross-border area(s)	Charging zone in which services are provided
DFS	Alsie	Germany
LFV	H2a	Sweden
LFV	H2b	Sweden
LFV	L2	Sweden
LFV	L3	Sweden
DFS	Michaelsdorf	Germany
NATS	North Sea Area III	UK
NATS	North Sea Area High	UK

Number of cross-border area(s) where ANSP(s) from another State provide(s) services in the charging zone(s) covered by the performance plan	2

Cross-border service provision in the charging zone(s) covered by the performance plan		
ANSP Name	Name of the cross-border area(s)	Charging zone in which services are provided
LFV	H1	Denmark
LFV	Area C	Denmark

1.1.2 - Other entities in the scope of the Performance and Charging Regulation as per Article 1(2) last para.

Number of other entities	1

Entity name	Domain of activity	Rationale for inclusion in the Performance Plan
Trafikstyrelsen (Danish Civil Aviation and Railway Authority)	NSA	Separate cost base

1.1.3 - Charging zones (see also 1.4-List of Airports)

En-route	Number of en-route charging zones	1

En-route charging zone 1	Denmark

Terminal	Number of terminal charging zones	1

Terminal charging zone 1	Denmark - TCZ

1.1.4 - Other general information relevant to the plan

Relevant local circumstances with high significance for performance target setting
Traffic in Danish airspace is affected Russia’s war of aggression against Ukraine and the subsequent closure of Russian airspace for i.a. European

carriers. A significant part of the traffic to and from Asia that would normally pass though the Danish air-space has been rerouted leading to a considerably loss of service units.

Additional information

1.2 - Traffic Forecasts

1.2.1 - En route

En route Charging zone 1 **Denmark**

En route traffic forecast STATFOR February 2025 (Base)

STATFOR February 2025 (Base)	2022A	2023A	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	CAGR 2024-2029
IFR movements (thousands)	505	559	594	633	654	664	675	682	2,8%
IFR movements (yearly variation in %)		10,8%	6,2%	6,6%	3,3%	1,7%	1,6%	1,0%	
En route service units (thousands)	1.282	1.459	1.571	1.640	1.682	1.713	1.745	1.767	2,4%
En route service units (yearly variation in %)		13,7%	7,7%	4,4%	2,5%	1,9%	1,9%	1,3%	

1.2.2 - Terminal

Terminal Charging zone 1 **Denmark - TCZ**

Terminal traffic forecast STATFOR February 2025 (Base)

STATFOR February 2025 (Base)	2022A	2023A	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	CAGR 2024-2029
IFR movements (thousands)	101	114	120	130	133	135	137	138	2,8%
IFR movements (yearly variation in %)		12,4%	5,9%	7,9%	2,8%	1,5%	1,5%	0,5%	
Terminal service units (thousands)	131	148	161	175	181	184	187	187	3,1%
Terminal service units (yearly variation in %)		13,0%	8,9%	8,5%	3,6%	1,6%	1,5%	0,4%	

1.3 - Stakeholder consultation

1.3.1 - Overall outcome of the consultation of stakeholders on the performance plan

Description of main points raised by stakeholders and explanation of how they were taken into account in developing the performance plan
Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024 **Traffic forecast** In the draft Performance Plan Denmark has used the Statfor February 2024 base forecast. At the consultation users argued that this forecast is too pessimistic for Denmark and not in line with what they are experiencing. Users therefore urged Denmark to use to the upcoming Statfor October 2024 forecast instead as this forecast is expected to be more positive than the February forecast. The October forecast will only be available after the draft Performance Plan has been submitted on the 1 October 2024. However, if the forecast is noticeable above the current forecast, Denmark will seek approval to update the Plan with the October forecast. **Investments** Users found the level of investments planned for RP4 to be excessive considering the expected traffic development and urged Naviair to consider postponing some investments. Specifically, users had reservations about the investment in upgrading and replacing the radar systems questioning whether they are necessary for ATC or serve other purposes. Users also asked how CP1 is linked to the planned investments. Subsequent the investments plans have been thoroughly reviewed and all planned investments are deemed necessary, and this also includes the replacements of the radars. CP1 is integrated in ATC One which is the necessary upgrade of the legacy ATC system. **Capacity targets and incentive schemes.** It was pointed out by users that the capacity performance previously has been better than the proposed targets and users asked the NSA to take note of this and pointed out that there are cost for the airlines associated with delay. Initially Denmark had suggested an incentive scheme with a deadband around the national capacity reference values with a max. bonus of 0,4% and a max penalty of 1,0% of determined costs. Users argued that a bonus was unacceptable considering the unambitious capacity targets compared to the historical performance and that should be a penalty only scheme. It was also argued that the max penalty should be set at 2,0%. Considering these arguments, the Danish NSA has decided to remove the bonus but to maintain a max. penalty of 1,0%. The en route capacity targets for RP4 were initially set equal to the national reference values which are: 0,17 min. in 2025, 0,13 min. in 2026 and 0,10 min each year for the rest of the period. Following the consultation, the Danish NSA has decided to set the national target to 0,10 min. for every year in RP4. **Cost base** In general users were very critical of the planned cost base for RP4 considering the relatively weak development in traffic expected over the period. Users also didn't see the need to make Naviair more operational robust arguing that Naviair historically had been able to handle similar traffic with lower costs. Users also asked for further information on number of ATCOs. ATCOs on other duties. trainees and retirements. Users disagreed in that there is a

need to increase the operational robustness of Naviair argueing that Naviair previous have been able to handle the same amount of traffic with less costs.

Naviair supported by the Danish NSA maintained that increased costs are necessary to secure operational robustness even though the development in traffic is relatively weak. Even though Naviair previously has handled more traffic with less cost, the organization was not robust.

Long term cost efficiency
At the consultation users were informed that it would be possible for States which were significantly affected by the war in Ukraine to use the same method as was used in the revised Swedish performance plan for RP3. Using this method an estimate is made of what the traffic would have been at the end of the period had the war not occurred. This traffic estimate is then used when assessing the long-term cost-efficiency trend. The users were informed that this method would be used by Denmark.
Users objected to this arguing that the described method was only to be used by Sweden in RP3 and not by other States in RP4.
However, it is the view of the Danish NSA that the use of this method is in accordance with COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION (EU) 2024/1688 on union wide performance target for RP4. In recital 23 it is stated that countries considerably impacted by changed traffic flows can make use of the same method as was used in the revised Swedish performance plan for RP3. This method implies that traffic in 2029 is estimated as if there were no shifts in traffic flows and this revised estimate is then used when assessing the long-term target for cost efficiency.
Based on this, Denmark maintains, that the use of the described method is in accordance with the relevant regulation why this method will be used when assessing the long-term target.
Unit rates for 2025
Users asked Denmark to consider the deferral of some of the adjustments in the 2025 unit-rate to remedy the significant increase in the rate. In particular Denmark was asked if the adjustment of 102 MDKK stemming from the extraordinary measures during Coved could be postponed. Denmark is currently looking into this, and no decision has yet been made.

Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025

Long term cost efficiency
Naviair presented their plan to gradually reduce cost during RP4 primarily on staffing and OPEX. The cost reductions will reduce the financial robustness.

Traffic flows in Danish airspace are significantly affected by the war in Ukraine. Due to this Denmark plan to adjust the traffic forecast in 2029 in order to reach the long term goal for cost efficiency. The method used is the same PRB used to calculate til Ukraine effect in a number of other performance plans.

Users did not find it acceptable that the long term cost efficiency goal was reached only by adjusting the traffic for the effect on the Ukraine war on traffic flows. Users did not consider that the Ukraine adjustment is needed.
Since traffic in Danish airspace is estimated to be 13,7% lower than it would have been without the war in Ukraine, the NSA agrees that this effect should be factored in when calculating the long term cost efficiency.

Capacity and ATCO training
Naviair is experiencing lack of ATCO's due to underinvestment in ATCO training historically and COVID-19 adjustments. The lack of ATCO's has already affected capacity in the 2023 and will continue to do so in RP4 if not mitigated by training, recruitment, and retention activities. Naviair focus on ensuring capacity by increasing the number of ATCO's by, increasing investments in training, external recruitment, retention and efficiency. Until Naviair reaches sufficient ATCO-levels the consequences of the shortage of ATCO's is mitigated by the existing ATCOs pulling a large number of extra shifts.

Users commented on Naviairs use of the partly owned EPN for ATCO training. Users asked if other providers were used. Other providers have and will be used if price and quality is favorable.

Investments
After the consultation in 2024 Naviair revisited the investment plan. The investment plan is mainly re-investments in old equipment, end-of life,

and major investments in the new ATM-system, Users however commented that they see further potential for reductions in the investment plan. Based on the fact that the investment plan was revisited after last years consultation the plan will not be changed.

Cost of capital
Users had concerns about the cost of capital estimation. IATA considers that this should be around 1,5 pct. instead of 4% when compared to the interest on state bonds. It was informed that is a subordinated loan not comparable to bonds and that the loan was re-negotiated in RP3 and went from an interest rate of 9 pct. to 4 pct.

Incentive scheme
Since the capacity targets in 2025 and -26 have been set lower than the local reference values the possibility of bonus of 0,4% has been introduced. Users appreciated the lower capacity target but preferred a penalty only incentive scheme. The NSA has considered the position of the users, but nevertheless decided to maintain the bonus possibility.
N+2 adjustment on investmentcosts
The NSA informed that the plan was to balance investment costs over the entire RP4 period and claim or reimburse the difference after the period. Users however mentioned that it would be helpful to have n+2 adjustments on investment costs instead at the end of the reference period. The NSA will consider this.

1.3.2 - Specific consultation requirements of ANSPs and airspace users on the performance plan

Topic of consultation	Applicable	Results of consultation
Establishment of determined costs included in the cost base for charges	Yes	**Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024** In general users were very critical of the planned cost base for RP4 considering the relatively weak development in traffic expected over the period. Users also didn't see the need to make Naviair more operational robust arguing that Naviair historically had been able to handle similar traffic with lower costs. Naviair supported by the Danish NSA maintained that increased costs are necessary to secure operational robustness **Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025** Users did not find it acceptable that the long term cost efficiency goal was reached only by adjusting the traffic for the effect on the Ukraine war on traffic flows. Users did not consider that the Ukraine adjustment is needed. Since traffic in Danish airspace is estimated to be 13,7% lower than it would have been without the war in Ukraine, the NSA agrees that this effect should be factored in when calculating the long term cost efficiency
New and existing investments, and in particular new major investments, including their expected benefits	Yes	**Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024** Users found the level of investments planned for RP4 to be excessive considering the expected traffic and urged Naviair to consider postponing some investments. Subsequent the investments plans have been thoroughly reviewed and all planned investments are deemed necessary. **Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025** After the consultation in 2024 Naviair revisited the investment plan. The investment plan is mainly re-investments in old equipment, end-of life, and major investments in the new ATM-system, Users however commented that they see further potential for reductions in the investment plan. Based on the fact that the investment plan was revisited after last years consultation the plan will not be changed.

Charging policy	Yes	**Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024** Users were informed that: -There is only one charging zone, Copenhagen FIR -No modulation of charges is applied -Differences in Eurocontrol and NSA costs will be adjusted in the n+2 rate. -Differences in investment costs to be adjusted in the 2031 unit rate (end of RP4 after scrutiny and consultation with users) No comments were recieved on this subject. **Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025** The NSA informed that the plan was to balance investment costs over the entire RP4 period and claim or reimburse the difference after the period. Users however mentioned that it would be helpful to have n+2 adjustments on investment costs instead at the end of the reference period. The NSA will consider this.
Maximum financial advantages and disadvantages for the mandatory incentive scheme on capacity	Yes	**Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024** Initially Denmark had suggested an incentive scheme with a deadband around the national capacity reference values with a max. bonus of 0,4% and a max penalty of 1,0% of determined costs. Users argued that a bonus was unacceptable considering the unambitious capacity targets compared to the historical performance and that should be a penalty only scheme. It was also argued that the max penalty should be set at 2,0%. Considering these arguments, the Danish NSA has decided to remove the bonus but to maintain a max. penalty of 1,0%. The en route capacity targets for RP4 were initially set equal to the national reference values which are: 0,17 min. in 2025, 0,13 min. in 2026 and 0,10 min each year for the rest of the period. Following the consultation, the Danish NSA has decided to set the national target to 0,10 min. for every year in RP4. **Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025** Since the capacity targets in 2025 and -26 have been set lower than the local reference values the possibility of bonus of 0,4% has been introduced. Users appreciated the lower capacity target but preferred a penalty only incentive scheme. The NSA has considered the position of the users, but nevertheless decided to maintain the bonus possibility.
Symmetric range ("dead band") for the purpose of the mandatory incentive scheme on capacity	Yes	**Consultation on the draft performance plan 21 August 2024** A deadband of 0,05 min. was suggested. Apart from the comments referred to in the above section no other comments were made. **Consultation on the revised draft performance plan 25 June 2025** The deadband has been set to 0,04 min. to allow for a smooth sliding scale
Where applicable, decision to modulate performance targets for the purpose of pivot values to be used for the mandatory incentive scheme on capacity	No	
Establishment or modification of charging zones	No	
Where applicable, values of the modulated parameters for the traffic risk sharing mechanism	No	

Where applicable, decision to apply the simplified charging scheme	No	
Where applicable, decision to diverge from the STATFOR base forecast	No	

1.3.3 - Consultation of stakeholder groups on the performance plan

#1 - ANSPs	
Stakeholder group composition	Naviair, DMI
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	Consultation on the revised performance plan held on 25. June 2025.
Main issues discussed	Naviair and DMI are part of the Performance Plan and answered questions from the stakeholders at the cosultation and after.
Actions agreed upon	-
Points of disagreement and reasons	-
Final outcome of the consultation	-

Additional comments
Please consult annex C for consultation minutes etc.

#2 - Airspace Users	
Stakeholder group composition	IATA, SAS, KLM, IAG Group, Qatar Airways
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	Consultation on the revised performance plan held on 25. June 2025.
Main issues discussed	Numbers of ATCOs and ATCO traning. Cost development in RP4. Investments. Long term cost efficiency. Ukraine effect, Incentive scheme. Capacity targets, cost of capital.
Actions agreed upon	It will be considered to adjust differences in investment costs in n+2 instead of after the reference period.
Points of disagreement and reasons	Users disagreed that the negative effect on traffic flows in Danish airspace from the war in Ukraine should be factored in when calculating the long term cost efficiency. Users also disagreed that all the planned investments are necessary and that a bonus possibility is added to the incentive schemes.
Final outcome of the consultation	It will be considered to adjust differences in investment costs in n+2 instead of after the reference period. Costbase, investments and bonus is maintained as presented.

Additional comments
Please consult annex C for consultation minutes etc.

#3 - Professional staff representative bodies	
Stakeholder group composition	DACTA (Danish ATCO union)
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	Consultation on the revised performance plan held on 25. June 2025.
	No issues were raised by DATCA

Main issues discussed	No issues were raised by BATCA
Actions agreed upon	-
Points of disagreement and reasons	-
Final outcome of the consultation	-

Additional comments

#4 - Airport operators	
Stakeholder group composition	Copenhagen Airport
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	Consultation on the revised performance plan held on 25. June 2025.
Main issues discussed	Copenhagen Airport stressed the importance of maintaining capacity in the approach control.
Actions agreed upon	-
Points of disagreement and reasons	-
Final outcome of the consultation	-

Additional comments
Please consult annex C for consultation minutes etc.

#5 - Airport coordinator	
Stakeholder group composition	Not present at consultation and no comments have been recieved.
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	-
Main issues discussed	-
Actions agreed upon	-
Points of disagreement and reasons	-
Final outcome of the consultation	-

Additional comments

#6 - Other (specify)	
Stakeholder group composition	PRB
Dates of main meetings / correspondence	Consultation on the revised performance plan held on 25. June 2025.
Main issues discussed	-
Actions agreed upon	-
Points of disagreement and reasons	-
Final outcome of the consultation	-

Additional comments

Please consult annex C for consultation minutes etc.

1.4 - List of airports subject to the performance and charging Regulation

1.4.1 - Airports as per Article 1(3) (IFR movements ≥ 80 000)

ICAO code	Airport name	Charging Zone	IFR air transport movements			
			2021	2022	2023	Average
EKCH	Copenhagen	Denmark - TCZ	109.870	202.210	227.333	179.804

1.4.2 Other airports added on a voluntary basis as per Article 1(4)

Number of airports	0		
ICAO code	Airport name	Charging Zone	Additional information

Additional comments

1.5 - Services under market conditions

Number of services under market conditions	0

1.6 - Process followed to develop and adopt a FAB Performance Plan

Description of the process
Not applicable

1.7 - Establishment and application of a simplified charging scheme

Is the State intending to establish and apply a simplified charging scheme for any charging zone/ANSP?	No

SECTION 2: INVESTMENTS

2.0 - Summary of investments

2.1 - Investments - NAVIAIR

- 2.1.1 - Summary of investments
- 2.1.2 - Detail of new major investments
- 2.1.3 - Other new and existing investments

2.2 - Investments - DMI

- 2.2.1 - Summary of investments
- 2.2.2 - Detail of new major investments
- 2.2.3 - Other new and existing investments

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX E. INVESTMENTS

NOTE: The requirements as per Annex II, 2.2.(c) are addressed in item 4.1.3

2.0 - Summary of Investments

NAVIAIR

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)					
				2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
New major investments for RP4 (Table A)	427.660.465	427.660.465	Average NBV	51.600.529	152.926.451	255.379.339	344.335.774	372.596.801
			Depreciation	1.812.874	3.916.470	12.751.159	22.882.568	27.316.301
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Other new investments for RP4 (below 5M€) (Table B)	125.202.970	479.794.835	Average NBV	43.916.011	69.995.062	137.598.641	201.728.428	271.369.669
			Depreciation	3.602.195	12.604.839	15.836.839	27.305.521	36.559.176
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Major investments from RP3 (Tables C + D)	198.907.032	198.907.032	Average NBV	176.065.163	169.807.950	154.373.371	138.938.792	123.504.213
			Depreciation	15.018.689	15.434.579	15.434.579	15.434.579	15.434.579
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Existing investments from previous reference periods (Table E)	2.704.805.038	2.434.324.535	Average NBV	755.285.097	695.495.642	611.395.528	522.786.263	451.095.380
			Depreciation	80.769.243	76.927.791	72.958.419	61.111.154	55.055.500
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Total for the ANSP in RP4	**3.456.575.505**	**3.540.686.866**	Average NBV	**1.026.866.800**	**1.088.225.105**	**1.158.746.879**	**1.207.789.257**	**1.218.566.064**
			Depreciation	**101.203.000**	**108.883.679**	**116.980.996**	**126.733.821**	**134.365.556**
			Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

DMI

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)					
				2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
New major investments for RP4 (Table A)	0	0	Average NBV	0	0	0	0	0
			Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Other new investments for RP4 (below 5M€) (Table B)	0	NA	Average NBV	8.724.050	7.889.100	6.806.200	6.942.750	7.081.125
			Depreciation	623.354	635.821	648.538	661.508	674.738
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Major investments from RP3 (Tables C + D)	0	0	Average NBV	0	0	0	0	0
			Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Existing investments from previous reference periods (Table E)	NA	NA	Average NBV	26.172.150	23.667.300	20.418.600	20.828.250	21.243.375
			Depreciation	1.870.062	1.907.463	1.945.613	1.984.525	2.024.215
			Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0
Total for the ANSP in RP4	**0**	**0**	Average NBV	**34.896.200**	**31.556.400**	**27.224.800**	**27.771.000**	**28.324.500**
			Depreciation	**2.493.416**	**2.543.284**	**2.594.150**	**2.646.033**	**2.698.954**
			Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

2.1 - Investments - NAVIAIR

Complementary information may be provided in ***ANNEX E***

2.1.1 - Investments from RP4

Table A - Number of new major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) for RP4	7

Ref. #	Name of new major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) for RP4	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)						Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Planned date of entry into operation	Allocation (%)*	
					2025	2026	2027	2028	2029			En route*	Terminal*
A1	COOPANS Legacy	52.750.521	52.750.521	Average NBV	11.713.119	36.906.764	37.739.178	36.828.531	35.832.576	15	2025-2028	95%	5%
				Depreciation	1.812.874	3.916.470	5.301.647	5.886.955	5.886.955				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A2	ATC One SW	125.202.970	125.202.970	Average NBV	7.500.000	27.800.594	51.001.188	85.001.782	111.502.376	15	2026-2030->	95%	5%
				Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A3	ATC One HW	52.502.275	52.502.275	Average NBV	3.902.275	5.502.275	25.002.275	52.502.275	44.626.934	6	2028	95%	5%
				Depreciation	0	0	0	7.875.341	7.875.341				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A4	EXODUS	72.502.479	72.502.479	Average NBV	24.502.479	48.502.479	72.502.479	67.668.980	62.835.482	15	2030->	95%	5%
				Depreciation	0	0	4.833.499	4.833.499	4.833.499				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A5	Radar 1	37.128.000	37.128.000	Average NBV	0	0	18.564.000	37.128.000	35.457.240	20	2028	100%	0%
				Depreciation	0	0	0	1.670.760	1.670.760				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A6	VCS Next Gen	49.256.000	49.256.000	Average NBV	0	0	12.252.000	29.504.000	49.256.000	6-15	2029	85%	15%
				Depreciation	0	0	0	0	4.433.733				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
A7	INFO Next Gen	38.318.219	38.318.219	Average NBV	3.982.655	34.214.339	38.318.219	35.702.206	33.086.193	6-20	2027	95%	5%
				Depreciation	0	0	2.616.013	2.616.013	2.616.013				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
Subtotal of new major investments from RP4		**427.660.465**	**427.660.465**	**Average NBV**	**51.600.529**	**152.926.451**	**255.379.339**	**344.335.774**	**372.596.801**				
				Depreciation	**1.812.874**	**3.916.470**	**12.751.159**	**22.882.568**	**27.316.301**				
				Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**				

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

Table B - Other new investments (below 5M€) from RP4

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)	Lifecycle (Amortisation	Planned date of entry into	Allocation (%)*

	contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	performance plan (in **national currency**)		2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	(Amortisation period in years)	of entry into operation	En route*	Terminal*
Subtotal of other new investments from RP4	**533.105.372**	**479.794.835**	**Average NBV**	**43.916.011**	**69.995.062**	**137.598.641**	**201.728.428**	**271.369.669**			86%	14%
			Depreciation	**3.602.195**	**12.604.839**	**15.836.839**	**27.305.521**	**36.559.176**				
			Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**				

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

2.1.2 - Investments from RP3

Table C - Number of major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) from RP3 performance plan	2

Ref. #	Name of major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) stemming from RP3 performance plan	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Planned date of entry into operation	Allocation (%)* En route*	Allocation (%)* Terminal*
C1	COOPANS build 3.x extension	163.750.972	163.750.972	Average NBV	146.670.579	135.710.903	122.394.350	109.077.797	95.761.244	6-15	07-01-2024	95%	5%
				Depreciation	13.959.676	13.316.553	13.316.553	13.316.553	13.316.553				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
C2	Back-up ATM	35.156.060	35.156.060	Average NBV	29.394.584	34.097.047	31.979.021	29.860.995	27.742.970	6-15	01-01-2024	95%	5%
				Depreciation	1.059.013	2.118.026	2.118.026	2.118.026	2.118.026				
				Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0				
Subtotal of major investments from RP3 performance plan		**198.907.032**	**198.907.032**	**Average NBV**	**176.065.163**	**169.807.950**	**154.373.371**	**138.938.792**	**123.504.213**				
				Depreciation	**15.018.689**	**15.434.579**	**15.434.579**	**15.434.579**	**15.434.579**				
				Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**				

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

Table D - Number of major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) added during RP3	0

2.1.3 - Existing investments from previous reference periods

Table E - Existing investments from previous RPs

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Planned date of entry into operation	Allocation (%)* En route*	Allocation (%)* Terminal*
Subtotal of existing investments from previous RPs	**2.704.805.038**	**2.434.324.535**	**Average NBV**	**755.285.097**	**695.495.642**	**611.395.528**	**522.786.263**	**451.095.380**			85%	15%
			Depreciation	**80.769.243**	**76.927.791**	**72.958.419**	**61.111.154**	**55.055.500**				
			Cost of leasing	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**				

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

2.1.4 - Detail of new major investments for RP4 from table A

NOTE: Section 1.3 (Stakeholder Consultation) should include details on the consultation with airspace users' representatives on new major investments.

Name of new major investment 1	***COOPANS Legacy***			Reference #	***A1***	Total value of the asset		***52.750.521***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other	
		X							
Description of the asset	COOPANS legacy is Naviairs existing main ATM system (COOPANS/TopSky) which requires regular updates (both SW and HW) to enure it fulfills the combined COOPANS operational requirementes for a main ATM system.								
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	No								
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan	N/A								
Level of impact of the investment	Network level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH FIR can be maintained.							
	Local level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH airport and CPH FIR can be maintained.							
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency		
	Negligeable		Negligeable		Negligeable		Negligeable		
Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives									
Joint investment / partnership	Yes	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives			COOPANS: ACG, Airnav Ireland, CCL, LFV, Naviair, Nav Portugala				

Name of new major investment 2	***ATC One SW***			Reference #	***A2***	Total value of the asset		***125.202.970***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other	
		X				*X*			

Description of the asset		**Name: AAA (EXODUS & ATC One).** The existing ATM system in use has been in operational service for over 12 years, making it outdated and at the end of its operational life. The technological advancements and changes in the aviation industry have rendered the current system less effective and efficient compared to modern solutions. The latest version of TopSky has undergone a significant transformation to enhance its performance. Thales has undertaken key modifications aimed at simplifying its architecture and increasing its flexibility. One pivotal change involves reengineering the fundamental components of the system. Thales is transitioning from a complex configuration to a more streamlined framework that offers greater adaptability. This transition necessitated several modifications, such as adopting a new operating system, utilizing containerization technology for software management, and incorporating a service layer for seamless integration. The system operates using Java, a modern and widely used programming language. Additionally, Thales has revamped the user interface, making it more intuitive and user-friendly. These modifications enable easier integration with third-party solutions, enhancing the system's adaptability. Thales has implemented advanced development and testing methodologies. They've employed modern practices to expedite and optimize their processes. For instance, they've encapsulated different software components into containers, facilitating better organization and management. They've also automated various tasks, improving the overall efficiency. This updated system also features new capabilities such as Dynamic Airspace Management, Aircraft Capability Management, Virtual Central Operations, Open ATM, and Automatic Speech Recognition (exclusively for simulations). Thales has incorporated a new research to refine the HMI, making it more user-friendly. In summary, Thales has undertaken a comprehensive overhaul of the existing air traffic management system, resulting in a simplified, more intelligent, and more interoperable solution. These improvements enhance its capabilities, adaptability, and usability, ultimately contributing to more effective air traffic control operations.			
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	Yes	Modernization is necessary to achieve the CP1 (Common Project 1) compliance. The compliance with regulatory standards and requirements is crucial for maintaining operational integrity and safety. The upgraded system will incorporate features and capabilities that better align with CP1 and future requirements and standards.			
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan		The modernization effort will bring COOPANS in line with the European ATM Master Plan and the Digital Europen Sky initiative. This overhaul creates enblers for the future DPO implementation.			
Level of impact of the investment	Network level				
	Local level				
Quantitative impact per KPA		Safety	Environment	Capacity	Cost Efficiency
		Major	Significant	Significant	Major

Benefits for airspace users and results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives		Resilience (Business Continuity and Security) The upgraded ATM system is expected to be more resilient in terms of software, and security. Using the latest technology, including cutting-edge cybersecurity methods, improves resilience, ensuring better business continuity, minimizing disruptions due to technical failures or security breaches. This enhanced resilience directly contributes to maintaining the safety and security of air traffic operations. Safety The upgraded ATM system enhances operational safety through introducing a variety of new features. These provide ATCOs with better situational awareness, improving decision making and equipping them with the tools to respond swiftly to any arising issues. Capacity The upgraded system is anticipated to offer greater capacity, enabling it to handle a higher flights volume. As air travel demand continues to increase, having the ability to manage more flights efficiently is crucial for avoiding congestion and delays within the airspace. Productivity The upgraded ATM system will incorporate advanced controller tools that empower air traffic controllers (ATCOs) to efficiently manage more flights per ATCO hour. These tools could include automation, data analytics, and improved decision-support systems, all of which can streamline operations and enhance overall productivity. Cost effectiveness The decision to upgrade the current system to the TopSky One system provides a cost-effective solution that is compatible with the previous levels of capital expenditure by the COOPANS partners and which, through cost-sharing, represents a considerably lower investment rate per ANSP than for the other ANSPs served by the same supplier or, indeed, the other suppliers in Europe.	
Joint investment / partnership	Yes	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives	Digital Sky Demonstartor - Project 101122636 — 22-EU-TG-EXODUS

Name of new major investment 3	***ATC One HW***		Reference #	***A3***	Total value of the asset		***52.502.275***
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system	Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other
Description of the asset	**See ATC One SW (line 301)**						
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	Yes						
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan							
Level of impact of the investment	Network level						
	Local level						
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency
	Click to select		Click to select		Click to select		Click to select
Benefits for airspace users and results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives	**See ATC One SW (line 313)**						

Joint investment / partnership	Yes	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives	

Name of new major investment 4	***EXODUS***		Reference #	***A4***	Total value of the asset		***72.502.479***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other
Description of the asset	**See ATC One SW (line 301)**							
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	Yes							
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan								
Level of impact of the investment	Network level							
	Local level							
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency	
	Click to select		Click to select		Click to select		Click to select	
Benefits for airspace users and results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives	**See ATC One SW (line 313)**							
Joint investment / partnership	Yes	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives						

Name of new major investment 5	***Radar 1***		Reference #	***A5***	Total value of the asset		***37.128.000***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other
					X			
Description of the asset	The Radar 1 upgrade/replacement is an upgrade or a replacement of Naviairs existing combined main radar (Mode S and primary) situated at Copenhagen Airport which officially has been declared End-Of-Life by the radar supplier.							
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	No							
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan	N/A							
Level of impact of the investment	Network level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH FIR can be maintained.						
	Local level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH airport and CPH FIR can be maintained.						
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency	
	Negligeable		Negligeable		Negligeable		Significant	
Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives								

Joint investment / partnership	No	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives	

Name of new major investment 6	***VCS Next Gen***		Reference #	***A6***	Total value of the asset		***49.256.000***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other
	X							
Description of the asset	The VCS Next Generation is a replacement of Naviairs existing main VCS system which officially has been declared End-Of-Life by the system supplier.							
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	No							
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan	The VCS Next Generation system will be a 100 % VoIP based system with a modern distributed and service oriented system architecture thereby supporting SDO #08 - Service-oriented delivery model (data driven and cloud based).							
Level of impact of the investment	Network level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH FIR can be maintained.						
	Local level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH airport and CPH FIR can be maintained.						
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency	
	Negligeable		Negligeable		Negligeable		Significant	
Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives								
Joint investment / partnership	No	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives						

Name of new major investment 7	***INFO Next Gen***		Reference #	***A7***	Total value of the asset		***38.318.219***	
Main category of the investment	New ATM system	Overhaul of existing ATM system		Other ATM	CNS	Infrastructure	Ancilliary	Other
				X				
Description of the asset	The INFO Next Generation is a replacement of Naviairs existing ATCO INFO system which is End-Of-Life (20+ years). The system contains several different types of operational important data needed by the ATCO at the CWP: weather data, check lists, contact lists, etc.							
Is the investment mandated by a SES Regulation (i.e. PCP/CP1/Interoperability)? If yes please provide description/reference	No							
For investments in new ATM systems and major overhauls of ATM systems, information on the consistency of the investment with the European ATM Master Plan	The INFO Next Generation system will be a system with a modern distributed and service oriented system architecture thereby supporting SDO #08 - Service-oriented delivery model (data driven and cloud based).							
Level of impact of the investment	Network level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH FIR can be maintained.						
	Local level	Existing safety, capacity and regularity in CPH airport and CPH FIR can be maintained.						
Quantitative impact per KPA	Safety		Environment		Capacity		Cost Efficiency	
	Negligeable		Negligeable		Negligeable		Significant	
Results of the consultation of airspace users' representatives								

Joint investment / partnership	No	If yes, please provide reference to joint project and/or indicate reference to cross-border initiatives	

2.1.5 - Details on other new investments for RP4 from table B

Overall description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period
In generel Naviairs investements are aimed at ensuring the continous delivery by Naviair of high quality (zero delay; zero safety incidents & environmental impact) air navigation services to all air space users in Copenhangen Flight Information Region including delegated airspaces. Naviair is preparing for a significant upgrade of its primary Air Traffic Management (ATM) system scheduled for an O-date in RP4. This upgrade will necessitate accelerated depreciation of several ancillary systems, as well as additional depreciation of building investments to meet enhanced sustainability and security standards. The ATM system upgrade will not only demand technical resources but also demand substantial operational resources during its development and implementation phases. For ATM, the main investements are related to the replacement of the existing COOPANS TopSky system with COOPANS ATC One while ensuring that the existing COOPANS system is fit for purpose until the new ATC One system has become operational. In addition, a key ATCO information system used in ACC and APP/TWR in Copenhagen, Roskilde and Billund airports need to be replaced as the existing information system is End-of-Life. Also the main VCS system in ACC and APP/TWR in Copenhagen airport need to be replaced as the supplier of the existing main VCS has declared it End-of-Life. For CNS, the main investments are related to a renovation and rationalization of Naviairs surveillance infrastructure in part forced by a system supplier leaving the business (WAM) and in part due to existing radars at Copenhagen and Aarhus airports being End-of-Life. Furtheremore Naviair has initiated the replacement of the ground based Naviaigation DME infrastructure (VOR) to support MON, after which a replacement and potential enhancement of the DME infrastructure will be initiated. Finally, Naviair is continously maintaining Naviair's building and other infrastructure in order to secure an efficient and reliable operational working environment. In RP4, Naviair plans to undertake major renovations of its buildings and other crucial systems, some of which are nearly two decades old. From 2000 to 2007-08, Naviair executed extensive updates and acquisitions of buildings and ATM infrastructure, including a new tower and control center. These assets are now approaching obsolescence and require timely replacement or renovation to avoid increased operational expenditures (OPEX) that would otherwise be necessary to extend their usable life.

Ref. #	Name of other new investments for RP4	Master Plan reference (if any)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)						Description
						2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	
B1	Physical security		28.026.822	28.026.822	Average NBV	16.103.247	28.026.822	25.224.140	22.421.458	19.618.776	The physical security of Naviairs HQ and Tower in Copenhagen Airport has to be updated and improved with new access control system, speed
					Depreciation	0	2.802.682	2.802.682	2.802.682	2.802.682	
					Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0	
B2	WAM Mid-Life-Upgrade		24.564.000	24.564.000	Average NBV	0	0	1.782.000	12.282.000	24.564.000	Naviairs WAM system supplier has decided to leave the WAM business and Naviair therefore needs to mid-life-upgrade the existing WAM
					Depreciation	0	0	0	0	2.456.400	
					Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0	
B3	Radar 7		11.064.000	11.064.000	Average NBV	0	5.532.000	11.064.000	10.510.800	9.957.600	The exiting Radar 7 situated near EKAH needs to be replaced as it is End-of-life.
					Depreciation	0	0	553.200	553.200	553.200	
					Cost of leasing	0	0	0	0	0	
					Average NBV						

B4					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B5					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B6					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B7					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B8					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B9					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B10					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						

2.2 - Investments - DMI

Complementary information may be provided in ***ANNEX E***

2.2.1 - Investments from RP4

Table A - Number of new major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) for RP4	0

Table B - Other new investments (below 5M€) from RP4

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)						Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Planned date of entry into operation	Allocation (%)*	
				2025	2026	2027	2028	2029			En route*	Terminal*
Subtotal of other new investments from RP4	**NA**	**NA**	**Average NBV**	**8.724.050**	**7.889.100**	**6.806.200**	**6.942.750**	**7.081.125**			100%	
			Depreciation	**623.354**	**635.821**	**648.538**	**661.508**	**674.738**				
			Cost of leasing									

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

2.2.2 - Investments from RP3

Table C - Number of major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) from RP3 performance plan	0

Table D - Number of major investments (i.e. above 5 M€) added during RP3	0

2.2.3 - Existing investments from previous reference periods

Table E - Existing investments from previous RPs

	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)						Lifecycle (Amortisation period in years)	Planned date of entry into operation	Allocation (%)*	
				2025	2026	2027	2028	2029			En route*	Terminal*
Subtotal of existing investments from previous RPs	**NA**	**NA**	**Average NBV**	**26.172.150**	**23.667.300**	**20.418.600**	**20.828.250**	**21.243.375**			100%	
			Depreciation	**1.870.062**	**1.907.463**	**1.945.613**	**1.984.525**	**2.024.215**				
			Cost of leasing									

** En route/Terminal allocation within the scope of the Regulation. The total % En route+terminal should be equal to 100%.*

2.2.4 - Detail of new major investments for RP4 from table A

Not applicable

2.2.5 - Details on other new investments for RP4 from table B

Overall description and justification of the costs nature and benefits of other new and existing investments in fixed assets planned over the reference period
DMI has ongoing replacement of IT equipment and measuring equipment. The figures are with the reservation that changes may occur as a result of postponement, supplier challenges and other management decisions and priorities.

Ref. #	Name of other new investments for RP4	Master Plan reference (if any)	Total value of the asset (capex or contractual leasing value) (in **national currency**)	Value of the assets allocated to ANS in the scope of the performance plan (in **national currency**)	Elements for the calculation of the determined costs of investments (net book value (NBV), depreciation and cost of leasing) (in **national currency**)						Description
						2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	
B1					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B2					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B3					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B4					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B5					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B6					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B7					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B8					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B9					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						
B10					Average NBV						
					Depreciation						
					Cost of leasing						

SECTION 3: PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND MEASURES FOR THEIR ACHIEVEMENT

3.1 - Safety targets

3.1.1 - Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management achieved by ANSPs

3.2 - Environment targets

3.2.1 - Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en route flight efficiency (KEA)

3.3 - Capacity targets

3.3.1 - Capacity KPI #1: En route ATFM delay per flight

3.3.2 - Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight

3.3.3 - ATCO Planning

3.4 - Cost-efficiency targets

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

En Route Charging Zone #x

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

Terminal Charging Zone #x

3.4.3 - Cost allocation ATSP/CNSP

ATSP/CNSP #x

3.4.4 - Cost allocation METSP

METSP #x

3.4.5 - Cost allocation NSA

3.4.6 - Determined costs assumptions

ANSP #x

3.4.7 - Pension assumptions

3.4.8 - Interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services

3.4.9 -Additional determined costs related to measures necessary to achieve the en route capacity targets

3.4.10 - Restructuring costs

3.5 - Additional KPIs / Targets

3.6 - Description of KPAs interdependencies and trade-offs including the assumptions used to assess those trade-offs

3.6.1 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between safety and other KPAs

3.6.2 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between capacity and environment

3.6.3 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between cost-efficiency and capacity

3.6.4 - Other interdependencies and trade-offs

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX A. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (EN-ROUTE)

ANNEX B. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TERMINAL)

ANNEX F. BASELINE VALUES (COST-EFFICIENCY)

ANNEX H. RESTRUCTURING MEASURES AND COSTS

ANNEX M. COST ALLOCATION

ANNEX J. OPTIONAL KPIs AND TARGETS

ANNEX O. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL SAFETY TARGETS

ANNEX P. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TARGETS

ANNEX Q. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL CAPACITY TARGETS

ANNEX R. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL COST-EFFICIENCY TARGETS

ANNEX U. VERIFICATION BY THE NSA OF THE COMPLIANCE OF THE COST BASE

SECTION 3.1: SAFETY KPA

3.1 - Safety targets

3.1.1 - Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management achieved by ANSPs

a) Safety national performance targets

b) Justifications for the local safety performance targets

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the safety performance targets

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX O. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL SAFETY TARGETS

3 - PERFORMANCE TARGETS AT LOCAL LEVEL

3.1 - Safety targets

3.1.1 - Safety KPI #1: Level of Effectiveness of Safety Management achieved by ANSPs

a) Safety performance targets

	Number of Air Traffic Service Providers	1

		2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
NAVIAIR	Safety policy and objectives	B	C	C	C	C
	Safety risk management	C	C	C	C	D
	Safety assurance	B	B	B	C	C
	Safety promotion	B	B	B	B	C
	Safety culture	B	B	C	C	C
	Additional comments					

b) Justifications for the local safety performance targets

Naviair considers the safety performance targets set by RP4 for 2029 sufficient and ambitious, and applicable as local safety perfomance targets.

** Refer to Annex O, if necessary.*

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local safety performance targets

Enclosed in annex O you will find the draft implementation plan for the requirements in the 5 areas laid down in the draft RP4 S(K)PI guidance material.
In the plan there are information on when each of the 5 areas will be completed.

There are many identified impendences between the five areas which are not yet settled in the plan which may influence on when specific requirements will be met.

However generally the requirements to be achieved early in RP4 will drive later scheduled requirements to be implemented at an earlier stage.

The implementation plan focuses on goals and activities in areas from RP4 S(K)PI´s where Naviair not already considers the requirements to be met. The structure of the implementation plan is aligned with the structure in the draft RP4 Guidance Material. The plan will be subject for continuous review in order to be aligned with other internal safety-related projects.

In the expected cost-level of 2024 (baseline) the management has committed to allocate the necessary resources to achieve the local safety performance targets. Hence, the implementation plan is pending approval of the expected cost level of 2024.

** Refer to Annex O, if necessary.*

SECTION 3.2: ENVIRONMENT KPA

3.2 - Environment targets

3.2.1 - Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en route flight efficiency (KEA)

a) Environment national performance targets

b) Justifications for the local environment performance targets

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the environment performance targets

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX P. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TARGETS

3.2 - Environment targets

3.2.1 - Environment KPI #1: Horizontal en route flight efficiency (KEA)

a) National environment performance targets

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
National reference values	1,43%	1,42%	1,41%	1,40%	1,39%

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
National targets	1,43%	1,42%	1,41%	1,40%	1,39%

b) Justifications for the local environment performance targets

The Network Manager's national reference values are chosen as national performance targets, and consistency is therefore complied with.

** Refer to Annex P, if necessary.*

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local environment performance targets

In the previous RPs, Naviair has put in substantial effort to improve the environmental performance and shorten the flight routes in the Danish Airspace. Both Flexible Use of Airspace and Free Route Airspace are fully implemented in Denmark as well as Performance Based Navigation at Copenhagen Airport/Kastrup.
This has also resulted in previous monitoring reports, that the means available in Denmark to further improve the environmental performance is limited. Naviair is currently among the top performing Member States in HFE-performance.

The continuous review of the network together with the work that has already been done to shorten the flight routes in the airspace is seen as an indicator of the Danish contribution to the EU wide target as already fulfilled.

In 2025 Denmark will implement new military training areas for the newly purchased F-35 fighter aircrafts. This represent an increase in the airspace reserved for military training, and combined with changed flows due to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, it is anticipated that the environmental performance will be affected. Already now the use of F-35 in Danish airspace indicates higher workloads for ATCOs.

Naviair prioritizes contributing to the reduction of CO2 emissions from flying. Sufficient capacity is essential to be able to deliver on the targets, hence it is paramount that Naviair builds up the necessary capacity as soon as possible. With an increased operational robustness, Naviair will put effort into ensuring a high performance and expects to be able to deliver on the targets.

** Refer to Annex P, if necessary.*

SECTION 3.3: CAPACITY KPA

3.3 - Capacity targets

3.3.1 - Capacity KPI #1: En route ATFM delay per flight
- a) National capacity performance targets
- b) Justifications for the local en route capacity performance targets
- c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local en route capacity performance targets

3.3.2 - Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight
- a) National capacity performance targets
- b) Justifications for the local terminal capacity performance targets, including contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance
- c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local terminal capacity performance targets

3.3.3 - ATCO planning
- a) ATCOs in the scope of the performance plan
- b) ATCO planning at ACC level
- c) ATCO training

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX Q. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL CAPACITY TARGETS

3.3 - Capacity targets

3.3.1 - Capacity KPI #1: En route ATFM delay per flight

a) National capacity performance targets

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
National reference values	0,17	0,13	0,10	0,10	0,10

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
National targets	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,10

b) Justifications for the local en route capacity performance targets

National targets for En route have adjusted to 0,10 min. in 2025 and -26 compared to the reference values set by the PRB in order to increase the level of ambition. Although the targets are slightly above the targets set for PR3, Naviair foresees that the planned investment in ATCO resources are crucial to meet the future requirements. The ATCO shortage in Naviair is expected to improve in the coming years and should support the capacity targets for RP4.

Minor studies have been launched in terms of ACC secotorisation, division flight level as well as an expansion of FRA to lower levels. In order to optimize such measures, make them consistent at network level and deliver the highest possible benefits, should they prove to deliver improvements, such will be embedded in the future edition of the European Route Network Improvement Plan (ERNIP)- Part 2 as well as in the NOP.

** Refer to Annex Q, if necessary.*

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local en route capacity performance targets

Investments in recruitment and training of ATCOs in the entire RP4 period. Naviair has implemented and is following the standards and recommended practise developed by the Network Manager in terms of Air Traffic Flow and Capacity Management.

In 2025 Denmark will implement new military training areas for the newly purchased F-35 fighter aircrafts. This represents an increase in the airspace reserved for military training.

The new military training areas and Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine influence the performance of capacity in terms of congestion, coordination of airspace closures, and increased complexity.

** Refer to Annex Q, if necessary.*

3.3.2 - Capacity KPI #2: Terminal and airport ANS ATFM arrival delay per flight

a) National capacity performance targets

		2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
		Target	Target	Target	Target	Target
National targets		0,2	0,1	0,1	0,1	0,1
Additional comments						
Airport level	***EKCH-Copenhagen***	0,20	0,10	0,10	0,10	0,10
	Airport contribution to national targets					

b) Justifications for the local terminal capacity performance targets, including contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance

In light of the staff shortage at Copenhagen TWR and APP, the national targets for Copenhagen Airport, Kastrup has been set slightly higher/at the same level as within the RP3 period. In a period of heavy investment in ATCO recruitment, training and consolidation the TWR/APP Unit will experience an increased workload which has been factored in when setting the local capacity performance target.

The following supporting projects/enablers implemented at Copenhagen Airport, Kastrup have already contributed to the network performance.

- Airport Collaborative Decision Making (A-CDM),
- Departure manager (DMAN), Continuous climb operations (CCO),
- Continuous descent operation (CDO),
- Arrival manager (AMAN),
- Advanced Surface Movement Guidance and Control System (A-SMGCS)

** Refer to Annex Q, if necessary.*

c) Main measures put in place to achieve the local terminal capacity performance targets

Investments in recruitment and training of ATCOs in the entire RP4 period. Naviair har implemented and are following the standards and recommended practice developed by the Network Manager in terms of Air Traffic Flow and Capacity Management. Naviair will aim at an ambitious target at 0,20 minutes of delay pr. arrival in 2025.

Naviair will maintain the ambitious terminal capacity target from previous reference period with 0.10 minutes of delay pr. arrival from 2026.
In the beginning of RP4, the operational robustness will still be ramping up, which impacts the target ambition.

** Refer to Annex Q, if necessary.*

3.3.3 - ATCO planning and training

NAVIAIR

a) ATCOs in the scope of the performance plan

ATCOs in the scope of the performance plan		Actual	Forecast	Planned				
		2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Number of ATCO in OPS (year-end FTEs) employed by the ANSP (for services within the scope of the performance plan)	ACC	81	81	87	88	89	89	90
	APP	48	49	55	55	56	56	57
	TWR	32	32	36	37	37	37	38
Number of ATCOs in OPS (year-end FTEs) allocated to the en route cost base(s)		129	131	141	143	144	146	147
Number of ATCO on other duties (year-end FTEs) employed by the ANSP		54	54	59	60	60	61	62

b) ATCO planning at ACC level

	Actual	Forecast	Planned				
Copenhagen (EKDK ACC)	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Number of additional ATCOs in OPS planned to start working in the OPS room (FTEs)	9	5	9	8	9	8	5
Number of ATCOs in OPS planned to stop working in the OPS room (FTEs)	5	5	3	7	8	7	5
Number of ATCOs in OPS planned to be operational at year-end (FTEs)	81	81	87	88	89	89	90

Additional comments
Naviair foresees that the planned investment in ATCO resources is crucial to meeting future requirements. The ATCO shortage in Naviair is expected to improve in the coming years and should support a high performance on RP4. Naviair is experiencing ATCO understaffing due to under investments in training in the 2010's, COVID-19 adjustments, and demography (retirements). The lack of ATCO's resulted in a high level of delays in the spring/early summer of 2023 and since then it has been mitigated by extensive use of extra shifts. Naviair is currently investing in training, recruitment and retainment to en-sure increased operational robustness. The training, recruitment and retain-ment is expected to result in an increase in the number of ATCOs over the next years. This increase will accommodate both the current shortage of staff, and the demography of the ATCOs. By the end of RP3 69 out of total 251 have passed the legal retirement age (55+), and another 51 ATCOs can legally retire during RP4. The upscale in training effort also strains the number of ATCOs needed for instructor duties, re-training of existing ATCOs, unit training etc. Naviair plans with a retirement age of 60 years as the most realistic assumption. By the end of RP3 20 ATCOs out of total 251 have passed the realistic retirement age (60+), and another 49 of the ATCOs will realistically retire during RP4. In the years 2018 and 2019 Naviair provided service with very low/postponed recruitment and use of extra shifts were necessary to provide the required level of service. In the coming years the ATCO resources will be directed more towards activities related to training of new ATCOs but with efforts to support efficiency gains servicing a 2019-level performance while also controlling the need for extra shifts. Naviair entered a temporary agreement with the ATCOs in June 2023 to mitigate the adverse effects of understaffing until enough ATCOs have been trained. The agreement includes initiatives such as retention bonus and payment for extra duty as well as performance linked KPI's (increased productivity etc.). 1) Number of additional ATCOs in OPA include confirmed hires (in 2024 only) and only ab initio students - not internal educations. Internal shifts/education sometimes lead to discrepancies between total year-end ATCOs and the shown "additional" and "stopped" ATCOs 2) Number of ATCOs planned to stop working mainly reflects planned retirements when ATCOs turn 60 years of age. 3) Number of additional ATCOs and ATCOs planned to stop working are calculated from 75% in scope of the performance plan and does not inlucde the 25% for other duties. Meanwhile, number of trainees planned to enter the training program include "full" FTEs (of 100% occupation) and does not distinguesh between the 75/25% assumption.

c) ATCO Training

ATCO trainees of the ANSP		Actual	Forecast	Planned				
		2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Number of trainees planned to enter the training program(s) during the year.		15	18	16	13	18	14	14
Number of trainees expected to complete the training program(s) during the year based on statistical estimates.		3	2	8	9	10	10	8
Number ATCO trainees at year end.		18	34	39	38	40	38	39

Description of the training process, including details on the average failure rate and the process used to allocate newly qualified ATCOs between ACC, APP and TWR positions.
ATCO training contains training of ATCOs starting from recruitment, initial training and through unit training. Naviair allocates newly qualified ATCOs between ACC, APP and TWR in accordance with the identified long-term needs to ensure safety and robustness. ATCO students attend initial training along with the associated rating courses depending on the rating they need to obtain (including TWR, APP, or ACC). Once the students are qualified, the allocation of newly qualified ATCOs to TWR, APP or ACC positions is based on several factors, including the specific needs of the different sectors (ACC) or the different TWR/APP units in Denmark. Each phase can be elaborated as follows: 1. Recruitment: This phase includes competency tests, physical tests, and secu-rity clearances to ensure that the right candidates are selected from the beginning. This part of the process is critical to minimize dropout rates and ensure the value of the investment. Naviair conducts the process, and the duration of the phase is approximately 9 months from when the recruitment process is initiated until the selected candidates are screened and approved. 2. Initial Training: After recruitment, the candidates undergo initial training, where they are trained in various ratings necessary to obtain a student license in accordance with EU-legislation. Naviair has neither an active nor passive training certificate and has outsourced the initial training to subcontractors, e.g. Entry Point North (EPN), or via procurement. Naviair aims to provide its own instructors whenever possible, but due to resource constraints, it often needed to purchase these services from subcontractors. The duration of the training in-cluded in a student license is approximately 14 months and is roughly the same regardless of the educational purpose (ACC, TWR/APP). 3. Unit Training: This phase includes specific training in the individual unit's pro-cedures, airspace, and workflows. Naviair conducts the process, and the length of this unit training is aligned with and approved by the Danish Civil Aviation and Railway Authority (CAA) in reference to applicable EU-legislation. The more complex and traffic-heavy units require longer unit training. Naviair provides its own instructors, and after this simulated training, an On the Job phase follows, where the trainee works directly under the supervision of experienced personnel (under their responsibility/certification). This phase has a duration of approximately 8 to 18 months. Naviair’s training process fully complies with the relevant legislation (EU2015/340), including regulation for initial training and unit training (the latter including transitional training, pre-OJT training and OJT training). Naviair expects an average failure rate for the full education duration of 35%.

SECTION 3.4: COST-EFFICIENCY KPA

3.4 - Cost-efficiency targets

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

En Route Charging Zone #x

a) RP4 cost-efficiency performance targets

b) Information on the baseline values for the determined costs and the determined unit costs

c) Detailed justifications for the adjustments to the baseline values

d) Justification of the consistency of the local cost-efficiency performance targets with the Union-wide targets

e) Where a deviation from the Union-wide performance targets is observed, please indicate if the NSA considers those deviations to be necessary and proportionate

f) Main measures put in place to achieve the targets for determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

g) Verification by the NSA

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

Terminal Charging Zone #x

a) RP4 cost-efficiency performance targets

b) Information on the baseline values for the determined costs and the determined unit costs

c) Detailed justifications for the adjustments to the baseline values

d) Justifications for the local terminal cost-efficiency performance targets, including contribution to the improvement of the

e) Main measures put in place to achieve the targets for determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

f) Verification by the NSA

3.4.3 - Cost Allocation ATSP/CNSP

ATSP/CNSP #x

a) Summary of services provided

b) Allocation of costs by segment

c) Allocation of costs related to the provision of approach services

d) Description of other services and activities outside the scope of the performance plan and their financing

e) Changes in cost allocation methodology

f) Verification by the NSA

3.4.4 - Cost Allocation METSP

METSP #x

a) Summary of services provided

b) Allocation of costs by segment

c) Breakdown of determined meteorological costs between direct and core costs and allocation between en route and terminal services

d) Meteorological direct costs and allocation across charging zone(s)

e) Meteorological core costs and allocation across charging zone(s)

f) Changes in cost allocation methodology

g) Verification by the NSA

3.4.5 - Cost allocation NSA

a) Supervision costs

b) Search and rescue costs (if reported as part of the NSA costs)

c) Changes in cost allocation methodology

d) Verification by the NSA

3.4.6 - Determined costs assumptions

ANSP #x

3.4.6.1 - Operating costs

3.4.6.2 - Capital costs

3.4.6.3 - Costs for VFR exempted flights

3.4.6.4 - NSA verification

3.4.7 - Pension assumptions

3.4.7.1 Total pension costs

3.4.7.2 Assumptions for the "State" pension scheme

3.4.7.3 Assumptions for the occupational "Defined contributions" pension scheme

3.4.7.4 Assumptions for the occupational "Defined benefits" pension scheme

3.4.8 - Interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services

3.4.9 - Additional determined costs related to measures necessary to achieve the en route capacity targets

a) Overall description of the measures necessary to achieve the en-route capacity targets for RP4, which induce additional costs

b) Detailed information on the additional costs of measures necessary to achieve the capacity targets for RP4

c) Detailed information on the additional costs of measures necessary to achieve the capacity targets for RP4 by nature by ANSP

d) Demonstration that the deviation from the Union-wide targets is exclusively due to the additional determined costs related to measures necessary to achieve the performance targets in capacity

3.4.10 - Restructuring costs

3.4.10.1 Restructuring costs from previous reference periods to be recovered in RP4

3.4.10.2 Restructuring costs planned for RP4

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX A. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (EN-ROUTE)

ANNEX B. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TERMINAL)

ANNEX F. BASELINE VALUES (COST-EFFICIENCY)

ANNEX H. RESTRUCTURING MEASURES AND COSTS

ANNEX M. COST ALLOCATION

ANNEX R. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL COST-EFFICIENCY TARGETS

ANNEX U. VERIFICATION BY THE NSA OF THE COMPLIANCE OF THE COST BASE

3.4 - Cost-efficiency targets

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

En Route Charging Zone #1 - Denmark

a) RP4 cost-efficiency performance targets

En route charging zone Name of the CZ	Baseline 2019 2019 B	Baseline 2024 2024 B	RP4 cost-efficiency targets (determined 2025-2029) 2025 D	 2026 D	 2027 D	 2028 D	 2029 D	2029D vs. 2019B (CAGR)	2029D vs. 2024B (CAGR)
Total en route costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	727.182.254	874.283.360	902.613.984	919.487.154	935.932.392	948.191.391	947.886.871	3,0%	1,6%
Total en route costs in real terms (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**783.466.038**	**844.747.094**	**859.715.023**	**862.892.926**	**866.130.733**	**866.087.312**	**854.688.112**	1,0%	0,2%
Total en route costs in real terms (in EUR2022) [1]	105.342.379	113.582.037	115.594.578	116.021.869	116.457.214	116.451.376	114.918.675	1,0%	0,2%
YoY variation			0	0,4%	0,4%	0,0%	-1,3%		
Total en route Service Units (TSU)	1.679.151	1.570.566	1.639.873	1.681.511	1.713.248	1.745.024	1.767.052	0,6%	2,4%
YoY variation			0	2,5%	1,9%	1,9%	1,3%		
Real en route unit costs (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**466,58**	**537,86**	**524,26**	**513,17**	**505,55**	**496,32**	**483,68**	0,4%	-2,1%
Real en route unit costs (in EUR2022) [1]	**62,74**	**72,32**	**70,49**	**69,00**	**67,97**	**66,73**	**65,03**	0,4%	-2,1%
YoY variation			0	-2,1%	-1,5%	-1,8%	-2,5%		

National currency	**DKK**
[1] Average exchange rate 2022 (1 EUR=)	**7,44**
Actual inflation index 2024 - Base 100 in 2022	**104,74**

b) Information on the baseline values for the determined costs and the determined unit costs

En route charging zone Name of the CZ	Baseline 2019 2019 B	Baseline 2024 2024 B	Actuals 2019 2019 A	Actuals 2024 2024 A	2019 Baseline adjustments	2024 Baseline adjustments
Total en route costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	727.182.254	874.283.360	701.118.720	873.976.769	26.063.534	306.591
Total en route costs in real terms (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**783.466.038**	**844.747.094**	**756.576.946**	844.454.390	26.889.092	292.704
Total en route costs in real terms (in EUR2022) [1]	105.342.379	113.582.037	101.726.957	113.542.681	3.615.423	39.356
Total en route Service Units (TSU)	1.679.151	1.570.566	1.780.648	1.570.566	-101.497	0

c) Detailed justifications for the adjustments to the baseline values

c.1) Adjustments to the 2019 baseline value for the determined costs

Number of adjustments	5

Adjustment #1	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Netted out funding #1	Naviair	ANSP	Staff	5.486.034	6.083.638	817.987
Description and justification of the adjustment						
Description provided in Draft Annex F1						

Adjustment #2	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Netted out funding #2	Naviair	ANSP	Other operating	1.828.678	2.027.879	272.662
Description and justification of the adjustment						
Description provided in Draft Annex F1						

Adjustment #3	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Netted out funding #3	Naviair	ANSP	Depreciation	5.386.587	5.386.587	724.264
Description and justification of the adjustment						
Description provided in Draft Annex F1						

Adjustment #4	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Revised cost of capital methodology	Naviair	ANSP	Cost of capital	13.098.284	13.098.284	1.761.154
Description and justification of the adjustment						
Description provided in Draft Annex F2-4						

Adjustment #5	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Space Weather	DMI	MET	Other operating	263.951	292.704	39.356
Description and justification of the adjustment						
According to the "Joint Declaration by the States in the Single Sky Committee on the inclusion of charges for space weather information services in their RP4 performance plans" costs for space weather services have been added to the MET costbase. To avoid influence on the cost efficiency targets the 2019 and 2024 baselines have been adjusted with the planned 2029 space weather costs.						

Total adjustments to the 2019 baseline value for the determined costs	**Costs nominal NC**	**Costs real NC**	**Costs EUR2022**
	26.063.534	**26.889.092**	**3.615.423**
	26.063.534	26.889.092	3.615.423
c.2) Adjustments to the 2019 service units	0	0	0

Impact of transition to actual route flown	Actual service units (M2)	Coefficient M2/M3	Source	Actual service units (M3)	Service units adjustment
	1.780.648	-5,70%	CRCO correction factor May 2019 (on 12 months)	1.679.151	-101.497

Other adjustment to the 2019 service units	No

Total adjustments to the 2019 service units	-101.497

c.3) Adjustments to the 2024 baseline value for the determined costs

Number of adjustments	1

Adjustment #1	Entity name	Entity type	Nature	Costs nominal NC	Costs real NC	Costs EUR2022
Space Weather	DMI	MET	Other operating	306.591	292.704	39.356
Description and justification of the adjustment						
According to the "Joint Declaration by the States in the Single Sky Committee on the inclusion of charges for space weather information services in their RP4 performance plans" costs for space weather services have been added to the MET costbase. To avoid influence on the cost efficiency targets the 2019 and 2024 baselines have been adjusted with the planned 2029 space weather costs.						

Total adjustments to the 2024 baseline value for the determined costs	**Costs nominal NC**	**Costs real NC**	**Costs EUR2022**
	306.591	**292.704**	**39.356**
	306.591	292.704	39.356
c.4) Adjustments to the 2024 service units	-0	-0	-0

Other adjustment to the 2024 service units	No

d) Justification of the consistency of the local en route cost-efficiency performance targets with the Union-wide targets

The Ukraine conflict has had significant impact on traffic flows in Denmark. Due to the closure of Russian airspace, a significant portion of air traffic between Europe and Asia has been rerouted away from Danish airspace. This has resulted in a substantial loss of service units and weaker traffic growth. According to the STATFOR forecast from February 2025, the number of service units in Danish airspace in 2029 is expected to be only 4.6% higher than in 2019, compared to a 21.3% increase forecasted for the entire RP region. To account for these exceptional circumstances, the Performance Review Body (PRB) developed a methodology for adjusting the long-term cost-efficiency trend in affected Member States. This method compares pre-war traffic forecasts (from October 2021) with actual traffic in 2022–2023 and applies the difference to projections for 2029. Based on this calculation, Danish service units would be 13.7% higher in 2029 had the war in Ukraine not occurred. Analyses shows that 71% of the traffic decline from 2019 to 2023 in Denmark can be attributed to reduced flows from Asia and Other Europe. These regions, which contributed approximately 20% of Danish service units in 2019, experienced sharp declines of –54.4% (Asia) and –88.8% (Other Europe). Between 2019 and 2023, Denmark lost a total of 332,000 service units, with 228,000 of those linked to the reduced flows from Asia and Other Europe. In 2029, air traffic in the wider ECAC region is expected to recover more robustly, reaching an overall index of 107 relative to 2019. In contrast, Danish traffic related to Asia and Other Europe is forecasted to reach an index of just 47. More specifically, the recovery indices for these flows are projected at 64 (Asia) and 6 (Other Europe) in Denmark, compared to 133 and 43 in the ECAC region. While total Danish traffic is expected to reach 102% of the 2019 level, the specific loss of high-density east-west long-haul traffic continues to weigh heavily. On this basis Denmark find it justified to apply an adjustment of 13.7% in 2029 when assessing the long-term trend for cost efficiency. Using this adjustment the long-term trend for cost efficiency can be calculated to -1.0% which is in line with the union wide target for cost efficiency. The justification is further elaborated in annex R.

** Refer to Annex R, if necessary.*

e) Where a deviation from the Union-wide performance targets is observed, please indicate if the NSA considers those deviations to be necessary and proportionate under:

Additional costs of measures necessary to achieve the capacity targets for RP4	Yes	Detailed in part 3.4.9 of the performance plan
Restructuring costs planned for RP4	Yes	Detailed in part 3.4.10 of the performance plan

f) Main measures put in place to achieve the targets for determined unit cost (DUC) for en route ANS

See Annex R

** Refer to Annex R, if necessary.*

g) Verification by the NSA

Confirmation by the NSA that the data and information included in this section have been verified in accordance with Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/317	Yes

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

Terminal Charging Zone #1 - Denmark - TCZ

a) RP4 cost-efficiency performance targets

Terminal charging zone Name of the CZ	Baseline 2024 2024 A	RP4 cost-efficiency targets (determined 2025-2029) 2025 D	 2026 D	 2027 D	 2028 D	 2029 D	2029D vs. 2024B (CAGR)
Total terminal costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	**218.147.671**	**241.791.862**	246.331.471	253.278.305	258.416.991	259.357.263	3,5%
Total terminal costs in real terms (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**209.638.347**	**228.287.691**	**228.362.322**	**230.684.942**	**231.066.916**	**228.138.834**	1,7%
Total terminal costs in real terms (in EUR2022) [1]	**28.187.313**	**30.694.845**	**30.704.880**	**31.017.172**	**31.068.531**	**30.674.830**	1,7%
YoY variation		**8,9%**	0,0%	1,0%	0,2%	-1,3%	
Total terminal Service Units (TNSU)	162.066	175.370	181.694	184.517	187.264	187.957	3,0%
YoY variation		**8,2%**	3,6%	1,6%	1,5%	0,4%	
Real terminal unit costs (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**1.293,54**	**1.301,75**	**1.256,85**	**1.250,21**	**1.233,91**	**1.213,79**	-1,3%
Real terminal unit costs (in EUR2022) [1]	**173,92**	**175,03**	**168,99**	**168,10**	**165,91**	**163,20**	-1,3%
YoY variation		**0,6%**	-3,4%	-0,5%	-1,3%	-1,6%	

National currency	**DKK**
1 Average exchange rate 2022 (1 EUR=)	**7,44**
Actual inflation index 2024 - Base 100 in 2022	**104,74**

b) Information on the baseline values for the determined costs and the determined unit costs

Terminal charging zone Name of the CZ	Baseline 2024 2024 B	Actuals 2024 2024 A	2024 Baseline adjustments
Total terminal costs in nominal terms (in national currency)	218.147.671	218.147.671	0
Total terminal costs in real terms (in national currency at 2022 prices)	**209.638.347**	209.638.347	0
Total terminal costs in real terms (in EUR2022) [1]	28.187.313	28.187.313	0
Total terminal Service Units (TNSU)	162.066	162.066	

990,6545606

c) Detailed justifications for the adjustments to the baseline values

161075,5354

-161075,5354

c.1) Adjustments to the 2024 baseline value for the determined costs

Number of adjustments	0

c.2) Adjustments to the 2024 service units

Adjustment to the 2024 service units	No

d) Justifications for the local terminal cost-efficiency performance targets, including contribution to the improvement of the European ATM network performance

The local cost-efficiency target for terminal is consistent with the union-wide target for en route cost efficiency.

** Refer to Annex R, if necessary.*

e) Main measures put in place to achieve the targets for determined unit cost (DUC) for terminal ANS

** Refer to Annex R, if necessary.*

f) Verification by the NSA

Confirmation by the NSA that the data and information included in this section have been verified in accordance with Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/3172	Yes

3.4.3 - Cost allocation ATSP/CNSP - NAVIAIR

Complementary information may be provided in ANNEX M

a) Summary of services provided

Air navigation services provided		Description of the services provided by the concerned entity
ATS/ATM	Yes	• Naviair is providing ATS, ASM and ATFCM in Danish airspace and in the TMA/CTZ at various airports (Copenhagen, Roskilde, Billund, Aarhus & Alborg) • Naviair is providing technical maintenance and development of ATM-equipment (COOPANS system for ACC/APP Copenhagen and local ATM-systems for airports at Billund and Roskilde) • Enroute FIS at Greenland below FL 195 • AFIS at Vagar Airport at the Faroe Islands
Communication	Yes	• Naviair is providing VHF G/A Communication in Danish Airspace and in the TMA/CTZ at various airports (Copenhagen, Roskilde and Aalborg) • Naviair is providing G/G Telephone services at various airports (Copenhagen, Roskilde, Billund and Aalborg) • Naviair is providing network services (LAN & WAN), for operational en-route equipment, in Danish Airspace
Navigation	Yes	Naviair is providing NAVAIDs in Danish airspace and at various airports (Copenhagen, Soenderborg and Aalborg) by use of VOR & DME systems
Surveillance	Yes	Naviair is providing surveillance in Danish Airspace and in the TMA/CTZ at various airports (Copenhagen, Roskilde, Billund, Esbjerg, Aarhus and Aalborg) by use of conventional Radars (Primary and Secondary Surveillance Radars) • Naviair is providing Enhanced Mode S surveillance, in Danish Airspace, by use of a WAM (Wide Area Multilateration) System
Search and rescue	No	n/a - only Greenland
Aeronautical Information	Yes	Aeronautical publications, NOTAM, Briefing services in Denmark, Greenland and Faroe Islands
Meteorological services	No	n/a
Services to OAT	No	n/a - no costs for Naviair to providing ATS service to OAT in Danish Airspace - see below
Cross-border ATS	No	n/a - no costs for Naviair to provide ATS service in various airspaces in neighboring states where ATS is delegated to Denmark - see below

Description of the methodology used for allocating costs of facilities or services between different air navigation services based on the list of facilities and services listed in ICAO Regional Air Navigation Plan European Region (Doc 7754) as last amended and a description of the methodology used for allocating those costs between different charging zones.
The cost base model is established to comply with the rules on separate accounts for regulated and non-regulated services. According to Naviair's cost base model, the costs are distributed directly to the cost bases / the charging zone where the costs are actually incurred in a transparent manner. In cases where the costs relate to different activities that cannot be allocated directly to a single cost base / charging zone, Naviair has an allocation key that can allocate the costs in a transparent and consistent manner, based on, for example, activity measurements/resource consumption, number of positions, areas of work and an assessment of the interrelationships of the activities. The principles and actual allocation keys are maintained in a memo describing all costbases of Naviair. The memo (and changes to the principles) are subject to approval in a forum of directors responsible for cost areas. The memo is shared with the NSA yearly. From 2010, costs for ATS related to approach services are being allocated 100 per cent to the en route charging zone. At Roskilde Airport, Billund Airport, Aarhus Airport and Aalborg Airport, the tower and approach units are integrated units that handle both tower, approach and area control. The costs are distributed to both the en route charging zone and the terminal charging zone based on an allocation key. Cost of Roskilde Airport, Billund Airport and Aarhus Airport is allocated 50 per cent to en route. Cost of Aalborg Airport is allocated 40 per cent to en route. The different allocation of Aalborg Lufthavn is due to higher workload in the terminal area. Operational training and education costs are allocated to the relevant cost base reflecting the demand from the operational site. The distribution in ”Detail by service” is unchanged compared to that of RP2 & RP3. Denmark, along with several other States, has received an infringement letter from the Commission regarding the allocation of costs between en route and TNC in RP3. As described above Denmark allocates 100% of the costs to approach services to Copenhagen Airport to the en route cost base. The Commission does not find this to be in accordance with the relevant regulations despite no objections have been raised earlier. Denmark does not find regulation 2019/317 to be sufficient clear on this point and has asked the Commission for clarification to ensure that all States use the same principles. Denmark is currently awaiting further clarification from the Commission before a thorough analysis and an potential adjustment of the cost allocation in RP4 between en route and TNC will be conducted.

b) Allocation of costs by segment

ANSP costs by segments (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Determined costs for en route charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	772.854	786.140	799.779	812.172	811.071

Determined costs for terminal charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	239.604	244.099	251.002	256.095	256.989
Forecasted costs for terminal services at airports outside the scope of the performance plan	73.682	73.554	76.090	77.417	78.832

Description of the criteria used to allocate costs between terminal and en route services in accordance with Article 22(5), including at airports outside the scope of the performance plan
The costs of all eligible services, facilities and activities have been allocated in a transparent manner to the charging zones, in respect of which they are actually incurred. From 2010, costs for ATS related to approach services are being allocated 100 per cent to the en route charging zone. Allocation of main Staff costs related to Air Traffic Services of Roskilde Airport, Billund Airport and Aarhus Airport is allocated 50 per cent to en route. Cost of Aalborg Airport is allocated 40 per cent to en route. The different allocation of Aalborg is due to higher workload in the terminal area. Denmark does not find regulation 2019/317 to be sufficient clear on allocation of costs and will ask the Commission for further clarification. See also section a above. The forecasted costs for terminal services at airport outside the scope of the perofrmance plan are forecasts based on Rønne, Billund, Århus and Aalborg.

c) Allocation of costs related to the provision of approach services

Allocation of costs related to approach services (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Total determined costs for approach services	177.544	180.596	183.729	186.576	186.323
Determined costs for approach services allocated to the en route charging zone(s)	177.544	180.596	183.729	186.576	186.323
Determined costs for approach services allocated to the terminal charging zone(s) within the scope of the performance plan					

Description of the methodology used for establishing approach costs and allocating them between en route and terminal services, including the distance from the relevant airport(s) used for allocating approach costs and description of the operational requirements on the basis of which that distance has been defined
The costs of all eligible services, facilities and activities have been allocated in a transparent manner to the charging zones, in respect of which they are actually incurred. From 2010, costs for ATS related to approach services are being allocated 100 per cent to the en route charging zone. Allocation of main Staff costs related to Air Traffic Services of Roskilde Airport, Billund Airport and Aarhus Airport is allocated 50 per cent to en route. Cost of Aalborg Airport is allocated 40 per cent to en route. The different allocation of Aalborg is due to higher workload in the terminal area. Denmark does not find regulation 2019/317 to be sufficient clear on allocation of costs and will ask the Commission for further clarification.

d) Description of other services and activities outside the scope of the performance plan and their financing

Based on the description of the services provided under item a) above, describe the nature of the activities outside the scope of the performance plan, the related costs and the arrangements in place to finance them as well as the methodology used by the NSA to ensure that these amounts are excluded from the cost bases charged to airspace user

Terminal ANS at airports (outside the scope of the performance plan)	Yes
If yes, description of the nature of the services provided and the geographical scope	
Naviair is handling TWR-services in the following airports in Denmark: Rønne, Billund, Aarhus, Aalborg.	
If yes, description of the arrangements for the financing of the services provided	
For Billund there is a Terminal Navigation Charge. For Rønne, Aarhus and Aalborg there is a contract with the Airport for the costs related to the terminal service	

Services to OAT	Yes
If yes, description of the arrangements for the financing of the services provided	
Services are performed by the ATCC in Copenhagen - the military supplies the ressources - also described in the LSSIP	

Other ANS	Yes
If yes, description of the nature of the services provided and the geographical scope	
Naviair has activities in Faroe Islands and Greenland operating AFIS.	
If yes, description of the arrangements for the financing of the services provided	
The services in Greenland is state financed and user (Joint Finance Agreement) and the Faroe Islands is based on contract with Vagar airport.	

Non ANS	Yes
If yes, description of the nature of activities (products and/or services) performed and the relevant markets/customers	
Naviair performs various contracts related to primarily airport services, e.g. ILS, ATM-/CNS and airport equipment based on tenders and allocated to specific costbases.	

e) Changes in cost allocation methodology

Are there changes in the cost allocation criteria with respect to the previous reference period? If yes, please provide the description and justification of the changes and impact(s) on the determined costs and/or baseline.	No

f) Verification by the NSA

Confirmation by the NSA that the data and information included in this section have been verified in accordance with Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/317	Yes

3.4.4 - Cost allocation METSP - DMI

Complementary information may be provided in ANNEX M

a) Summary of services provided

Description of the services provided by the meteorological service provider, the geographical scope and the different users for which the services are provided
MET services related to the functions as MWO for København FIR and as MO for Danish civil airports

b) Allocation of costs by segment

Meteorological ANS costs (direct + core) by segments (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Determined costs for en route charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	44.984	46.415	47.776	47.965	48.457
Determined costs for terminal charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	2.188	2.232	2.277	2.322	2.369
Forecasted costs for terminal services at airports outside the scope of the performance plan					

c) Breakdown of determined meteorological costs between direct and core costs and allocation between en route and terminal services

Description of the meteorological costs and of the methodology for allocating these costs between direct costs and the costs of supporting meteorological facilities and services that also serve meteorological requirements in general (‘MET core costs’)
Allocation of costs is based on time recordings. Cost for MET services related to the functions as MWO for København FIR and as MO for Danish civil airports, including aviation specific R&D, are allocated 100% to the charging zone, Other MET services are not allocated. Core costs are allocated in proportion to the relative use of facilities by MET services for aviation, based on time recordings from the time managements systems. Costs for meteorological services are allocated to the ENR and TNC cost base using man-hours as the cost driver. By this mechanism 93 % of the total costs for providing meteorological services to civil aviation are allocated to en route corresponding to the relative workload on the aviation shifts

d) Meteorological direct costs and allocation across charging zone(s)

Total determined direct meteorological costs allocated to the charging zones within the scope of the performance plan (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)		2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
En route charging zone 1	Denmark	18.565	19.136	19.679	19.752	19.947
Terminal charging zone 1	Denmark - TCZ	1.182	1.205	1.229	1.254	1.279
Total forecasted costs for the concerned entity		**19.746**	**20.341**	**20.908**	**21.006**	**21.226**

Description of the items included in the meteorological direct costs and methodology used to allocate these costs in the scope of the performance plan, as well as across charging zone(s).
The direct costs for providing MET services is allocated to civil aviation based on time recordings. This includes development exclusively for aviation.

e) Meteorological core costs and allocation across charging zone(s)

Total determined core meteorological costs allocated to the charging zones within the scope of the performance plan (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)		2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
En route charging zone 1	Denmark	26.097	26.954	27.768	27.878	28.171
Terminal charging zone 1	Denmark - TCZ	1.007	1.027	1.047	1.068	1.090
Total forecasted costs for the concerned entity		**27.104**	**27.981**	**28.815**	**28.947**	**29.261**

Description of the items included in the meteorological core costs and methodology used to allocate these costs to civil aviation, including the proportion of meteorological core costs included in the scope of the plan as compared to total meteorological costs incurred by the entity, as well as across charging zones.
The core costs are allocated to civil aviation using the following cost pools:

- General management and administration
- Buildings
- Commonly used telecommunication and data processing
- Core research and development
- In situ observation systems
- Remote sensing systems

The costs are allocated to civil aviation in proportion to the relative aeronautical and non-aeronautical use made of the facility based on time recordings. This calculation is done on a yearly basis, to ensure the most accurate reflection of the actual status and to ensure a fair allocation of costs to aviation. This however results in the costs shifting somewhat from year to year, due to changes in allocation.

For facilities serving meteorological services e.g. weather radar the proportion of costs allocated to civil aviation is the ratio of recorded man hours on aviation services to the recorded total man hours for meteorological services e.g. meteorological services to the public, defense and Greenland.

For facilities serving all services, e.g. supercomputer installation, the proportion of costs allocated to civil aviation is the ratio of recorded man hours for aviation services to the recorded total man hours spent on ice services, oceanographical, climatological and meteorological services.

By this mechanism:
4.7% of all general management costs
10.6% of core costs of facilities used by all services
20.4% of core cost of facilities used by meteorological services
are allocated to civil aviation.

f) Changes in cost allocation methodology

Are there changes in the cost allocation criteria with respect to the previous reference period? If yes, please provide the description and justification of the changes and impact(s) on the determined costs and/or baseline.	No

g) Verification by the NSA

Confirmation by the NSA that the data and information included in this section have been verified in accordance with Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/317	Yes

3.4.5 - Cost allocation - NSA

Complementary information may be provided in ANNEX M

a) Supervision costs

Description of the supervision activities performed by the NSA(s), the underlying assumptions used to estimate the related determined costs and the main
The main part of the supervision costs consist of its share of Trafikstyrelsens overhead costs, such as rent and staff assistance. Overhead cost are distributed via an hourly rate to this area, in the same way as it is distributed to other areas of Trafikstyrelsen. Supervision costs also includes other minor adminstrative costs. Costs vary mainly due to the share of overhead costs, that depends on the hours allocated.

Description of the methodology used to allocate NSAs supervision costs between en route and terminal as well as across different charging zones
Through out all previus reference periods all NSA ANS-costs have been allocated to en-route. 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.

b) Search and rescue costs (if reported as part of the NSA costs)

Description and underlying assumptions for search and rescue costs and main factors explaining the variations over the reference period
No search and rescue cost are included in the costbase.

Total search and rescue costs for the entity providing search and rescue services (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Determined costs for en route charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	0	0	0	0	0
Determined costs for terminal charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan	0	0	0	0	0
Forecasted search and rescue costs outside the scope of the performance plan	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Description of the methodology used to allocate search and rescue costs to civil aviation and in the scope of the performance plan, including the proportion of search and rescue costs included in the scope of the plan as compared to total search and rescue costs incurred by the entity

Description of the methodology used to allocate search and rescue costs to civil aviation between en route and terminal as well as across different charging zones

c) Changes in cost allocation methodology

Are there changes in the cost allocation criteria with respect to the previous reference period? If yes, please provide the description and justification of the changes and impact(s) on the determined costs and/or baseline.	Yes
In principle not, but in the RP3 a new budget system for state agencies was implemented at the time of budgeting which meant that allocation of overhead on staff costs and on other operating costs both were included in costs for other operating costs. The allocation of overhead on staff costs were changed in the system from 2021, so that it became part of the staff cost and not part of other operating cost.	

d) Verification by the NSA

Confirmation by the NSA that the data and information included in this section comply with the requirements of Article 15(2) Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 and with IR 2019/317.	Yes

3.4.6 - Determined costs assumptions - NAVIAIR

3.4.6.1 - Operating costs

a) Staff costs

Number of entries	4

#	Staff costs building blocks (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	Actual 2023	Actual 2024	Determined 2025	Determined 2026	Determined 2027	Determined 2028	Determined 2029
1	Salaries & Wages	Wages and salaries, employers' contributions to social security, etc.	En-route charging zones	392.753	437.978	438.172	431.114	438.162	447.459	455.721
			Terminal charging zones	114.281	129.784	140.568	138.303	140.564	143.547	146.197
2	Pension Contributions	Pension costs are explained in the Performance plan and constitutes an average of 17 per cent of the Staff costs.	En-route charging zones	62.789	69.734	71.611	72.753	73.886	75.589	76.919
			Terminal charging zones	18.270	21.207	22.973	23.340	23.703	24.249	24.676
3	Other staff benefits	Social benefits/insurance	En-route charging zones	1.656	1.786	1.728	1.728	1.728	1.728	1.728
			Terminal charging zones	482	543	554	554	554	554	554
4	Work performed for own account and capitalized	Work performed for own account and capitalized" comprises staff costs and other internal expenses incurred during the financial year and recognized in the cost of self-constructed intangible assets and property, plant and equipment.	En-route charging zones	-16.927	-21.778	-24.686	-26.842	-18.374	-19.733	-14.361
			Terminal charging zones	-5.035	-6.372	-6.439	-7.001	-4.793	-5.147	-3.746
Total staff costs			**En-route charging zones**	**440.271**	**487.720**	**486.826**	**478.753**	**495.402**	**505.043**	**520.007**
			Terminal charging zones	**127.998**	**145.162**	**157.656**	**155.196**	**160.029**	**163.203**	**167.682**

Accounting provisions included in total staff costs	None	En-route charging zones							
		Terminal charging zones							

Assumptions underlying the determined pension costs and expected evolution over Reference Period 4 (for Main ANSP please refer to tab 3.4.7)	Check tab 3.4.7	En-route charging zones							
		Terminal charging zones							

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of staff costs over the reference period
The expected staff costs are in line with the strategy of operational robustness during RP4, with a majority of increasing ATCOs. Notably the change between 2025 and 2026 is due to the ATCO agreement of summer 2023, where the rention bonus stops. There is no change in expected pension assumptions - the differences are driven by the FTE expectations. The development in the Work performed for own account and capitalized is in line with the expecations of the Investments and due to activation it is subtracted in the charged determined costs.

b) Other operating costs

Number of entries	7

	Other operating costs building blocks	Description of the composition of		Actual	Actual	Determined

#	(in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
1	Costs for training	Costs related to Training, incl. FEAST, Initial Training subscription, simulator	En-route charging zones	19.109	21.422	32.889	36.751	35.739	35.025	33.683
			Terminal charging zones	4.685	6.077	10.474	11.917	12.380	13.120	12.438
2	Energy related costs	Costs related to Energy consumption, water, heat.	En-route charging zones	9.726	4.912	9.708	9.902	10.101	10.303	10.509
			Terminal charging zones	2.385	1.393	2.882	2.940	2.999	3.059	3.120
3	Technical Maintenance, IT infrastructure & buildings	Technical infrastructure, buildings and cyber security	En-route charging zones	57.052	66.550	63.173	70.591	68.647	67.276	64.698
			Terminal charging zones	13.988	18.878	20.118	22.890	23.779	25.200	23.891
4	Travel expenditures	Travel expenditures, etc.	En-route charging zones	3.601	4.120	4.636	4.729	4.824	4.920	5.018
			Terminal charging zones	883	1.169	1.377	1.404	1.432	1.461	1.490
5	Facility and admin costs	Costs related to facility management, IT and administrative costs	En-route charging zones	24.120	22.164	28.244	31.560	30.691	30.078	28.925
			Terminal charging zones	5.914	6.287	8.994	10.234	10.631	11.266	10.681
6	Other Operating costs	Compilation of smaller Other Operating Costs	En-route charging zones	24.964	23.650	28.492	31.966	31.022	30.347	29.103
			Terminal charging zones	6.121	6.709	9.102	10.402	10.814	11.476	10.850
7			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							
Total other operating costs			**En-route charging zones**	**138.571**	**142.818**	**167.142**	**185.499**	**181.023**	**177.949**	**171.937**
			Terminal charging zones	**33.976**	**40.513**	**52.947**	**59.788**	**62.034**	**65.582**	**62.471**

Accounting provisions included in total other operating costs	None	En-route charging zones	0						
		Terminal charging zones							

Costs for ground-ground communication services	WAN infrastructure (CANDI-IP), MPLS services C-NET, Back-up net MPLS services, NewPENS All by external providers (TDC, CPH, Global Connect, BT Communcations)	En-route charging zones	5.123	5.246	5.429	5.538	5.649	5.762	5.877
		Terminal charging zones	1.577	1.614	1.671	1.704	1.738	1.773	1.808
Costs for air-ground communication services via terrestrial link	CPDLC services - VDLm2, PreFans	En-route charging zones			1.658	1.669	1.703	1.737	1.771
		Terminal charging zones			510	514	524	534	545
Costs for air-ground communications services via satellite link	IRIS/Satcom (Satcom is still in tender)	En-route charging zones	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Terminal charging zones	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of other operating costs over the reference period
The main factors regarding the Other operating costs are the need for increased training of staff, most notably ATCOs, with reference to the ATCO planning tab. Energy related costs are assumed on a stable level (increasing with inflation) throughout RP4. There is also an increase in maintenance, buildings and cyber security, which has an increased effect over the year.

c) Exceptional items

Number of entries	1

#	Exceptional items building blocks (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	Actual	Actual	Determined				
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
1			En-route charging zones				-3.500	-8.000	-14.000	-30.000
			Terminal charging zones							-2.350

Total exceptional items		**En-route charging zones**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-3.500**	**-8.000**	**-14.000**	**-30.000**
		Terminal charging zones	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-2.350**

Accounting provisions included in total exceptional items	None	En-route charging zones	0						
		Terminal charging zones							

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of other exceptional items over the reference period
To meet consistency of the relevant trends regarding cost-efficiency a top-down approach has been applied to the total costs. The “negative” costs in exceptional items reflects the necessary determined cost-reduction beyond the initiatives implemented by Naviair to meet the requirement and ultimately the costs for the users. The final decision on where and how to implement the remaining cost reductions has not yet been decided.

d) Accounting provisions

Number of entries	0

#	List of provisions included in the	Description of the composition of	Charging zones	Value of the	Forecast	Determined

a) Depreciation costs

Method adopted for the calculation of the depreciation cost (point 1.3 of Table 1):	Historical
If current cost accounting is applied, equivalent historical cost accounting figures have to be provided in Annex E in order to allow for comparison	

b) Cost of capital

Description of the assumptions used to compute the cost of capital (point 1.4 of Table 1), including the composition of the asset base, the return on equity, the average interest on debts and the shares of financing of the asset base through debt and equity
Justification for the Cost of Capital 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. The total asset base used for the

calculation of the cost of capital is allocated to either En route, TNC CPH or a third activity are allocated based upon the historic distribution of revenue for Naviair, which is in itself a reflection of activity levels.

Definition of the Total Asset Base
RP4 DC (turnover based distribution) En route 70,0%, TNC 20,0%, CPH Other 10,0%

1. Cost of Capital:
The total cost of capital in RP4 is determined by the forecasted Total asset base for RP4, which is defined in the table Cost of capital assumptions. The total cost of capital is the distribution of the combined amount of interest payment on debt, incl. the sub-ordinated loan, return on equity and the deduction of capitalisation of interim interest.

1.1. Cost of Debt:
The payments of interests cover the external debt/financing, incl. the sub-ordinated loan. Due to the revenue gap from the COVID-19 crisis and traffic risk sharing in RP3 there will be a draw on the facilities from the bank and state loan (expected peak in 2024 of 800 M DKK) which will lead to increased interest payments.

In 2021 based on feedback from Airlines and the Commission concerning the interest rate the Ministry of Transport lowered the interest on the sub-ordinated loan to a more market conform interest rate (from the original 9,0 % to 4,0 %).

1.2 Return on Equity:
When Naviair in 2010 was converted into a state-owned company the owner (Ministry of Transport/Transportministeriet) stated a requirement equity ratio (incl. sub-ordinated loan) and a return on equity. This percentage is in RP4 set to 5.0 per cent before tax. (which is similar to RP3) and solidity was changed to 45 percent.

1.3 Deduction of capitalisation of interim interest.
For the RP4 the capitalisation of interim interest is subtracted in the cost of capital as to not be charged twice – as part of cost of capital and again as part of the depreciations. On a technical note the subtraction of this item from the cost of capital will lower the determined costs and the calculation of the unit rate.

Cost of capital assumptions	Description of each item
NBV fixed assets	Net Book Value of fixed assets: • Property, plant and equipment • Intangible assets.
Adjustments total assets	Adjustments: • Investments • Deferred tax
Net current assets	Net current assets: • Current assets • Provisions for regulatory over-recoveries & • Short-term liabilities other than provisions
Cost of capital %	The total cost of capital in RP4 is determined by the forecasted Total asset base for RP3. The total cost of capital is the distribution of the combined amount of interest payment on debt, incl. the sub-ordinated loan, return on equity and the deduction of capitalisation of interim interest.
Return on equity	5,0 per cent (Pre-tax). This is reported as 5,0% (pre-tax) which is the reported figure for Return on Equity for En route RP2. This percentage applies for the company in RP4.

Average interest on debts	The average interest on debt is characterized by the loans explained on tab 3.4.8 and their respecitive interest payments.
Share of financing through equity	The State-owner has defined that an important measurement of the financial health of Naviair is the solidity, incl. the sub-ordinated loan.

3.4.6.3 - Costs for VFR exempted flights

Description of the methodology and assumptions used to establish the costs of air navigation services provided to VFR flights, when exemptions are granted for VFR flights in accordance with Article 31(3), 31(4) and 31(5)
The Government finances VFR and other exempted flights. Cost for the specific activity is allocated based on time recordings. During 2019 the allocation of costs of air navigation services provided to VFR flights was revisited and estimated at a higher level than previous years – primarily due to increased workload related to VFR-flights and there has been a re-calculation of the amount for RP4.

3.4.6.4 - NSA verification

Findings of the verification by the NSA (under Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/317) of the compliance of the determined costs of the ANSP with the requirements of Article 15(2) of Reg. 550/2004 and Article 22 of IR 2019/317, and where applicable identification of corrections applied to the cost base as a result of this verification
The verification of the costbase did not identify any need for corrections.

3.4.6 - Determined costs assumptions - DMI

3.4.6.1 - Operating costs

a) Staff costs

Number of entries	Click to select

#	Staff costs building blocks (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	Actual	Actual	Determined				
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Total staff costs			**En-route charging zones**	**20.909**	**23.202**	**25.337**	**25.844**	**26.361**	**26.888**	**27.426**
			Terminal charging zones	**1.466**	**1.626**	**1.650**	**1.683**	**1.716**	**1.751**	**1.786**
Accounting provisions included in total staff costs			En-route charging zones	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Terminal charging zones	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assumptions underlying the determined pension costs and expected evolution over Reference Period 4 (for Main ANSP please refer to tab 3.4.7)			En-route charging zones	3.575	3.968	4.333	4.419	4.508	4.598	4.690
			Terminal charging zones	251	278	282	288	294	299	305

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of staff costs over the reference period
Pension is included in the salaries. The pension funds are managed by independent pension managing companies and thus not in the DMI assets. The average weighted pension cost is 17,1%

b) Other operating costs

Number of entries	Click to select

#	Other operating costs building blocks (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	Actual	Actual	Determined				
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Total other operating costs			**En-route charging zones**	**13.645**	**16.866**	**17.701**	**18.555**	**19.326**	**18.912**	**18.791**
			Terminal charging zones	**441**	**571**	**538**	**549**	**560**	**571**	**583**
Accounting provisions included in total other operating costs			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							
Costs for ground-ground communication services			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							
Costs for air-ground communication services via terrestrial link			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							
Costs for air-ground communications services via satellite link			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of other operating costs over the reference period
Other operating costs will increase over RP4. DMI contributions to international organizations WMO. ECMWF (European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts) and EUMETSAT (European Organization for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites) are added with the expected contributions for RP4 and the relative use of the facilities by civil aviation. The allocation fraction of 2022 is used. Most notably the contribution to

Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites) are added with the expected contributions for RP4 and the relative use of the facilities by civil aviation. The allocation fraction of 2022 is used. Most notably the contribution to EUMETSAT will increase in RP4, but it has to be acknowledged that an increasing number of nowcasting programmes hugely benefitting aviation are centrally developed by EUMETSAT.

c) Exceptional items

Number of entries	1

#	Exceptional items building blocks (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)	Description of the composition of each item	Charging zones	Actual 2023	Actual 2024	Determined 2025	Determined 2026	Determined 2027	Determined 2028	Determined 2029
1			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							
Total exceptional items			**En-route charging zones**	**0**	**0**	**-1.428**	**-1.425**	**-1.420**	**-1.416**	**-1.411**
			Terminal charging zones	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Accounting provisions included in total exceptional items			En-route charging zones							
			Terminal charging zones							

Description of the main factors explaining the planned variations of other exceptional items over the reference period
Note that at the time of drafting the performance plan, a negative exceptional item was added in order to reach the cost efficiency target for RP4. Also note that costs of Space Weather are excluded from the above figures.

d) Accounting provisions

Number of entries	0

#	List of provisions included in the	Description of the composition of	Charging zones	Value of the	Forecast	Determined

a) Depreciation costs

Method adopted for the calculation of the depreciation cost (point 1.3 of Table 1):	Historical
If current cost accounting is applied, equivalent historical cost accounting figures have to be provided in Annex E in order to allow for comparison	

b) Cost of capital

Description of the assumptions used to compute the cost of capital (point 1.4 of Table 1), including the composition of the asset base, the return on equity, the average interest on debts and the shares of financing of the asset base through debt and equity

Cost of capital assumptions	Description of each item
NBV fixed assets	Assets consist of facilities supporting core functions e.g. HPC, in-situ observation systems, lightning detection, weather radar. A fraction of NBV of fixed assets, as allocable to
Adjustments total assets	According to DMI investment plan for core activities.
Net current assets	
Cost of capital %	
Return on equity	
Average interest on debts	
Share of financing through equity	Share of financing through equity is 0 as DMI is a government agency.

3.4.6.3 - Costs for VFR exempted flights

Description of the methodology and assumptions used to establish the costs of air navigation services provided to VFR flights, when exemptions are granted for VFR flights in accordance with Article 31(3), 31(4) and 31(5)

3.4.6.4 - NSA verification

Findings of the verification by the NSA (under Art. 22(7) of IR 2019/317) of the compliance of the determined costs of the ANSP with the requirements of Article 15(2) of Reg. 550/2004 and Article 22 of IR 2019/317, and where applicable identification of corrections applied to the cost base as a result of this verification
The verification of the costbase did not identify any need for corrections.

3.4.7 - Pension assumptions

NAVIAIR

3.4.7.1 Total pension costs, including retirement and pre-retirement schemes (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)

Pension costs per segment	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
En-route activity	71.611	72.753	73.886	75.589	76.919
Terminal activity	22.973	23.340	23.703	24.249	24.676
Other activities	13.141	13.350	13.558	13.870	14.114
Total pension costs	107.725	**109.443**	**111.147**	**113.709**	**115.709**

3.4.7.2 Assumptions for the "State" pension scheme (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)

Are there different contribution rates for different staff categories? If yes, how many?	Select

<Staff category name>	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Total pensionable payroll to which this scheme applies					
Employer % contribution rate to this scheme					
Total pension costs in respect of this scheme	107.725	109.443	111.147	113.709	115.709
Number of employees the employer contributes for in this scheme					

Description on the relevant national pension regulations and pension accounting regulations on which the assumptions are based, as well as information whether changes of those regulations are to be expected during RP4
Naviairs pension costs are a mix of government defined benefit schemes and defined contribution schemes. For all schemes applies that the schemes are either completely defined by central government or by collective agreements with the central government. For that reason it is considered most appropriate to describe the situation all together under "State pension schemes". Naviair pays an actuarially calculated percentage for defined benefits. The amount is paid to the state. For defined contribution, Naviair pays a percentage to a private pension fund (often run by the professional organizations). The percentage is basically the result of a collective agreement. The main rule is, that the employee pays 1/3 of the pension contribution, while the employer pays 2/3. In practice, it does not matter, since it is all included in the total salary expense for each employee. So in principle, the employee's 1/3 contribution is also an expense for Naviair, because Naviair also pays for the employee's pension share of 1/3, as a result of an agreement with the trade unions. Therefore, it is now a theoretical breakdown. Defined benefit scheme comprises approximately 43% of Naviair's employees, ie. part of their pension is covered by defined benefit, while the rest is defined contribution. 57% of employees only have a defined contribution scheme For employees with both defined benefit scheme and defined contribution scheme: The basic salary is covered by the defined benefit scheme, while the wage supplement is pensionally regulated through the defined contribution scheme. The breakdown of the two types of pension varies according to the group (ATCO´s, ATCO assistents, Technicians, Academics etc.). For ATCOs, the distribution is approx. 50% / 50% between the two types of pensions, while for the other employees approx. 65 - 67% of salary covered by defined benefit scheme. Defined benefit scheme is a slightly more costly pension scheme than defined contribution. However, we experience that the trade unions are working to increase the pension share for employees covered by defined contributions. Since 2010, Naviair has only employed employees with defined contribution scheme, and this applies to all staff catagories. Below is the average pension percentage for each category: Defined benefit: Air traffic controllers: 27.4% ATS operators, technicians and administrative: 22.2% Defined contributions: Air traffic controllers: 23%/18% ATS operators: 18% Technicians: 15.39% / 18% Administrative: 22.2% Academics: 17.1%

Description of the assumptions underlying the calculations of pension costs comprised in the determined costs, separately for retirement and early retirement
The average pension share is estimatede at approx. 17% of the labor cast.

Describe the actions taken ex-ante to manage the cost-risk (cost increase) associated with this item, as well as the actions taken to limit the impact of the unforeseen change on the costs to be passed on to airspace users
Naviair has a strong focus on having the required number of air traffic controllers and other staff to meet the expected demand. This means striking a balance of not having an excessive number of employees, but at the same time also ensuring not facing a shortage situation for e.g. air traffic controllers, which can cause regulations and thereby delays for the airlines. Naviair also focuses on continuously training new air traffic controllers so that we can ensure future needs for air traffic controllers for the benefit of our customers.

3.4.7.3 Assumptions for the occupational "Defined contributions" pension scheme (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)

Are there different contribution rates for different staff categories? If yes, how many?	No

3.4.7.4 Assumptions for the occupational "Defined benefits" pension scheme (in nominal terms in '000 national currency)

Are there different defined benefits schemes applicable? If yes, how many?	No

3.4.8 - Interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services

NAVIAIR

Select number of loans	2

Interest rate assumptions for loans financing the provision of air navigation services
(Amounts in nominal terms in '000 national currency)

Loan #1		2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Description		Loan facility in Nordea (800 MDKK) and a State re-lending facility (500 MDKK) with interest to counter the liquidity need from COVID-19 and the lower revenue than planned (under-recovery) from the RP3-period - the state loan is 10 years in duration. Loan facility in Nordea is variable and the State re-lending facility is fixed. In RP4 the assumed rates are fixed throughout the period as an average interest rate.				
Remaining balance		719.100	539.100	269.100	134.100	-
Interest rate %	Variable	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%	2,20%
Interest amount		15.513	11.630	5.805	2.893	-

Loan #2		2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Description		Subordinated loan is a standing loan to the state through the Ministry of Transport. Naviair's Board of Directors shall, on the basis of an overall assessment of the financial position, liquidity and the extent of non-subordinated debt obligations, annually assess the extent to which further repayment of the loan will be justifiable. The loan has a fixed interest rate of 4% p.a. and the loan ranks after Naviair's other interest-bearing debt. The loan thus fulfills the conditions for being considered equity or equivalent capital according to the loan agreement. This is also described in Naviair's Annual Report.				
Remaining balance		180.000	180.000	180.000	180.000	180.000
Interest rate %	Fixed	4,00%	4,00%	4,00%	4,00%	4,00%
Interest amount		7.200	7.200	7.200	7.200	7.200

Other loans	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Description	Short-term bank corporate overdraft facility used for day-to-day operations. In the RP4-model it is used for residual purposes. The average rate on the corporate overdraft facility is 1.0%				
Remaining balance	0	-	4.408	12.336	-
Average weighted interest rate %	-	-	1,00%	1,00%	-
Interest amount	0	-	44	123	-

Total loans	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Total remaining balance	899.100	719.100	453.508	326.436	180.000
Average weighted interest rate %	2,53%	2,62%	2,88%	3,13%	4,00%
Interest amount	22.713	18.830	13.049	10.216	7.200

3.4.9 - Additional determined costs related to measures necessary to achieve the en route capacity targets

Additional costs of measures necessary to achieve the capacity targets for RP4?	No

3.4.10 - Restructuring costs

3.4.10.1 Restructuring costs from previous reference periods to be recovered in RP4

Restructuring costs from previous reference periods approved by the European Commission?	Select
If yes, number of charging zones concerned	Select

Restructuring costs from previous reference periods to be recovered in RP4 (nominal terms in '000 national currency)					
Restructuring costs recovery plan from previous RPs	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D

Additional comments

3.4.10.2 Restructuring costs planned for RP4

Restructuring costs foreseen for RP4?	Select
If yes, number of charging zones concerned	2

a) Overall description of the restructuring measures planned for RP4

b) Where applicable, information on how the restructuring measures make use of shared services, ATM data services and/or how the measures contribute to infrastructure rationalisation

c) Detailed information on the restructuring measures planned for RP4

Number of restructuring measures	1

Click to select					
Measure #1	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Associated restructuring costs (nominal terms in '000 national currency)					
Description and justification of the restructuring measure					
Demonstration that the restructuring measure will deliver a net financial benefit to airspace users at the latest in the next reference period					
Information on the impact of the restructuring measure on the key performance area of Safety					
Information on the impact of the restructuring measure on the key performance area of Environment					
Information on the impact of the restructuring measure on the key performance area of Capacity					

	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Total restructuring costs by measures ('000 national currency)	-	-	-	-	-

d) Detailed information on the restructuring costs by nature by charging zone

Restructuring costs planned for RP4 by nature and by charging zone (nominal terms in '000 national currency)					
Click to select	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Staff					
of which, pension costs					
Other operating costs					
Depreciation					
Cost of capital					
Exceptional items					
Total restructuring costs	-	-	-	-	-

Click to select	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D

Staff					
of which, pension costs					
Other operating costs					
Depreciation					
Cost of capital					
Exceptional items					
Total restructuring costs	-	-	-	-	-

	2025D	2026D	2027D	2028D	2029D
Total restructuring costs by charging zone ('000 national currency)	-	-	-	-	-

Additional comments

SECTION 3.5: ADDITIONAL KPIS / TARGETS

3.5 Additional KPIs / Targets

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX J. OPTIONAL KPIs AND TARGETS

3.5 - Additional KPIs / Targets

Number of additional KPIs	0

SECTION 3.6: DESCRIPTION OF KPAS INTERDEPENDENCIES AND TRADE-OFFS INCLUDING THE ASSUMPTIONS USED TO ASSESS THOSE TRADE-OFFS

3.6 - Description of KPAs interdependencies and trade-offs including the assumptions used to assess those trade-offs

- 3.6.1 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between safety and other KPAs
- 3.6.2 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between capacity and environment
- 3.6.3 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between cost-efficiency and capacity
- 3.6.4 - Other interdependencies and trade-offs

3.6 - Description of KPAs interdependencies and trade-offs including the assumptions used to assess those trade-offs

3.6.1 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between safety and other KPAs

a) With regard to the over-riding safety objectives, what pressures does your organisation experience in meeting the cost, capacity and environmental KPAs? Describe how you ensure that these pressures do not negatively impact safety within your organisation. Describe the mitigation measures that have been introduced to demonstrate that safety performance has been sustained and what monitoring has been envisaged to measure the effectiveness of those mitigations.
Naviair has as per EU 2017/373 implemented a Change Management Procedure. Within this proceedure is a mandatory risk/safety assessment proces and if this indicated an impact on safety, a change will not be implemented regardless of a potential impact on cost, capacity and environment targets. Safety remains the main priority in Air Traffic Services. The impact of the requirements will be fully assessed as part of the draft implementaion plan described in Annex O. It has not been deemed feasible to conduct indepeth analysis while still waitning for the final guidance material in on Saftey KPAs in RP4.

b) What are the main assumptions used to assess the interdependencies between safety and other KPAs? Please provide a detailed analysis. Describe the analysis methodology and the data that has been used to assess the interdependencies between safety and other KPAs. What indicators, in addition to those described in the Regulation, are used for monitoring during the reference period to ensure that the targets in the KPAs of capacity, environment, and
Safety will always have the highest priority hence other targets will need to take into account any safety implications. The biggest risk is lack of sufficient resources which could lead to lack of capacity in order to ensure safety level. Naviair has not performed an analysis on its own but make use of CANSO analysis regarding interdependencies. This will be further developed as part of the draft implementation plan descirbed in Annex O, in particular Safety Risk Management, Effectlivly safety-related internal interfaces and Riskmitigation and control.

c) Describe the organisation's philosophy for managing competing priorities between the KPAs effectively – for instance delaying programmes to manage competing demands. It is expected that the organisation uses its business risk management processes to assess the consequential risks of the organisation's competing priorities
Naviair has a risk management proces in place with regading to business risks. This proces together with the management process and project process allows for such risks to be managed and prioritised. When it comes to changes to the functional system, the safety effect will always take priority. This will be further developed as part of the draft implementation plan described in Annex O, in particular Safety Policy, standards and processes, Safety Risk Management, Riskmitigation and control, but also in relation to the already established change management processes.

d) What trade-offs in safety have been accepted to manage resources shortfalls in realising the organisation's objectives to meet the cost, capacity and environment KPA targets? Have trade-offs restricted the release of staff for safety activities, such as safety training (ATC training excepted), safety surveys, safety audits, safety
The current situation with ATCO shortage and the associated focus on ATCO recruitment and Training presents a risk for the safety management system as such. However, the necessary process are in the operational decision making to ensure that an effect on the safety performance is prioritized, and could have an effect of capacity and/or environmental performance. The trade offs have not had an impact on direct safety activities within Naviair, but certain delays in activites have been experienced. Such prioritisations follow Naviairs established change management procedures and safey promotion procedures in which a careful consideration to flight safety is included.

e) Has the State reviewed the ANSP financial and personnel resources that are needed to support safe ATC service provision through safety promotion, safety improvement, safety assurance and safety risk management in line with planned changes that will enable targets in other KPAs to be achieved? Please provide a detailed

The ANSP financial and personnel resources needed to support safe ATC service provision are reviewed through the NSA oversight of the ANSP´s compliance with the provisions in EU regulation 2017/373.

3.6.2 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between capacity and environment

KEA achievements are clearly influenced by traffic level and volatility (the yearly profile is clearly influenced by seasonality and number of flights). The implementation of Free Route Airspace has had a huge benefit on the overall environmental performance however with its increased use across borders, it has also increased the complexity. ATCOs are experiencing less predictability and are reporting higher complexity which in the long run could lead to a decrease in capacity.
ATCO shortage has a direct effect on the capacity performance and will subsequently result in a decrease in flight efficiency.

3.6.3 - Interdependencies and trade-offs between cost-efficiency and capacity

ATCO shortage has direct impact on capacity and secondary also on the flight efficiency. Having the sufficient capacity and being able to deliver services without delay is a main priority in Naviair hence recruitment of new ATCOs is a tradeoff when it comes to cost efficiency.

3.6.4 - Other interdependencies and trade-offs

Performance areas such as security, sustainability, business continuity, etc. are also important, and activities undertaken to address performance in these areas can affect performance in relation to the KPIs and targets included in this plan, e.g. improving security will come at a cost.
Similarly, within the KPAs of safety, capacity, environment and cost efficiency there are (both local and European) issues or priorities that require action even without target setting - compare the PIs included in the performance and charging regulation. As an example, it may be necessary to invest in detecting and/or preventing runway incursions or airspace infringements. This will also affect cost efficiency, but it will not contribute to meeting any of the targets in this plan.

SECTION 4: CROSS-BORDER INITIATIVES AND SESAR IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 - Cross-border initiatives and synergies

- 4.1.1 - Cross-border areas where the ANSP provides ANS outside the State's charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan
- 4.1.2 - Planned or implemented cross-border initiatives at the level of ANSPs
- 4.1.3 - Investment synergies achieved at FAB level or through other cross-border initiatives

4.2 - Deployment of SESAR Common Projects (CP1)

4.3 - Change management

Annexes of relevance to this section

ANNEX N. CROSS-BORDER INITIATIVES

ANNEX V. CONSISTENCY OF INVESTMENTS WITH ATM MASTER PLAN

4.1 - Cross-border initiatives and synergies at the level of the ANSP(s)

4.1.1 - Cross-border areas where the ANSP(s) provide(s) services outside of the State's charging zone(s) in the scope of the performance plan

As indicated in section 1.1.1, the cross-border area(s) reported below are those cross-border areas or groups of adjacent cross-border areas of a size above 500 km2, unless the area or group of areas concerned has fewer than 7,500 controlled flight movements on average per year.

Number of cross-border area(s) where the ANSP(s) of the Member State provide(s) services in another State's charging zone(s)	**8**

Cross-border area(s) #1	**Alsie**	**Situated in:**		**Germany**	
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**54 39 30N 010 30 00E - along UIR boundary 54 54 39N 008 40 00E - 54 42 00N 008 40 00E - 54 38 00N**				
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**				
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**2247**				
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**				
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #2	**H2a**	**Situated in:**		**Sweden**	
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**55 33 56N 012 46 51E - 55 31 01N 012 50 32E - 54 55 00N 012 51 00E - FIR/UIR boundary -**				
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**				
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**570**				
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**				
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #3	**H2b**	**Situated in:**	**Sweden**
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**55 31 01N 012 50 32E - 55 22 01N 013 01 37E - 55 14 58N 012 59 56E - 54 55 00N 013 00 00E -**		
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**		
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**595**		
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**		

Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #4	**L2**	**Situated in:**	**Sweden**
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**56 01 58N 012 39 25E - 56 01 58N 012 40 46E - 55 59 58N 012 43 56E - 55 58 34N 012 51 56E -**		
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**		
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**1643**		
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**		
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**		
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area			
Air Traffic Services (ATS)			

Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #5	**L3**	**Situated in:**	**Sweden**
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**55 14 58N 012 59 56E - 54 55 00N 013 00 00E - 54 55 00N 012 51 00E - FIR boundary -**		
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**		
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**531**		
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**		
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**		
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area			
Air Traffic Services (ATS)			

Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #6	**Michaelsdorf**	**Situated in:**	**Germany**

Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**54 27 00N 012 00 00E - 54 17 45N 011 38 11E - 54 34 00N 010 59 00E - 54 39 20N 010 40 00E**				
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**				
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**901**				
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**				
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #7	**North Sea Area III**	**Situated in:**	**UK**		
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**56 35 00N 005 00 00E - 55 00 00N 005 00 00E - 55 19 58N 004 19 55E - 55 45 52N 003 22 08E -**				
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area covers the Danish Economic Zone and established to provide service to the danish Off Shore platforms and rigs in the North Sea.**				
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**11026**				
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**				
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					
The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.					

Cross-border area(s) #8	**North Sea High**	**Situated in:**	**UK**		
Geographical scope of the cross-border area(s)	**57 00 00N 005 00 00E - 55 00 00N 005 00 00E - 54 30 00N 004 32 09E - 54 38 43N 004 20 00E -**				
Rationale for establishing the cross-border area, including performance benefits	**The area is established purely for operational purposes to ensure a safe and optimised/efficient handling of traffic crossing the FIR boundary.**				
Size of the cross-border area (km2)	**21096**				
Estimated annual number of flights	**n/a**				
Estimated annual number of SUs, if available	**n/a**				
Description of the services provided by the ANSP in the cross-border area					
Air Traffic Services (ATS)					
Annual cost incurred by the ANSP for the provision of services in the cross-border area	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	0	0	0	0	0
Methodology used to estimate/establish these costs					
There are no costs incurred in relation to the ATS delegation					
Have these costs been excluded from the determined costs in the scope of the performance plan?					No
See above					
Description of the financial arrangements in place to cover these costs					
See above					
Additional comment					

The area is established purely for operational purposes, with the objective to ensure a safet, most optimum/efficient handling of traffic across the FIR boundary. The area is not established as an independant ACC sector but included in the responsible ACC sector AoR hence no traffic counts are available for the area on its own but is included in the total sector count.

4.1.2 - Planned or implemented cross-border initiatives at the level of ANSPs

Number of cross-border initiatives	0

4.1.3 - Investment synergies achieved at FAB level or through other cross-border initiatives

Details of synergies in terms of common infrastructure and common procurement
There are no planned or implemented cross-border initiatives, hence no investment synergies. ATS delegation is based purely on operational requirements and no change to the current setup/number of ATS delegations is expected in the RP4 period.

4.2 - Deployment of SESAR Common Projects (CP1)

CP1 ATM Functionality (CP1-AF)/ Sub-functionality (CP1-s-AF)	Target date of implementation	Date of actual/expected deployment of s-AF	Description of realised and/or planned investment(s) related to the deployment of s-AF	Relevant investments (Ref. # as per section 2)	RP4 determined costs related to the sub-AF (in national currency and in nominal terms)				
					2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
CP1-AF1 - Extended AMAN and Integrated AMAN/DMAN in High-Density TMAs									
CP1-s-AF1.1 AMAN extended to en-route airspace	*31-12-2024*	**2018**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF1.2 AMAN/DMAN Integration	*31-12-2027*		**Not in scope**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-AF2 - Airport Integration and Throughput									
CP1-s-AF2.1 DMAN synchronised with predeparture sequencing	*31-12-2022*	**2024**	**Awaits CPH A/S upgrade on ASMGCS expected Q3 2024 and then full compliance.**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF2.2.1 Initial airport operations plan (iAOP)	*31-12-2023*		**Not relevant for Naviair ANSP**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF2.2.2 Airport operations plan (AOP)	*31-12-2027*		**Not relevant for Naviair ANSP**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF2.3 Airport safety nets	*31-12-2025*	**2024**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-AF3 - Flexible Airspace Management and Free Route Airspace									
CP1-s-AF3.1 Airspace management and advanced flexible use of airspace	*31-12-2022*	**2017**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF3.2 Free route airspace	*31-12-2025*	**2011**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-AF4 - Network Collaborative Management									
CP1-s-AF4.1 Enhanced short-term ATFCM measures	*31-12-2022*	**2022**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF4.2 Collaborative NOP	*31-12-2023*	**2023**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF4.3 Automated support for traffic complexity assessment	*31-12-2022*	**2022**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF4.4 AOP/NOP integration	*31-12-2027*	**2018**	**Completed**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0

CP1-AF5 - SWIM									
CP1-s-AF5.1 Common infrastructure components	*31-12-2024*	**2024**	**Will use EACP PKI solution provided by NM.**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF5.2 SWIM yellow profile technical infrastructure and specifications	*31-12-2025*	**2025**	**Local project ongoing. The investment is included in RP3 and the remaining part in RP4 including the deprication.**	see 2.1.3 Table E	-	400.000	400.000	400.000	400.000
CP1-s-AF5.3 Aeronautical information exchange	*31-12-2025*	**2025/2029**	**Majority of AF5.3will be completed in 2025. Remaining Related work to ensure TopSky-ATC One while becoming CP1 compliant also extract the operational benefits of CP1 in terms of improved information exchanges and operations incl cost savings. TopSky-ATC One solution for remaining CP1 requirements, based on COOPANS CP1 SWIM infrastructure design, integration and further development of local SWIM integration platform. Including test and validation of COOPANS upgraded system, preparation and performing of related training. The investment costs are reported in 2.1.1 as part of the total ATC One investment. As Naviair will go into operataions late 2029, no depreciation costs are included in the determined costs for RP4.**	see 2.1.1 A2 and A3	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF5.4 Meteorological information exchange	*31-12-2025*	**2025**	**Project ongoing and investment and depreciation is included in the RP3 reporting in 2.1.3 Table E**	see 2.1.3 Table E	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF5.5 Cooperative network information exchange	*31-12-2025*	**2025**	**No investment forseen as Naviair will use NM systems**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF5.6 Flight information exchange (yellow profile)	*31-12-2025*	**2025/2029**	**Flight planning for LCAPS will be ready in time. FDP will be ready with ATC One in 2029. The investment costs are reported in 2.1.1 as part of the total ATC One investment. As Naviair will go into operataions late 2029, no depreciation costs are included in the determined costs for RP4.**	See 2.1.1 A2 and A3	0	0	0	0	0

CP1-AF6 - Initial Trajectory Information Sharing									
CP1-s-AF6.1 Initial air-ground trajectory information sharing	*31-12-2027*	**2029**	**AF 6 will be implemented together with new ATM system (ATC One) planned for 2029. Functionality is part of the COOPANS ATC One project with Thales. The investment costs are reported in 2.1.1 as part of the total ATC One investment. As Naviair will go into operataions late 2029, no depreciation costs are included in the determined costs for RP4.**	see 2.1.1 A2 and A3	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF6.2 Network Manager trajectory information enhancement	*31-12-2027*	n/a	**only related to NM**	n/a	0	0	0	0	0
CP1-s-AF6.3 Initial trajectory information sharing ground distribution	*31-12-2027*	**2029**	**AF 6 will be implemented together with new ATM system (ATC One) planned for 2029. Functionality is part of the COOPANS ATC One project with Thales. The investment costs are reported in 2.1.1 as part of the total ATC One investment. As Naviair will go into operataions late 2029, no depreciation costs are included in the determined costs for RP4.**	See 2.1.1 A2	0	0	0	0	0

Total RP4 determined costs for common project related to the sub-functionalities across charging zones for the concerned entity	0	400000	400000	400000	400000

4.3 - Change management

Change management practices and transition plans for the entry into service of major airspace changes or for ATM system improvements, aimed at minimising any negative impact on the network performance
Naviair has implemented EU regulation 2017/373 including the change management processes required. This currently includes changes to ATS, CNS, QMS and SMS system. Any change to operational procedures, Airspace changes, Training and the technical system is assessed in accordance with established, and by danish authority, approved procedures that take into account the total effect on the system when deciding on a change to the functional system. The change management procedures are an intrgrated part of Naviair Management System ref. the requirements laid out in EU 2017/373. Main synergies, incl. transition plans for entry into service, are obtained via the COOPANS Alliance when it comes to change management of ATM system improvements.

SECTION 5: TRAFFIC RISK SHARING ARRANGEMENTS AND INCENTIVE SCHEMES

5.1 - Traffic risk sharing parameters

- 5.1.1 Traffic risk sharing - En route charging zones
- 5.1.2 Traffic risk sharing - Terminal charging zones

5.2 - Capacity incentive schemes

- 5.2.1 - Capacity incentive scheme - Enroute
  - a) Parameters for the calculation of financial advantages or disadvantages - En route
  - b) Pivot values - En route
  - c) Modulation mechanism (if applicable)
- 5.2.2 - Capacity incentive scheme - Terminal
  - a) Parameters for the calculation of financial advantages or disadvantages - En route
  - b) Pivot values - Terminal
  - c) Modulation mechanism (if applicable)

5.3 - Optional incentives

Annexes of relevance to this section

- ANNEX G. PARAMETERS FOR THE TRAFFIC RISK SHARING
- ANNEX I. PARAMETERS FOR THE MANDATORY CAPACITY INCENTIVES
- ANNEX K. OPTIONAL INCENTIVE SCHEMES

5.1 - Traffic risk sharing

5.1.1 Traffic risk sharing - En route charging zones

Denmark			Traffic risk-sharing parameters adapted?			no
			Service units lower than plan		Service units higher than plan	
	Dead band	Risk sharing band	% loss to be recovered	Max. charged if SUs 10% < plan	% additional revenue returned	Min. returned if SUs 10% > plan
Standard parameters	±2,00%	±10,0%	70,0%	5,6%	70,0%	5,6%

5.1.2 Traffic risk sharing - Terminal charging zones

Denmark - TCZ			Traffic risk-sharing parameters adapted?			no
			Service units lower than plan		Service units higher than plan	
	Dead band	Risk sharing band	% loss to be recovered	Max. charged if SUs 10% < plan	% additional revenue returned	Min. returned if SUs 10% > plan
Standard parameters	±2,00%	±10,0%	70,0%	5,6%	70,0%	5,6%

5.2 - Capacity incentive schemes

5.2.1 - Capacity incentive scheme - En route

a) Parameters for the calculation of financial advantages or disadvantages - En route

En route	Expressed in	Value
Dead band Δ	fraction of min	±0,040 min
Max bonus (≤2%)	*% of DC*	0,40%
Max penalty (≥ Max bonus)	*% of DC*	1,00%

b) Pivot values - En route

Basis for the annual setting of pivot values	Fixed (equal to performance targets)

c) Modulation mechanism (if applicable)

Section to be filled out only if the option for modulated pivot values has been selected under b) above.

Modulation mechanism of pivot values	Click to select

Based on the modulation mechanism(s) selected above, provide a detailed description of the principles and methodology used to modulate the pivot values

Option A) - Modulation based on unforeseen changes in traffic

1) the pivot value for the year N is **equal** to the yearly update of reference values provided by the Network Manager in the NOP	Click to select
2) the pivot value for year N is **informed** by the yearly update early update of reference values by the Network Manager in the NOP	Click to select
If 2) applies describe the principle and formulas on the basis of which the pivot values are calculated	

Option B) - Modulation limiting pivot values to C, R, S, T, M, P delay codes

The scope of the incentives is limited to delay causes related to ATC capacity, ATC routing, ATC staffing, ATC equipment, airspace management and special events with the codes C, R, S, T, M and P of the ATFCM user manual
Explanation on the methodology used to modulate the pivot values accordingly

Additional information in the case of the combination of A) and B)

If the modulation of pivot values is based on both options A) and B) above, provide additional information on how these two modulation mechanisms are applied in combination with each other

5.2.2 - Capacity incentive scheme - Terminal

a) Parameters for the calculation of financial advantages or disadvantages - Terminal

Terminal	Expressed in	Value
Dead band Δ	fraction of min	0,04
Max bonus (≤2%)	*% of DC*	0,40%
Max penalty (≥ Max bonus)	*% of DC*	1,00%

b) Pivot values - Terminal

Basis for the annual setting of pivot values	Fixed (equal to performance targets)

c) Modulation mechanism (if applicable)

Section to be filled out only if the option for modulated pivot values has been selected under b) above.

Modulation mechanism of pivot values	Click to select
Based on the modulation mechanism(s) selected above, provide a detailed description of the principles and methodology used to modulate the pivot values	

Option A) - Modulation based on unforeseen changes in traffic

The pivot value for year N is modulated in order to enable significant and unforeseen changes in traffic to be taken into account	Click to select
Description the principle and formulas on the basis of which the pivot values are calculated	

Option B) - Modulation limiting pivot values to C, R, S, T, M, P delay codes

The scope of the incentives is limited to delay causes related to ATC capacity, ATC routing, ATC staffing, ATC equipment, airspace management and special events with the codes C, R, S, T, M and P of the ATFCM user manual
Explanation on the methodology used to modulate the pivot values accordingly

Additional information in the case of the combination of A) and B)

If the modulation of pivot values is based on both options A) and B) above, provide additional information on how these two modulation mechanisms are applied in combination with each other

SECTION 6: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN

6.1 Monitoring of the implementation plan

6.2 Non-compliance with targets during the reference period

6 - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PERFORMANCE PLAN

6.1 Monitoring of the implementation plan

Description of the processes put in place by the NSA to monitor the implementation of the Performance Plan including the yearly monitoring of all KPIs and PIs defined in Annex I of the Regulation and a description of the data sources
The NSA monitors the performance of the entities through the yearly monitoring report process, through a regular consultation of the performance data provided by Eurocontrol and through regular bilateral oversight processes with the service providers. In general, there are very good professional relations between the NSA and the service providers and the cooperation takes place in an athmosphere of confidence and transparency. In addition Naviair's and the Danish Civil Aviation and Railway Authority managements meet 4 times a year. The status of Naviair's plan to reduce costs as a result of the covid-19 crisis is a fixed item on the agenda and progress is monitored from meeting to meeting. There is a special focus on Naviair's liquidity and the measures Naviair has taken to strengthen it.

6.2 Non-compliance with targets during the reference period

Description of the processes put in place and measures to be applied by the NSA to address the situation where targets are not reached during the reference period
In the case that targets are not met, the NSA will contact the service provider in question and demand explanations and analyses as to how the situation arrived. Based on these findings, other stakeholders will be consulted if relevant and proportionate and appropriate actions will be put in place. The Commission and the PRB will be kept informed as required.

7 - ANNEXES

ANNEX A. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (EN-ROUTE)
    ANNEX A.x - En route Charging Zone #x
ANNEX B. REPORTING TABLES & ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TERMINAL)
    ANNEX B.x - Terminal Charging Zone #x
ANNEX C. CONSULTATION
ANNEX D. LOCAL TRAFFIC FORECASTS
ANNEX E. INVESTMENTS
ANNEX F. BASELINE VALUES (COST-EFFICIENCY)
ANNEX G. PARAMETERS FOR THE TRAFFIC RISK SHARING
ANNEX H. RESTRUCTURING MEASURES AND COSTS
ANNEX I. PARAMETERS FOR THE MANDATORY CAPACITY INCENTIVES
ANNEX J. OPTIONAL KPIs AND TARGETS
ANNEX K. OPTIONAL INCENTIVE SCHEMES
ANNEX L. JUSTIFICATION FOR SIMPLIFIED CHARGING SCHEME
ANNEX M. COST ALLOCATION
ANNEX N. CROSS-BORDER ANS
ANNEX O. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL SAFETY TARGETS
ANNEX P. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT TARGETS
ANNEX Q. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL CAPACITY TARGETS
ANNEX R. JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL COST-EFFICIENCY TARGETS
ANNEX S. INTERDEPENDENCIES
ANNEX T. OTHER MATERIAL
ANNEX U. VERIFICATION BY THE NSA OF THE COMPLIANCE OF THE COST BASE
ANNEX V. IMPLEMENTATION OF ATM MASTER PLAN
ANNEX Y. RESPONSES TO COMPLETENESS VERIFICATION
ANNEX Z. CORRECTIVE MEASURES