

Performance Review Body Monitoring Report

Czech Republic - 2021

This report is automatically generated from: sesperformance.eu

COPYRIGHT NOTICE© European Union, 2025AND DISCLAIMERThis report has been prepared for the European Commission by the Performance
Review Body of the Single European Sky (PRB).Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged. However, neither
the European Commission, nor any person acting on its behalf, may be held respon-
sible for the use which may be made of the information contained in this publication,
or for any errors which may appear, despite careful preparation and checking.

Performance Review Body of the Single European Sky | Rue de la Fusée 96, Office 50.659, 1130 Brussels

Office Telephone: +32 (0)2 234 7824 | cathy.mannion@prb.eusinglesky.eu | prb-office@prb.eusinglesky.eu | eu-single-sky.transport.ec.europa.eu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	OVE	RVIEW	3
	1.1	Contextual information • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3
	1.2	Traffic (En route traffic zone) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3
	1.3	Safety (Main ANSP) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4
	1.4	Environment (Member State) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4
	1.5	Capacity (Member State) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	5
	1.6	Cost-efficiency (En route/Terminal charging zone(s)) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6
2	SAF	ETY - CZECH REPUBLIC	6
	2.1	PRB monitoring · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6
	2.2	Effectiveness of Safety Management (EoSM) (KPI#1) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7
	2.3	Occurrences - Rate of runway incursions (RIs) (PI#1) & Rate of separation minima infringe-	
		ments (SMIs) (PI#2) • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	7
3	ENV	IRONMENT - CZECH REPUBLIC	7
	3.1	PRB monitoring · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7
	3.2	En route performance · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8
	3.3	Terminal performance	9
	3.4	Civil-Military dimension • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	10
4	CAP	ACITY - CZECH REPUBLIC	12
	4.1	PRB monitoring · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12
	4.2	En route performance · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13
	4.3	Terminal performance	15
5	COS	T-EFFIENCY - CZECH REPUBLIC	17
	5.1	PRB monitoring · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	17
	5.2	En route charging zone	17
	5.3	Terminal charging zone	20

1 OVERVIEW

1.2

FR movements ('000)

800

600

400

2019

---- Planned

2020

1.1 Contextual information

National performance plan adopted following Commission Decision (EU) 2022/772 of 13 April 2022

List of ACCs 1 Prague ACC	Exchange rate (1 EUR=) 2017: 26.3115 CZK 2021: 25.6216 CZK
No of airports in the scope of the performance plan: • ≥80'K 1 • <80'K 0	Share of Union-wide: • traffic (TSUs) 2021 1.9% • en route costs 2021 1.5% Share en route / terminal costs 2021 88% / 12%
	En route charging zone(s) Czech Republic Terminal charging zone(s) Czech Republic

Traffic (En route traffic zone)

IFR movements - STATFOR October 2021 -

Czech Republic

2021

- Actual

-- Base forecast -- High forecast -- Low forecast

2022

2023

2024

 Czech Republic recorded 404K actual IFR movements in 2021, +19% compared to 2020 (340K).

• ANS CR

Other ANSPs

MET Providers • CHMI

• Actual 2021 IFR movements were +7.1% above the plan (377K).

• Actual 2021 IFR movements represent 47% of the actual 2019 level (867K).



• Czech Republic recorded 1,280K actual en route service units in 2021, +12% compared to 2020 (1,138K).

• Actual 2021 service units were in line with the plan (1,280K).

• Actual 2021 service units represent 44% of the actual 2019 level (2,936K).

1.3 Safety (Main ANSP)



• In 2021, safety performance of the Czech Republic was stable and not affected by the pandemic. ANS CR, that has already exceeded the EoSM targets in the previous year, undertook further actions to enhance its SMS function and to align it to Regulation (EU) 2017/373.

• Czech Republic recorded an increase in the rate of runway incursions and Prague airport (LKPR) recorded the second highest rate of RIs at 6.4 per 100,000 movements. ANS CR should consider looking into the reasons contributing to the rate and take appropriate mitigating actions, if necessary.

• The rate of separation minima infringements de-

creased in 2021 and is below the Union-wide average rates. The NSA closely monitors the rate of occurrences and assesses the effectiveness of implemented measures.

• ANS CR monitors safety performance using specific automated safety recording tools for occurrences, and it is one of only a handful of ANSPs to do so.



1.4 Environment (Member State)

• Czech Republic achieved a KEA performance of 2.03% compared to its target of 2.05% and contributed positively towards achiev-ing the Unionwide target. This is the best performance since 2017.

• The NSA states the main step taken to improve KEA was the implementation of free route airspace in February 2021, which allows shorter routes and increases the options for route planning.

• Both KEP and SCR were further reduced in comparison with 2020 and are at the lowest since 2017. The value of these two indicators is similar, meaning airspace users plan close to the shortest route available.

• The proportion of CDO flights remains at similar levels to 2020.

• During 2021, additional time in terminal airspace decreased from 0.67 to 0.50, however, additional taxi out time increased from 1.36 to 1.76 min/flight. Both values are lower than those seen in RP2.

1.5 Capacity (Member State)



Average en route ATFM delay per flight by delay groups

0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.40 0.37 ATFM delay (min/flight) 0.30 0.20 0.09 0.10 0.01 0.00-2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 Capacity Staffing Disruptions Weather Other non-ATC - Target

Average arrival ATFM delay per flight by delay groups

• Czech Republic registered 0.01 minutes of average en route ATFM delay per flight during 2021, thus meeting the local breakdown value of 0.06.

• Delays should be considered in the context of lower traffic: In Czech Republic, IFR movements in 2021 were 53% lower than in 2019.

• Between February and May 2022, Czech Republic has been one of the five Member States to be the most affected by the airspace closures East of the SES area, which impacted its traffic recovery.

• 2019 traffic levels are not likely being reached during RP3. A slight increase in the number of AT-COs in OPS is planned during RP3 with no capacity related delays envisaged.

• Delays were highest in April and August, mostly due to adverse weather conditions and ATC disruptions.

• The share of delayed flights with delays longer than 15 minutes in the Czech Republic increased by 16.44 p.p. compared to 2020 and was lower than 2019 values.

• The yearly total of sector opening hours in Prague ACC was 25,853, showing a 29.5% decrease compared to 2020. Sector opening hours are 44.4% below 2019 levels.

• Prague ACC registered 13.98 IFR movements per one sector opening hour in 2021, being 21.2% below 2019 levels.

1.6 Cost-efficiency (En route/Terminal charging zone(s))



• The en route 2020/2021 actual unit cost of Czech Republic was 76.64 \notin 2017, -3.5% lower than the determined unit cost (79.46 \notin 2017). The terminal actual unit cost was 485.30 \notin 2017, -3.2% lower than the determined unit cost (501.57 \notin 2017).

• The en route 2021 actual service units (1,280K) were equal to the determined service units.

• In 2021, actual total costs were -6.8 M€2017 lower (-7.5%), with a decrease in all cost categories. The decrease was mainly driven by lower other operating costs (-4.7 M€2017, or -21%) and staff costs (-1.4 M€2017, or -3.4%). The NSA only explained the reasons for the variances between 2019 actual and 2021 (e.g. due to a decrease of travel, decrease of staff, etc.).

• ANS CR spent 25.7 M€2017 in 2021 related to costs of investments, -2.5% lower than planned (26.4 M€2017), mainly due to a higher share of financing through debt that led to a lower WACC.

• The en route actual unit cost incurred by users in 2020/2021 was 84.11€, while the terminal actual unit cost incurred by users was 526.46€.

2 SAFETY - CZECH REPUBLIC

2.1 PRB monitoring

• In 2021, safety performance of the Czech Republic was stable and not affected by the pandemic. ANS CR, that has already exceeded the EoSM targets in the previous year, undertook further actions to enhance its SMS function and to align it to Regulation (EU) 2017/373.

• Czech Republic recorded an increase in the rate of runway incursions and Prague airport (LKPR) recorded the second highest rate of RIs at 6.4 per 100,000 movements. ANS CR should consider looking into the reasons contributing to the rate and take appropriate mitigating actions, if necessary.

• The rate of separation minima infringements decreased in 2021 and is below the Union-wide average rates. The NSA closely monitors the rate of occurrences and assesses the effectiveness of implemented measures.

• ANS CR monitors safety performance using specific automated safety recording tools for occurrences, and it is one of only a handful of ANSPs to do so.

2.2 Effectiveness of Safety Management (EoSM) (KPI#1)



EoSM - ANS CR

Focus on EoSM

All five EoSM components of the ANSP meet, or exceed, already the 2024 target level, with only one question below maximum maturity.

2.3 Occurrences - Rate of runway incursions (RIs) (PI#1) & Rate of separation minima infringements (SMIs) (PI#2)



3 ENVIRONMENT - CZECH REPUBLIC

3.1 PRB monitoring

• Czech Republic achieved a KEA performance of 2.03% compared to its target of 2.05% and contributed positively towards achiev-ing the Union-wide target. This is the best performance since 2017.

• The NSA states the main step taken to improve KEA was the implementation of free route airspace in February 2021, which allows shorter routes and increases the options for route planning.

• Both KEP and SCR were further reduced in comparison with 2020 and are at the lowest since 2017. The value of these two indicators is similar, meaning airspace users plan close to the shortest route available.

• The proportion of CDO flights remains at similar levels to 2020.

• During 2021, additional time in terminal airspace decreased from 0.67 to 0.50, however, additional taxi out time increased from 1.36 to 1.76 min/flight. Both values are lower than those seen in RP2.

3.2 En route performance







KEP & SCR

KEP & SCR (monthly, compared to KEA)



3.3 Terminal performance

3.3.1 Additional taxi-out time (AXOT) (PI#3) & Arrival Sequencing and Metering Area (ASMA) time (PI#4)



Focus on ASMA & AXOT

ΑΧΟΤ

Additional taxi-out times at Prague increased in 2021 (LKPR; 2020: 1.36 min/dep.; 2021: 1.76 min/dep.), but they were still 37% lower than in 2019. These additional times are always much higher in the winter months (probably related to de-icing procedures)

According to the Czech Republic's monitoring report: The development of PI #3 is mainly influenced by the volume of traffic and its structure (gradual return of traffic after the COVID-19 pandemic). Another factor influencing its development is the volume of days when it is necessary to de-icing aircraft that are in remote staging (i.e. within taxi-out phase) at LKPR.

The PI monitoring is part of annual monitoring of the ANSP performance (on quaterly basis) to the CAA.

ASMA

The yearly average of the additional times in the terminal airspace decreased in 2021 (LKPR; 2019: 1.47 min/arr.; 2020: 0.67 min/arr.; 2021: 0.5 min/arr.). However the performance has slightly deteriorated with respect to the period April-December 2020, in line with the traffic recovery.

According to the Czech Republic's monitoring report: *No formal initiatives were implemented, but if traffic permits the aircrafts are allowed for direct routing.*

The PI monitoring is part of annual monitoring of the ANSP performance (on quaterly basis) to the CAA.

3.3.2 Share of arrivals applying continuous descent operations (CDOs) (PI#5)



Focus CDOs

The share of CDO flights decreased at Prague to 25.9% which is lower than the overall RP3 value in 2021 (30.5%).

The monthly values dropped significantly as from May with values staying below 27%.

According to the Czech Republic's monitoring report: *There is no CDO officialy published procedure in FIR Prague, but if traffic permits clearence are issued in order to allow CDO.*

The PI monitoring is part of annual monitoring of the ANSP performance (on quaterly basis) to the CAA.

	Airport level														
	Additional taxi-out time (PI#3)					Additional ASMA time (PI#4)			Share of arrivals applying CDO (PI#5)			PI#5)			
Airport Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Prague/Ruzyne	1.36	1.76	NA	NA	NA	0.67	0.50	NA	NA	NA	28%	26%	NA	NA	NA
Karlovy Vary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	13%	16%	NA	NA	NA
Ostrava	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	35%	37%	NA	NA	NA
Brno Turany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	39%	37%	NA	NA	NA

3.4 Civil-Military dimension



RAI & RAU via available conditional routes (PIs#7 & 8)





Focus on Civil-Military dimension

Update on Military dimension of the plan

There is a significant impact of MIL activities on the ENV indicators. The military has the lead role in the AMC, the ANSPs has no power to evaluate the airspace reservation by the military. In any case, the implementation of FUA is regularly evaluated through monitoring organized by the CAA. The administrators of the individual TRA / TSA (mostly represented by MAA) submit the evaluation of the plans and the activation of these airspaces on a monthly basis to CAA, and any deficiencies are addressed within the ASMCG meetings or individually with specific administrators, if needed.

Airspace Charter of the Czech Republic describes the competent authorities (CIV and MIL), their responsibilities and principles by which a joint civilian-military body (ASM Committee - ASMC) carries out strategic planning for the use of the Czech Republic airspace. The Charter incorporates as annexes the descriptions of processes used to provide high quality services to airspace users and ATS providers through safe, accurate and timely planning, approval and promulgation of national airspace management measures and international cooperation. The Airspace Charter was udated at the end of 2021.

The airspace of the Czech Republic is open to flights and it is divided in accordance with the rules contained in Sections 44 - 44c) of Act No. 49/1997. Pursuant to Section 44(2) of the Act, the CAA issues, in agreement with the Ministry of Defence and after consulting the Person authorized to exercise state administration in the matters related to sport flying devices, measures of general nature under the Administrative Procedure Code on division of the airspace of the Czech Republic to ensure safe conduct of flights and efficient provision of air services. In fulfilment of that mandate, the CAA takes into account, where possible, the FUA specifications described in "EUROCONTROL Specifications for the Application of the Flexible Use of Airspace (FUA)". Consultation with airspace users, service providers and other relevant bodies is conducted with the aim of obtaining consensus, wherever possible, before making changes in the planning or design of airspace management. The consultations are performed in a transparent way following a predefined procedure. The ASMC ensures effective cooperation at all levels through the ASM Consultation Group (ASMCG). In application of Regulation (EC) No 2150/2005, the ASMC cooperates very closely with CAA and takes into account the findings and relevant corrective measures resulting from control activities (e.g. CAA, MAA, EASA). In accordance with ICAO requirements, the CAA publishes the airspace management policy and implementation of new airspace structures and follow-up procedures or their changes so that all airspace users and ATS providers have sufficient time to comply with the new requirements.

Dynamic Airspace Management is realized at ASM Level 2 and/or ASM Level 3. Areas published in AIP CR / MIL AIP or other pre-arranged areas can be used under FUA rules as AUP manageble with UUP function updates.

The ATM systems of the Czech Airforces are directly connected to the ANS CR systems in order to present current status of reserved areas to the ATCOs. The AIM/AIS provider promulgates the planning status of the airspaces concerned in AISVIEW web tool, which serves for airspace users as an information source. On the local level the FUA is addressed within the AMC activities, on the FAB CE level the DAM/STAM projects are in progress. The AMC is newly certificated under the EU 2017/373. The regulation 2150/2005 is fully implemented within the Czech Republic.

Military - related measures implemented or planned to improve capacity

The traffic complexity manager (a tool developed with the SESAR support) was put into full operational use in 2020. The tool is predicting traffic load in particular sectors (including military activities) and thus allowing for better ATCOs usage and improvement in capacity area.

The establishment of Airspace designer function was preparing during the year 2021 to be ready at the begining of 2022 and serves as a goverment service for professional preparation of requests and supporting documentation for all changes in the airspace structures in future.

Initiatives implemented or planned to improve PI#6

[As previously documented in update of military dimension of the plan plus..]

The performance monitoring and the assessment and review of FUA operational performance are organised by CAA and MAA.

Dynamic Airspace Management is realized at ASM Level 2 and/or ASM Level 3. Areas published in AIP CR / MIL AIP or other pre-arranged areas can be used under FUA rules as AUP manageble with UUP function updates. FUA evaluation is performed monthly by individual TRA / TSA administrators and reported to the CAA. Deficiencies are addressed both within the ASMCG meetings and individually with individual administrators, if needed.

The MAA was informed about the negative trend in proportion of planned and subsequently used airspace in 2021 with aim to asked MIL for implementation of appropriate remedy actions.

Initiatives implemented or planned to improve PI#7

There is no data available for either Czech Republic or Prague ACC.

Initiatives implemented or planned to improve PI#8

There is no data available for either Czech Republic or Prague ACC.

4 CAPACITY - CZECH REPUBLIC

4.1 PRB monitoring

• Czech Republic registered 0.01 minutes of average en route ATFM delay per flight during 2021, thus meeting the local breakdown value of 0.06.

• Delays should be considered in the context of lower traffic: In Czech Republic, IFR movements in 2021 were 53% lower than in 2019.

• Between February and May 2022, Czech Republic has been one of the five Member States to be the most affected by the airspace closures East of the SES area, which impacted its traffic recovery.

• 2019 traffic levels are not likely being reached during RP3. A slight increase in the number of ATCOs in OPS is planned during RP3 with no capacity related delays envisaged.

• Delays were highest in April and August, mostly due to adverse weather conditions and ATC disruptions.

• The share of delayed flights with delays longer than 15 minutes in the Czech Republic increased by 16.44 p.p. compared to 2020 and was lower than 2019 values.

• The yearly total of sector opening hours in Prague ACC was 25,853, showing a 29.5% decrease compared to 2020. Sector opening hours are 44.4% below 2019 levels.

• Prague ACC registered 13.98 IFR movements per one sector opening hour in 2021, being 21.2% below 2019 levels.

4.2 En route performance

4.2.1 En route ATFM delay (KPI#1)



Average en route ATFM delay per flight by delay groups

Distribution of IFR flights per the duration of en route ATFM delay



Focus on en route ATFM delay

Summary of capacity performance

The Czech Republic experienced an increase in traffic from 340k flights in 2020 to 404k flights in 2021, with practically zero ATFM delays. However, traffic levels were still substantially below the 867k flights in 2019.

NSA's assessment of capacity performance

There were no material delay recorded in the Czech Republic due to significantly lower traffic caused by the COVID crisis.

Monitoring process for capacity performance

The monitoring process is based on quarterly monitoring reports prepared by ANS CR. These are based on the company Annual plan and cover all KPA. Quarterly reports are submitted to the CAA.

Capacity planning

There was enough capacity in the Czech Republic to cover actual demand in 2021. The spare capacity due to lower than originally predicted traffic was use to prepare the whole transition proces (testing, training, etc.) to new main ATM System - TopSky. The other main measures (ATS optimisation, FRA introduction, etc.) were deployed. Additional training was carried out to maintain ATCO skills.

Following the OPS introduction of the New ATM system TopSky, capacities were reduced. Since 25 FEB 2022 gradual increase of capacities is taking place, but at the time of issuing this monitoring report the capacities do not achieve 100% of available planned capacity. This process is significantly hampered by consequences of war in Ukraine and disruptions of operations in PANSA organisation (ANSP Poland).



4.2.2 Other indicators





Focus on ATCOs in operations

N/A

4.3 Terminal performance

4.3.1 Arrival ATFM delay (KPI#2)



Average arrival ATFM delay per flight by delay groups

Focus on arrival ATFM delay

Czech Republic has included only Prague in their last Performance Plan for RP3 monitoring. The Airport Operator Data Flow, necessary for the monitoring of the additional times, is correctly established at Prague and the monitoring of all environment indicators can be performed.

Traffic this airport in 2021 was still 62% lower than in 2019, even if 13% higher than in 2020. Average arrival ATFM delays at Prague in 2021 was 0.01 min/arr, compared to 0.09 min/arr in 2020. ATFM slot adherence has improved (2021: 95.3%; 2020: 94.7%).

Delays at Prague (LKPR: 2019: 0.18 min/arr.; 2020: 0.09 min/arr.; 2021: 0.01 min/arr.) averaged nearly zero, and were only registered in December. 100% of these regulations were attributed to ATC capacity

The provisional national target on arrival ATFM delay in 2021 was met. In accordance with Article 3 (3) (a) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1627: The incentive scheme shall cover only the calendar years 2022 to 2024.

All causes pre-departure delay 8.3 8.3 8 Delay (min/flight) 6 4 2 0 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024

Other terminal performance indicators (PI#1-3) 4.3.2

		Avg arrival ATF	M delay (KPI#2)		Slot adher	rence (PI#1)	
Airport name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
Brno Turany	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.0%	98.2%	NA%	NA%
Karlovy Vary	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.0%	100.0%	NA%	NA%
Ostrava	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.0%	98.0%	NA%	NA%
Prague/Ruzyne	0.09	0.01	NA	NA	94.7%	95.3%	NA%	NA%
		ATC pre depart	ure delay (PI#2))	A	Il causes pre dep	oarture delay (PI#3)
Airport name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
Brno Turany	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Karlovy Vary	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ostrava	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prague/Ruzyne	0.22	NA	NA	NA	8.3	8.3	NA	NA

Airport level

Focus on performance indicators at airport level

ATFM slot adherence

With the drastic drop in traffic, the share of regulated departures from Prague virtually disappeared until July 2021.

The slot adherence in 2021 was 95.3%, a slight improvement with respect to 2020 (94.9%). With regard to the 4.7% of flights that did not adhere, 4.2% was early and 0.5% was late.

ATC pre-departure delay

The quality of the airport data reported by Prague (the only Czech airport subject to monitoring of this indicator) is too low, preventing the calculation of this indicator.

The calculation of the ATC pre-departure delay is based on the data provided by the airport operators through the Airport Operator Data Flow (APDF) which is properly implemented at Prague.

However, there are several quality checks before EUROCONTROL can produce the final value which is established as the average minutes of pre-departure delay (delay in the actual off block time) associated to the IATA delay code 89 (through the APDF, for each delayed flight, the reasons for that delay have to be transmitted and coded according to IATA delay codes.

However, sometimes the airport operator has no information concerning the reasons for the delay in the off block, or they cannot convert the reasons to the IATA delay codes. In those cases, the airport operator might:

- Not report any information about the reasons for the delay for that flight (unreported delay)
- Report a special code to indicate they do not have the information (code ZZZ)
- Report a special code to indicate they do not have the means to collect and/or translate the information (code 999)

To be able to calculate with a minimum of accuracy the PI for a given month, the minutes of delay that are not attributed to any IATA code reason should not exceed 40% of the total minutes of pre-departure delay observed at the airport.

Finally, to be able to produce the annual figure, at least 10 months of valid data is requested by EUROCON-TROL.

The share of unidentified delay reported by Prague was well above 40% since April 2020, preventing the calculation of this indicator. Prague had proper reporting before the pandemic, but now even with the traffic recovery, unidentified delays still account for more than 50% of the total delays.

All causes pre-departure delay

Prague is the only Czech airport subject to the monitoring of this indicator.

The total (all causes) delay in the actual off block time at Prague in 2021 was nearly the same as in 2020 (LKPR: 2020: 8.30 min/dep.; 2021: 8.32 min/dep.). The highest delays per flight were observed in January-February and in April.

5 COST-EFFIENCY - CZECH REPUBLIC

5.1 PRB monitoring

• The en route 2020/2021 actual unit cost of Czech Republic was 76.64 €2017, -3.5% lower than the determined unit cost (79.46 €2017). The terminal actual unit cost was 485.30 €2017, -3.2% lower than the determined unit cost (501.57 €2017).

• The en route 2021 actual service units (1,280K) were equal to the determined service units.

• In 2021, actual total costs were -6.8 M€2017 lower (-7.5%), with a decrease in all cost categories. The decrease was mainly driven by lower other operating costs (-4.7 M€2017, or -21%) and staff costs (-1.4 M€2017, or -3.4%). The NSA only explained the reasons for the variances between 2019 actual and 2021 (e.g. due to a decrease of travel, decrease of staff, etc.).

• ANS CR spent 25.7 M€2017 in 2021 related to costs of investments, -2.5% lower than planned (26.4 M€2017), mainly due to a higher share of financing through debt that led to a lower WACC.

• The en route actual unit cost incurred by users in 2020/2021 was 84.11€, while the terminal actual unit cost incurred by users was 526.46€.

5.2 En route charging zone

5.2.1 Unit cost (KPI#1)







Actual and determined data

Total costs - nominal (M€)	2020-2021	2022	2023	2024
Actual costs	196	NA	NA	NA
Determined costs	203	118	126	128
Difference costs	-7	NA	NA	NA
Inflation assumptions	2020-2021	2022	2023	2024
Determined inflation rate	NA	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Determined inflation index	NA	112.8	115	117.3
Actual inflation rate	NA	NA	NA	NA
Actual inflation index	NA	NA	NA	NA
Difference inflation index (p.p.)	NA	NA	NA	NA



Focus on unit cost

AUC vs. DUC

In the combined year 2020-2021, the en route AUC (2,016.56 CZK2017 or 76.64 \in 2017) was lower by - 3.5% (-74.07 CZK2017 or -2.82 \in 2017) comparing to the DUC (2,090.64 CZK2017 or 79.46 \in 2017). This was the sole effect of the lower than planned en route costs in real terms (-3.5%, -179.2 MCZK2017 or -6.8 M \in 2017).

En route service units

There is no difference in the number of TSU, as the figures used in the final version of the RP3 PP for the forecasted traffic for years 2020 and 2021 were in line with actuals.

En route costs by entity

Actual en route costs are -3.5% lower than planned (-6.8 M€2017) which is mainly driven by the lower by -3.6% (or -5.8 M€2017) costs for the main ANSP (ANS Czech Republic) and for the NSA/EUROCONTROL, -4.4% (or -1.1 M€2017). Actual 2020-2021 costs for METSP were slightly above plan (+2.1%).

En route costs for the main ANSP at charging zone level

The lower than planned en route costs in real terms for ANS CR (-3.6%, or -5.8 M€2017) result from:

- lower than planned staff costs by -1.4% (or -1.3 M€2017);
- lower other operating costs by -15.9% (or -3.8 M€2017);
- lower depreciation by -0.3% (or -0.1 M€2017); and
- lower cost of capital by -3.5% (or -0.5 M€2017);
- slightly higher deduction for VFR exempted flights (+3.0%).

The lower execution of costs in 2020-2021 were the effect of measures implemented by ANS CR, and in particular: cancelation of benefits, limitation of the contribution to supplementary pension savings, reduction of basic salary and reduction in the number of staff. In the area of other operating costs the travel, maintenance and training costs were reduced.

5.2.2 Actual unit cost incurred by the users (AUCU) (PI#1)



AUCU components (€/SU) – 2020-202	1
Components of the AUCU in 2020-2021	€/SU
DUC	84.80
Inflation adjustment	0.25
Cost exempt from cost-sharing	-0.72
Traffic risk sharing adjustment	0.00
Traffic adj. (costs not TRS)	0.00
Finantial incentives	0.00
Modulation of charges	0.00
Cross-financing	0.00
Other revenues	-0.23
Application of lower unit rate	0.00
Total adjustments	-0.69
AUCU	84.11
AUCU vs. DUC	-0.8%

Cost exempt from cost sharing

Cost exempt from cost sharing by item - 2020-2021	€′000	€/SU
New and existing investments	-610.3	-0.25
Competent authorities and qualified	11.3	0.00
entities costs		
Eurocontrol costs	-1,188.8	-0.49
Pension costs	57.3	0.02
Interest on loans	0.0	0.00
Changes in law	0.0	0.00
Total cost exempt from cost risk sharing	-1,730.4	-0.72

5.2.3 Regulatory result (RR)



Share of RR in AUCU



Focus on regulatory result

ANS CR's net gain on activity in the en route charging zone in the combined year 2020-2021

ANS CR's net gain amounts to +152.1 MCZK (or +5.9 M€) and fully resulting form the gains from the cost sharing mechanism.

ANS CR's overall regulatory results (RR) for the en route activity

Ex-post, the overall RR taking into account the net gain from the en route activity mentioned above (+152.1 MCZK) and the actual RoE (+353.7 MCZK or +13.6 M \in) amounts to +505.8 MCZK or +19.5 M \in (11.2% of the en route revenues). The resulting ex-post rate of return on equity is 9.9%, which is higher than the 7.0% planned in the PP.

5.3 Terminal charging zone

5.3.1 Unit cost (KPI#1)





Actual and determined data						
Total costs - nominal (M€)	2020-2021	2022	2023	2024		
Actual costs	31	NA	NA	NA		
Determined costs	32	17	20	21		
Difference costs	-1	NA	NA	NA		
Inflation assumptions	2020-2021	2022	2023	2024		
Determined inflation rate	NA	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%		
Determined inflation index	NA	112.8	115	117.3		
Actual inflation rate	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Actual inflation index	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Difference inflation index (p.p.)	NA	NA	NA	NA		





Costs by nature - ANS CR 2020-2021



Focus on unit cost

AUC vs. DUC

In the combined year 2020-2021, the terminal AUC (12,769.02 CZK2017 or 485.30 \leq 2017) was lower by -3.2% (or -427.91 CZK2017 or -16.26 \leq 2017) comparing to the DUC (13,196.93 CZK2017 or 501.57 \leq 2017). This was in particular, the effect of the lower than planned terminal costs in real terms (-3.5%, -28.2 MCZK2017 or -1.1 M \leq 2017).

Terminal service units

The difference between planned and actual TNSUs (-0.3%) falls within the $\pm 2\%$ dead band. Hence, the resulting loss is borne by the main ANSP.

Terminal costs by entity

Actual terminal costs are -3.5% lower than planned (-1.1 M€2017) which is mainly driven by the lower costs for ANS CR (-3.7% or -1.1 M€2017). The differences in the actual costs for NSA and METSP are not significant, and correspond to -1.5% and -0.7% respectively.

Terminal costs for the main ANSP at charging zone level

The lower than planned terminal costs in real terms for ANS CR (-3.7%, or -1.1 M€2017) result from:

- lower than planned staff costs by -1.2% (or -0.2 M€2017);
- lower other operating costs by -15.8% (or -0.7 M€2017);
- lower depreciation by -0.8% (or -0.1 M€2017);

- deduction of the VFR exempted flights (-0.1 M€2017), while no deduction was foreseen in the PP. The lower execution of costs in 2020-2021 were the effect of measures implemented by ANS CR, and in particular: cancelation of benefits, limitation of the contribution to supplementary pension savings, reduction of basic salary and reduction in the number of staff. In the area of other operating costs the travel, maintenance and training costs were reduced. Cost of capital was not charged to the airspace users in 2020-2021.

5.3.2 Actual unit cost incurred by the users (AUCU) (PI#1)



AUCU components (€/SU) – 2020	-2021
Components of the AUCU in 2020-2021	€/SU
DUC	541.13
Inflation adjustment	1.80
Cost exempt from cost-sharing	-1.20
Traffic risk sharing adjustment	0.00
Traffic adj. (costs not TRS)	0.07
Finantial incentives	0.00
Modulation of charges	0.00
Cross-financing	0.00
Other revenues	-0.51
Application of lower unit rate	-14.93
Total adjustments	-14.77
AUCU	526.36
AUCU vs. DUC	-2.7%





Cost exempt from cost sharing by item - 2020-2021	€′000	€/SU
New and existing investments	-69.2	-1.15
Competent authorities and qualified entities costs	-8.1	-0.13
Eurocontrol costs	0.0	0.00
Pension costs	5.5	0.09
Interest on loans	0.0	0.00
Changes in law	0.0	0.00
Total cost exempt from cost risk sharing	-71.8	-1.20

5.3.3 Regulatory result (RR)



Share of RR in AUCU





Focus on regulatory result

ANS CR's net gain and overall regulatory result (RR) on activity in the terminal charging zone in the combined year 2020-2021

ANS CR's net gain amounts to +27.0 MCZK (or +1.1 M \in) and is the result of the gain from the cost sharing mechanism (+29.6 MCZK), and a loss from the traffic risk sharing mechanism (-2.6 MCZK). As ANS CR did not charge the cost of capital to the airspace users in 2020 and 2021, the overall RR for terminal activity in 2020-2021 corresponds to the net gain as mentioned above (+27.0 MCZK or +1.1 M \in).