

Comparison of Operational Air Navigation System Performance in Brazil and Europe

Performance Section (DECEA) and Performance Review Unit (EUROCONTROL)

08 June 2021

Contents

Operational Air Navigation System Performance - Brazil/Europe	5
(PART*) Part A - Demand/Traffic Development during COVID19	7
COVID Briefing	9
1 (PART*) - Initial Comparison	11
2 Brazil/Europe Comparison of Operational ANS Performance	13
Foreword(s)	15
Document Identification	17
3 Executive Summary	19
4 Introduction	21
4.1 Background	21
4.2 Scope	22
4.3 Data Sources	27
4.4 Structure of the Report	27
5 Air Navigation System Characteristics	29
5.1 Organisation of Air Navigation Services	29
5.2 High-Level System Comparison	30
6 Traffic Characterisation	33
6.1 Annual Traffic	33
6.2 Peak Day Traffic	34
6.3 Fleet Mix	37
7 Predictability	39
7.1 Arrival Punctuality	39
7.2 Departure Punctuality	40

8	Capacity and Throughput	43
8.1	Peak Declared Capacity	43
8.2	Peak Arrival Throughput	46
8.3	Peak Departure Throughput	47
8.4	Declared Capacity and Peak Throughput	48
8.5	Capacity Utilisation	49
9	Efficiency	51
9.1	Additional Taxi-In Time	51
9.2	Additional Taxi-Out Time	53
9.3	Additional Time in Terminal Airspace	54
10	Conclusions	57
11	References	59

Operational Air Navigation System Performance - Brazil/Europe

This online version presents the initial comparison of Operational Air Navigation System Performance in Brazil and Europe.

It is organised in 2 parts

- Part A - most recent COVID19 related system characteristics in terms of traffic/demand. This part will be updated on a monthly basis.
- Part B - initial comparison report. The initial comparison report describes the operational performance in Brazil and Europe for the years 2016-2019. It is based on a selected subset of the ICAO GANP key performance indicators. It is planned that the rolling update of Part A will successively develop into the next iteration of the comparison report.

Previous reports will be available via this page for download.

For any questions, please do not hesitate to contact one of the authoring organisations. Enjoy the read!

Performance Section, DECEA Performance Review Unit, EUROCONTROL

**(PART*) Part A -
Demand/Traffic
Development during
COVID19**

COVID Briefing

Here we paste the COVID briefing

Chapter 1

(PART*) - Initial Comparison

Chapter 2

Brazil/Europe Comparison of Operational ANS Performance

NOTE: THIS VERSION HAS BEEN RENDERED IN SUPPORT OF THE FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL AS AGREED DURING

Foreword(s)

Collaboration is critical to achieving complex goals. In 2015, DECEA initiated a strategic partnership with EUROCONTROL to improve Brazil's air navigation services by sharing best practices and developing meaningful joint projects. Now, another relevant product is ready. The Brazil/Europe ATM-related performance comparison report is an excellent example of successfully shared accomplishments. The data provided herein shows many positive outcomes in the Brazilian air traffic control system of DECEA's recent actions and offers insights to further opportunities for improvements. The report will help ANSPs, airlines, and airports better understand the similarities and differences between Brazilian and European air traffic. DECEA Subdepartment of Operations invites all ATM stakeholders to know more about aeronautical facts both in Brazil and Europe, and cooperate to develop enhanced ANS worldwide.

Brig. Fernando César da Costa e Silva Braga Head of SDOP

The Brazil/Europe Comparison of ANS performance is a great effort from both EUROCONTROL's Performance Review Unit and DECEA's Performance Section, which debuts in its first cooperative publication. We encourage the development of similar future works, so to help ATM stakeholders to understand and improve air traffic. The report is a step forward for an enhanced understanding of ATM aspects in both regions. Aviation is not a stand-alone system. In fact, it is a system-of-systems, and only by sharing data and through interactive activities will global ATM evolve. DECEA reinforces its trust in the high value of collaborative practices. We sincerely acknowledge EUROCONTROL partners' efforts and hope that the following pages may be useful to support a more efficient global ATM system.

Lt. Brig. Heraldo Luiz Rodrigues Director General DECEA

The Performance Review Commission (PRC) is committed to support the international harmonisation and further development of the performance based approach. It is encouraging to see that through regional collaborations many parties exchange and learn from each other. And together we manage to promote the performance know-how under the umbrella of ICAO. Performance comparisons are at the heart of developing data-driven and independent anal-

yses to support decision-making. Responding to the unprecedented impact of COVID and in view of the multifaceted challenges our industry faces over the coming years, I am pleased to see this first operational performance related comparison report between Brazil and Europe coming together. It documents a first step in a journey and provides a good basis to study the similarities and differences in both regions. We appreciate the effort that went into the data collection and production of this report on the Brazilian side by DECEA's Performance Section, and the close cooperation with the Performance Review Unit. This report will help to foster cooperation and carry out research and development into the longer term evolution of air navigation system performance and benchmarking with other regions.

Marc Baumgartner PRC Chairman

The EUROCONTROL Agency appreciates the cooperation under the DECEA/EUROCONTROL agreement.

The pressure on our industry to cope and respond to the challenges of 2020 is unprecedented. Competence and expertise will be crucial to meet the demands of the travelling public and airspace users. Performance benchmarking is a vital element in providing a basis for decision-making by providing insights in how different air navigation systems work. This first operational comparison between Brazil and Europe provides a basis to elaborate on operational concepts and supporting infrastructure in both regions. The report examines commonalities and differences in terms of air traffic management and performance influencing factors in Brazil and Europe and explores the observed performance on the basis of some key indicators. There is no shortage of ideas on how to expand the analyses through the close collaboration between the Performance Section and Performance Review Unit. With this initial report, we are looking forward to deepen our cooperation with DECEA and future updates.

Eamonn Brennan Director General EUROCONTROL

Document Identification

This document is a joint publication of the Department of Airspace Control of the Brazilian Air Force (DECEA) and the European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation EUROCONTROL in the interest of the exchange of information. It is prepared in application of Annex 4 of the Agreement for Co-operation signed between DECEA and EUROCONTROL on 5 October 2015. The objective of Annex 4 is to foster cooperation and facilitate further harmonisation of performance monitoring and reporting practices and to jointly produce factual high-level comparisons of Air Traffic Management performance between Brazil and Europe. The work is based on a set of comparable performance indicators, jointly developed and refined, creating a sound basis for such factual comparisons between countries and world regions. Both parties are committed to share the lessons learned and best practices through this process and promote the application of this know-how under the umbrella of further regional or international working arrangements.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER

Every possible effort was made to ensure that the information and analysis contained in this document are as accurate and complete as possible. Should you find any errors or inconsistencies we would be grateful if you could bring them to our attention.

The document may be copied in whole or in part providing that the copyright notice and disclaimer are included. The information contained in this document may not be modified without prior written permission from the Air Traffic Organization Strategy and Performance Business Unit or the Performance Review Commission. The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of DECEA or EUROCONTROL, which makes no warranty, either implied or express, for the information contained in this document, neither does it assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of this information.

© Department of Airspace Control (DECEA), Performance Section © European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL), Performance Review Unit

Chapter 3

Executive Summary

The Brazilian Department of Airspace Control (DECEA) Performance Section and the EUROCONTROL Performance Review Unit (PRU) jointly produced this initial performance study using commonly agreed metrics and definitions to compare, understand, and improve air the performance of navigation services (ANS).

This initial report focusses on a subset of the eleven ICAO Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) Key Performance Areas (KPA) (ICAO, 2005, Appendix D). While the primacy of Safety is fully recognised, the scope of this report is limited to operational ANS performance of the KPAs Predictability, Capacity, and Efficiency. Excellence in operational performance will positively influence safety.

From an indicator perspective, DECEA Performance Section and EUROCONTROL PRU agreed to collaborate on the basis of the performance indicators coordinated by ICAO as part of the recent update of the GANP (ICAO, 2016). These indicators form a *lingua franca* and are currently used within various regional and multi-national benchmarking reports. The work takes also into account the conventions made and elaborated by the multi-lateral Performance Benchmarking Working Group (PBWG) ¹.

For this initial report a subset of Key Performance Areas (KPA) and subsequent performance indicators was chosen:

- Predictability: arrival and departure punctuality;
- Capacity: peak arrival and departure throughput, and capacity utilisation;
- and

¹PBWG members include at the time of writing: CAA Singapore, Aerothai Thailand, Japan JCAB, Brazil DECEA, United States FAA/ATO, and EUROCONTROL. The working group aims to develop harmonised guidance material for the application of the ICAO GANP KPIs

- Efficiency: additional taxi-in and taxi-out time, and additional time in terminal airspace.

The goal of this report is to foster the common understanding and interpretation of the ICAO GANP KPIs and perform a systematic analysis of the operational air navigation system performance of the regional air traffic management systems in a coherent manner.

This report represents the first bi-regional study between Brazil and Europe. Under the umbrella of the DECEA-EUROCONTROL memorandum of cooperation regular updates of this comparison report are envisaged.

Chapter 4

Introduction

4.1 Background

ICAO emphasises the importance of a performance-based approach and invites States, (sub-) regions and organisations to engage and participate in performance benchmarking activities. In 2016 interested stakeholders developed a set of key performance indicators used by a variety of organisations to establish a common set of indicators. This set of indicators is proposed as part of the ICAO Global Air Navigation Plan update cycle and the related Aviation System Block Upgrades. Stakeholders are encouraged to share their common understanding and lessons learnt from measuring air navigation system performance and providing input to the decision making process in terms of operational procedure changes and deployment of novel enabling technologies.

Brazil and Europe represented by DECEA and EUROCONTROL engaged in 2016 in a cooperation agreement. Amongst other activities, this agreement entails the collaboration in developing an initial operational performance benchmarking exercise for Air Navigation Services (ANS).

Based on this agreement, DECEA started a Working Group, which has become the ATM Performance Indicators Management Committee, aiming at improving performance-based management. Through lessons learnt from the best practices observed at EUROCONTROL, and in particular PRU, DECEA established the Performance Section.

DECEA Performance Section and the PRU have established a joint project to foster the common understanding and harmonised interpretation of the proposed ICAO GANP indicators. The technical work has been conducted throughout the recent years comprising joint workshops and a series of web-based discussion sessions and face-to-face meetings. It also comprised the identification and validation of comparable data sources and joint data processing and analysis to

produce this report.

4.2 Scope

Comparisons and operational benchmarking activities require common definitions and joint understanding. Hence the work in this report draws from commonly accepted outputs of previous work from ICAO, the FAA, EUROCONTROL and CANSO. The key performance indicators (KPIs) used in this report are developed using procedures on best available data from both the DECEA Performance Section and PRU. The comparison described in this report does not address all eleven Key Performance Areas (KPA). From an indicator perspective, DECEA Performance Section and PRU agreed to focus on an operational benchmarking and to collaborate on the basis of the currently proposed performance indicators coordinated by ICAO in conjunction with the update of the Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP)(ica, 2016). This initial report focuses on system characteristic measures, and the KPAs Capacity, Efficiency and Predictability.

4.2.1 Geographical Scope

The geographical scope of this report relates to Brazil and Europe.

Brazil is defined as the sovereign airspace of the national territory of Brazil. In Brazil, airspace control is performed in an integrated civil-military manner. Both the air defence and air traffic control functions are performed by the same institution: the Department of Airspace Control (DECEA). DECEA is a governmental organisation subordinated to the Office of Defence and to the Brazilian Air Force Command, coordinating and providing human resources, technical equipment for all air traffic units servicing the Brazilian territory, ensuring the safety of air traffic flow and, at the same time, military defence.

DECEA is the main body of the Brazilian Airspace Control System (SISCEAB). The department is in charge of providing the Air Navigation Services for the 22 million km² of airspace jurisdiction, including oceanic areas. More specifically, the Brazilian airspace is composed of 5 Flight Information Regions (FIR). Air traffic within these FIRs is managed by 4 operational bases subordinated to DECEA. These integrated Centres for Air Defence and Air Traffic Control (CINDACTA) cover the following areas (c.f. Fig. 4.1).

The CINDACTAs combine civil air traffic control and air defence military operations. In addition to CINDACTAs, there is also the São Paulo Flight Protection Service (SRPV-SP), which is responsible for controlling the air traffic of the largest air flow density area in the country, in the terminal areas of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro.

In this report, Europe, i.e. the European airspace, is defined as the area where the 41 EUROCONTROL member states provide air navigation services, excluding the oceanic areas and the Canary islands. In 2016, EUROCONTROL signed




Figure 4.1: Brazilian Airspace Structure/FIRs (CINDACTAs)




Figure 4.2: European Airspace and EUROCONTROL Member States

a comprehensive agreement with Israel and Morocco. Both comprehensive agreement States will be successively fully integrated into the working structures including performance monitoring. EUROCONTROL is an inter-governmental organization working towards a highly harmonized European air traffic management system. Air traffic services are provided by air navigation service providers entrusted by the different EUROCONTROL member states. Dependent on the local and national regimes, there is a mix of civil and military service providers, and integrated service provision. The Maastricht Upper Area Control Center is operated by EUROCONTROL on behalf of 4 States (Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Germany). It is the only multi-national cross-border air traffic unit in Europe at the time being. Given the European context and airspace structure, the European area comprises 37 ANSPs with 62 en-route centers and 16 stand-alone Approach Control Units (i.e. totalling 78 air traffic service units).

Europe employs a collaborative approach to manage and service airspace and air traffic. This includes the integration of military objectives and requirements which need to be fully coordinated within the ATM System. A variety of coordination cells/procedures exists between civil air traffic control centers and air defence units reflecting the local practices. Many EUROCONTROL member states are members of NATO and have their air defence centers / processes for civil-military coordination aligned under the integrated NATO air defence system.

Further details on the organisation of the regional air navigation systems in Brazil and Europe will be provided in Section 5.1.

As concerns airport-related air navigation performance, this initial comparison report addresses the performance at a set of airports. These airports represent the top-10 or most relevant airports in terms of IFR movements in both regions and allow to make meaningful comparisons. In Brazil, next to the traffic, the study airports have consolidated systems and structured processes for data collection. For the European context, the selected study airports comprise the busiest airports in different states exhibiting a mix of national, regional, and international air traffic. These airports are also characterised by varying operational constraints that make them excellent candidates for an international comparison. All of these airports are subject to the performance monitoring under the EUROCONTROL Performance Review System and provide movement related data on the basis of a harmonised data specification.

```
## Warning: ggrepel: 6 unlabeled data points (too many overlaps). Consider
## increasing max.overlaps
```

Fig. 4.3 provides an overview of both regions and the location of the chosen study airports within the regions. The airports are also listed in Table 4.1.




Figure 4.3: Study airports of Brazil/Europe Comparison

Table 4.1: List of airports for initial Brazil / Europe operational ANS performance comparison

Brazil	Europe
* Brasília (SBBR)	* Amsterdam Schiphol (EHAM)
* Guarulhos (SBGR)	* Paris Charles de Gaulle (LFPG)
* São Paulo (SBSP)	* London Heathrow (EGLL)
* Campinas (SBKP)	* Frankfurt (EDDF)
* Rio de Janeiro (SBRJ)	* Munich (EDDM)
* Galeão (SBGL)	* Madrid (LEMD)
* Confins (SBCF)	* Rome Fiumicino (LIRF)
* Salvador (SBSV)	* Barcelona (LEBL)
* Porto Alegre (SBPA)	* London Gatwick (EGKK)
* Curitiba (SBCT)	* Zurich (LSZH)

4.2.2 Temporal Scope

Based on the data availability and associated pre-processing, this initial report addresses the observed performance at Brazilian airports for the period of

- 2016 - 2019 for SBCT, SBKP, SBCF, SBPA, SBBR; and
- 2017 - 2019 for SBGR, SBGL, SBRJ, SBSP and SBSV.

For the European study airports the data has been available for all airports for the horizon 2016 - 2019.

Throughout the report summary statistics will be given with reference to calendar years of this comparison study.

4.3 Data Sources

The nature of the performance indicator requires the collection of data from different sources. DECEA Performance Section and PRU investigated the comparability of the data available in both regions, including the data pre-processes, data cleaning and aggregation, to ensure a harmonised set of data for performance comparison purposes.

DECEA mainly uses tower data from the main airports as a data source for performance studies. Each landing and take-off operation is collected and provided automatically by the control tower system, such as the times of operations, gate entry and exit, and flight origin and destination.

Within the European context, PRU has established a variety of performance-related data collection processes. For this report the main source is the airport operator data flow (APDF). Flight by flight data is collected and processed from airports in accordance with the APDF data specification. This ensures consistent data for arrivals and departures at the chosen study airports. The data is collected on a monthly basis and typically processed for the regular performance reporting under the EUROCONTROL Performance Review System and the Single European Sky Performance and Charging Scheme ¹.

4.4 Structure of the Report

This initial Brazil-Europe comparison report is organised as follows:

- **Introduction** overview, purpose and scope of the comparison report; short description of data sources used
- **Air Navigation System Characteristics** high-level description of the two regional systems, i.e. areas of responsibility, organisation of ANS, and high-level air navigation system characteristics
- **Traffic Characterisation** air traffic movements, peak day demand, and fleet composition observed at the study airports
- **Predictability** observed arrival and departure punctuality
- **Capacity and Throughput** assessment of the declared capacity at the study airports and the observed throughput, including runway system utilisation comparing achieved peak throughput to the declared capacity.

¹The indicators used throughout this report represent a variation of the indicators used within the European context. Thus, while the overall trend is ensured, the actual values in this report may differ slightly from the European performance monitoring (c.f. <https://ansperformance.eu>).

- **Efficiency** analysis of taxi-in, taxi-out, and terminal airspace operations.
- **Conclusions** summary of this report and associated conclusions; next steps.

Chapter 5

Air Navigation System Characteristics

In general terms, air navigation services are provided in Brazil and Europe with similar operational concepts and procedures, and supporting technology. However, there exists a series of differences between the two regional systems. This section provides a general background on the characteristics of the Brazilian and European air navigation system. These characteristics form an integral part to explain the similarities and differences in the KPIs observed throughout this report.

5.1 Organisation of Air Navigation Services

The key difference between the Brazilian and European air navigation system can be seen in the organisation of ANS in both regions. In Brazil there is one air navigation services provider, while in Europe each member state has assigned the service provision to a national or local provider with the exception of the Maastricht Upper Area Control Center which is the only multi-national unit.

The Department of Airspace Control (DECEA) is responsible for the management of all the activities related to the safety and efficiency of the Brazilian airspace control. Its mission is to manage and control the air traffic in the Brazilian sovereign airspace as well as to guarantee its defence. In that respect, DECEA operates a fully integrated civil-military system.

The airspace under Brazil's responsibility is an area of approximately 22 million km² (8.5 million NM²), organised into 5 Flight Information Regions, comprised of 5 ACC, 59 TWR and 43 APP.

The European airspace spans over an area of 11.5 km². As concerns the provision of air traffic services, the European approach results in a high number of service

providers, i.e. there are 37 different en-route ANSPs with varying geographical areas of responsibility. Next to a limited number of cross-border agreements between adjacent airspaces and air traffic service units, air traffic service provision is predominantly organised along state boundaries / FIR borders. Maastricht UAC represents the only multi-national collaboration providing air traffic services in the upper airspace of northern Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The level of civil-military integration varies from country to country in Europe. Within the European context, air traffic flow management (ATFM) and airspace management (ASM) are provided/coordinated centrally through the Network Manager. The design of airspace and related procedures is no longer carried out or implemented in isolation in Europe. Inefficiencies in the design and use of the air route network are considered to be a contributing factor towards flight inefficiencies in Europe. Therefore the development of an integrated European Route Network Design is one of the tasks given to the Network Manager under the European Commission's Single European Sky initiative. This is done through a CDM process involving all stakeholders. A further task of the Network Manager is to ensure and coordinate that traffic flows do not exceed what can be safely handled by the air traffic service units while trying to optimise the use of available capacity. For this purpose, the Network Manager Operations Centre (NMOC) monitors the air traffic situation and proposes flow measures coordinated through a CDM process with the respective local authorities. This coordination is typically affected with the local flow management position (FMP) in an area control centre. The NMOC implements then the respective flow management initiative on request of the authority/FMP.

As in Europe, in Brazil there is the CGNA (Air Navigation Management Centre), which is an organization subordinated to DECEA that performs the same function as the NMOC. CGNA manages the Brazilian air traffic flow, applies ATFM measures and makes collaborative decisions with the airlines, airports, control and approach centres. In addition, CGNA also coordinates airspace management, the flight plan handling system, the statistical database and all activities related to air navigation. In summary, CGNA provides the operational management of the current actions of the ATM processes and related infrastructure, aiming for the sufficiency and quality of the services provided under the Brazilian Air Space Control System (SISCEAB).

5.2 High-Level System Comparison

Table 5.1 summarises the key characteristics of the Brazilian and European air navigation system. Both regions operate with similar operational concepts and procedures, and supporting technology.

The non-oceanic airspace serviced in Brazil (8.5 million km²) is about 25% smaller in comparison to Europe (11.5 million km²). In Brazil, there is a single ANSP, while in Europe a high number of national and local ANSPs assume responsibilities. Within the en-route environment, there are 37 different ANSPs

in Europe compared to a single provider, i.e. DECEA, in Brazil.

Over the past 10 years (2011 – 2019), Brazil has suffered the biggest recession in recent history, with the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) falling 3.8% in 2015 and 3.6% in 2016. Unemployment and household debt increased and investment in the economy retracted. Despite the serious economic problems, the air transport demand has maintained at moderately constant levels. While in 2016, air traffic was approximately 1.67 million, it gradually decreased to 1.59 million in 2019.

The European environment has seen a steady traffic increase over the last 6 years, i.e. 2013-2019. The positive trend showed a slightly slower rate in 2019. The lower growth rate in 2019 was influenced by the slowing economic growth in Europe and the collapse of several air transport operators. On top, the grounding of the B737 Max fleet impacted the trend in 2019 as well. Stronger variations observed in 2010 through 2013 were linked with economic distortions resulting in sharp drops of demand for air travel. Since 2013, flights in the ECAC area have grown by 15.4% which corresponds to 1.5 million additional flights in 2019 compared to 2013 totalling just under 11 million flights.

Table 5.1: High-Level System Comparison

KPA	Brazil	Europe
geographic area (million km) ²	22 (total), 8.5 (non-oceanic)	11.5 (non-oceanic)
number of en-route ANSPs	1 (DECEA)	37
number of towers	59	400+
number of APP	43	16 (stand alone)
number of ACC	5	62
number ATCOs in OPS	3 126	17 563 ¹
controlled IFR flights (2019)	1 594 442	10 995 092
2018, excluding Georgia and Canary Island ¹		

Chapter 6

Traffic Characterisation

The overarching objective of air traffic services is the provision of safe, orderly, and efficient flow of air traffic. Accordingly, operational system performance is linked to the actual and serviced demand (i.e. air traffic). For operational comparisons, it is therefore important to have a good understanding of the level and composition of the air traffic.

The previous section offered - *inter alia* - a brief summary of the economic context and traffic demand development in both regions. This chapter establishes some key air traffic characteristics for Brazil and Europe to frame the observed operational performance in latter parts of the report.

6.1 Annual Traffic

Fig 6.1 shows the annual traffic observed at the study airports in 2019 and the associated annual variation of traffic comparing 2018 and 2019. Given the nature of the chosen airports, changes in the number of movements and its variation provide an indication about the traffic development in both regions.

A discernible decrease of traffic is observed at 6 of the Brazilian airports. This decrease impacts also the overall traffic development in the Brazilian airspace. Campinas (SBKP) observed an increase in movements of 5.4%. The busiest airport in the country is Guarulhos (SBGR), with 294469 movements. This number was -0.5% lower when compared to 2018.

The traffic volume at the European airports remained or increased across the European airports in 2019. Traffic decreased just under 1% at Zurich (LSZH). Traffic variations at London Heathrow (EGLL) and Amsterdam (EHAM) are negligible. Paris Charles de Gaulle (LFPG) and Madrid (LEMD) observed a growth of movements of 4.6% and 4.2% in 2019 compared to 2018. Frankfurt (EDDF), LFPG, and EHAM represent the airports with the highest number of movements, each accounting for about or just under half a million flights




Figure 6.1: Annual traffic at study airport in 2019 and variation 2018/2019

per year. EHAM is subject to a political capacity cap placed at 1/2 million commercial movements per annum. Despite its infrastructure of 6 runways, this cap limits the capacity and respective movement numbers at EHAM. EGLL represents the busiest dual runway (independent parallel) airport in Europe operating at full capacity during most of its opening hours.

As mentioned above, c.f. section High-Level system comparison, the economic context is a driver for air traffic demand. The overall regional growth development is mirrored by the chosen study airports. It follows from this initial comparison that traffic levels in Brazil are lower than in Europe for the most relevant ten airports. The busiest Brazilian airport Guarulhos (SBGR) observes traffic levels comparable to London Gatwick (EGKK) and Zurich (LSZH).

6.2 Peak Day Traffic

While the annual traffic provides insights in the total air traffic volume and associated demand, it does not provide insights on the upper bound of achievable daily movement numbers. The latter depends on demand, operational procedures and constraints, and the use of the runway system infrastructure. The peak day traffic is determined as the 99th percentile of the total number of daily movements (arrivals and departures). The measure represents such an upper bound for comparison purposes.

Figure 6.2 shows the peak day traffic in 2019 with reference to the number of runways. Seven out of the 10 European airports have three or more runways and ultimately the infrastructure to achieve the overall number of movements as presented in the previous section. It must be noted that the number of runways is a useful categorical identification. The actual use of the runway system may, however, be impacted by the orientation of the runways, their spacing, and local operational procedures. Following this initial comparison it is planned to develop a more in-depth analysis of the runway system utilisation in each region.

The observed peak day traffic observed at Guarulhos (SBGR), a 2-runway airport, ranges in the same order of magnitude than London Gatwick (EGKK) - single runway - and exceeds Zurich (LSZH) - a 3-runway airport. Sao Paulo (SBSP), the 2nd busiest airport in Brazil, trails these airports with the other airports showing peak levels in accordance with their annual traffic demand.




Figure 6.2: Peak day traffic (99th percentile of annual movements)

Figure 6.3 shows the evolution of the peak day traffic. For the majority of airports the peak day movement numbers are stable over the study horizon on average.

In Brazil, peak day traffic at SBBR shows a slight decrease for the period 2016 through 2019. SBSP shows a significant drop when comparing 2018 to 2019. In contrast, peak day traffic increased in Galeão Airport (SBGL) from 2018 to 2019.




Figure 6.3: Variation of Peak day traffic over time

SBGL recorded an increase in peak day in 2019 because it received air traffic from Santos Dumont (SBRJ), located in the same city, which closed its main runway due to renovation works for one month; with this, demand in SBGL increased during that period. Salvador (SBSV) went through renovation works in the main taxiways and this may have influenced demand reduction throughout 2019. One of the main characteristics of SBSV is that it serves as an air traffic hub in the Northeast region of the country. Brasília (SBBR) may have been impacted, mainly, by the economic crisis in Brazil in the period from 2015 to 2017. Brasília is the federal capital, the main political centre of the country and more sensitive to fiscal adjustment in the public sphere.

With the exception of Heathrow (EGLL) and Zurich (LSZH) the peak day traffic increased across Europe. Both, EGLL and LSZH, operate consistently at the maximum levels during peak periods. With the current capacity limit and associated operational procedures, no further increase can be expected. Rome (LIRF) shows a slight decline of the peak day traffic. With a shallow increase in the annual traffic count, traffic is more spread across the days. Madrid (LEMD) showed a significant increase in peak day traffic over the study period and goes in hand with the annual traffic growth observed. The development is less pronounced in Barcelona (LEBL) showing a general increase of attractiveness of the two Spanish airports and markets. The other airports show a relatively stable peak day traffic measure. Traffic and inter-connectivity at the European study

airports is generally stable as a side effect from the slot declaration mechanism.

On average traffic levels at the European study airports are higher than in Brazil. Nonetheless, both airports serving São Paulo, i.e. Guarulhos (SBGR) and São Paulo/Congonhas (SBSP), see peak traffic levels comparable to some European airports (e.g. LIRF, EGKK, LZSH). At the time of writing, the top 10 airports in Europe range approximately at or above 800 daily movements, c.f. Fig 6.2.

In addition to the economic differences between Brazil and Europe, highlighted by the severe recession that Brazil has experienced in the last decade, Brazilian airports have some capacity limitations in their infrastructure. Despite the recent investments provided by airport concessions to the private sector, only Brasília (SBBR), among the ten studied airports, had simultaneous operations on two independent runways. The other airports operated with only one runway or, as it is the case with Guarulhos (SBGR), with two runways in a dependent manner.

6.3 Fleet Mix

The fleet mix - and in particular the separation requirements between the different aircraft types - is an important influencing factor for the capacity and observed (and realisable) throughput. In particular, aircraft with longer runway occupancy times or larger proportions of heavy aircraft may result in lower throughput due to the larger wake turbulence separations. The locally defined capacity values may therefore differ based on the predominant fleet mix and operational characteristics, and ultimately result in different observed Peak Day movement numbers. Figure 6.4 depicts the observed share of different wake turbulence categories across the study airports in 2019.

Across the Brazilian airports, Medium aircraft are the predominant aircraft class with Galeão (SBGL), Guarulhos (SBGR), and Campinas (SBKP) showing a good share of Heavy aircraft ranging around 10-12% of the traffic. Salvador (SBSV) has a relevant share of Light aircraft accounting for approximately 25% of the observed fleet mix

SBGL and SBGR are international hubs for aviation in Brazil. In addition, SBGR and SBKP are among the largest cargo terminals in the country. SBSV stands out for being a large tourist destination in the summer, during Carnival and music events. Congonhas (SBSP) and Santos Dumont (SBRJ) do not operate international flights and have operational restrictions; in view of their short runways, they do not operate heavy aircraft flights. Confins Airport (SBCF) has few light aircraft flights due to the existence of another airport (Pampulha) in the city of Belo Horizonte that absorbs this demand due to its convenient location.

For the European airports a higher level of Heavy aircraft can be observed. The structure of the European network is characterised by multiple national




Figure 6.4: Fleet mix observed at study airports in 2019

hubs across the different Member States. The chosen study airports comprise the major airports in Europe and represent hubs for regional and international travel. They also observe a good share of cargo air transport operations. For example, KLM operating out of Amsterdam (EHAM), Air France operating out of Paris Charles de Gaulle (LFPG), or Lufthansa out of Frankfurt (EDDF) and Munich (EDDM). Based on this network structure, the share of Light types across the European airports is relatively low. Zurich (LSZH) is a noticeable exception from this rule with a share of Light types of 4.5%.

Chapter 7

Predictability

Predictability in the system affects operations in both the strategic phase when airline schedules are produced and in the operating phase when ANSPs and stakeholders are balancing demand and capacity. High levels of predictability will benefit ANSPs servicing airspace users with a view to achieving highly efficient operations also during peak periods. This report focusses on the arrival and departure punctuality as measures of predictability.

7.1 Arrival Punctuality

Arrival punctuality in Europe is characterised by a relatively homogenous variation across the study airports, c.f. Figure 7.1. A share of 60-70% of the flights arrive within 5 minutes (or earlier) of their scheduled time. This behaviour is driven by the slot coordination and associated schedule. Due to the high level of ATFM demands observed across Europe in (2018 and) 2019, around 20% to 25% of the flights arrived later than 15 minutes after schedule. The data also shows a significant share of flights arriving early. In particular across the European airports about 20-25% of flights arrive earlier than 15 min. This has gained higher attention over the past years as operations at airports nearing the congestion/capacity level are impacted by the earlier demand. Airspace users may have reacted to constraints at congested airports by increasing their scheduled block times.

For the Brazilian context, this analysis is an initial attempt. The dataset for this particular comparison might contain additional variances as it is estimated and manually inserted by the operators. Santos Dumont (SBRJ) is an example worth of further research in future developments. Work is underway to enhance the accuracy of that information. There is a negligible share of flights arriving early, i.e. 15 or more minutes earlier than scheduled, while conversely a significant share of flights arrive late 5 minutes or more. Nevertheless, across the Brazilian




Figure 7.1: Arrival punctuality across study airports in 2019

airports, the share of flights arriving within 5 minutes of their scheduled arrival time is on average higher than in Europe. For a good share of aerodrome operations the traffic situation in Brazil shows a higher level of arrival predictability. Congonhas (SBSP), Guarulhos (SBGR), and Galeão (SBGL) show a spread of arrivals within 5 minutes of their schedule that is comparable to the spread of arrival punctuality values at European airports.

7.2 Departure Punctuality

On average, the share of departures within 5 minutes of their scheduled time in Brazil ranges at or above the departure punctuality values observed in Europe.

Salvador (SBSV) is the one with the highest share of early flights, around 55% of flights depart 5 or more minutes before schedule. This condition may be the result of manual inputs, resulting in relevant differences between the scheduled and actual registered take-off times. In addition, a high share of late departures has been observed at Galeão (SBGL). However, in average, a good share of 70% to 75% of Brazilian departures is within 5 minutes or earlier than scheduled. As in arrival punctuality performance, future research might focus on further investigation on the all-causes delays behind the 20% to 25% share of late departures.




Figure 7.2: Departure punctuality across study airports in 2019

The interplay between the slot control process and departure schedules can be observed at European airports. About 60-70% of flights depart within 15 minutes of their schedule with a robust share of 35-40% even within 5 minutes. Very early departures are the exception. Particularly in 2019, Europe has seen a significant share of ATFM delay. The surge of ATFM delay in 2019 contributed to the observed delays in departures across the study airports.

Chapter 8

Capacity and Throughput

A proper balance between airport capacity and flight demand is paramount to an adjusted network flow. This section addresses the capacity and throughput dimensions as measured by a variety of KPIs.

8.1 Peak Declared Capacity

Peak Declared Capacity refers to the highest movement rate (arrivals and landings) at an airport using the most favourable runway configuration under optimal conditions. The capacity value might be subject to local or national decision-making processes. The indicator represents the highest number of landings an airport can accept in one-hour time frame.

In Brazil, the peak capacity is determined by DECEA considering local operational constraints. Within the European region, the airport capacity is determined locally or nationally as part of the capacity declaration process. This considers local operational constraints (e.g. political caps, noise quota and abatement procedures), infrastructure related limitations (e.g. apron/stand availability, passenger facilities). The declaration process considers typically IMC separation minima for runway movements ¹.

All European airports in this study are Category 3 - fully slot controlled. The slot and capacity declaration process is undertaken on the local or national level. Throughout the last years additional political caps in terms of maximum number of annual movements (e.g. Amsterdam (EHAM) movement cap of 500.000 commercial operations) or permissible night and day time restrictions (e.g. Lon-

¹The Brazilian airports that have more than one operational runway are: Brasília (SBBR) with 2 independent runways; Guarulhos (SBGR) with 2 parallel runways (simultaneous but not independent operations); and Galeão (SBGL), Curitiba (SBCT) and Salvador (SBSV) with 2 intersecting runways.

don Heathrow night operation cap) have been introduced widely. Accordingly, capacity values in Europe vary despite the local runway system capabilities ².

Throughout the last years no substantial change in the declared capacity has been observed at European airports. In Brazil, on the other hand, 2019 shows a revised capacity declaration for most of the airports throughout the country, c.f. Figure 8.1. Since the end 2018, the CGNA has been working on the enhancement of the methodology applied in Brazil when it comes to the determination of runway capacity.

Previously, there were conservative limitations in the declarations of airports capacity. Capacity was limited to the maximum of 80% of its real value, due to other variables taken into account. The best practice then was the 50%/50% division between arrivals and departures. Nowadays, the process and analysis methodology has evolved in such ways that those mentioned concepts are no longer in use. The capacity is declared in its actual value considering all variables that can restrain the entire declaration of it. There are no limits in the operations division. It is applied according to the airport necessity or to the meteorological condition.

These changes significantly increased runway systems capacity for most of Brazilian airports. Airports such as SBGR, SBGL, SBCF, SBBR and SBSV got the best out of the changes made, once there were important changes in their runway system configurations. CGNA keeps developing enhancements in the runway capacity analysis process. By the end of 2020, a new document about that new process will be published. It will likely continue to improve the way Brazil analyses and declares its airport capacities.

Figure 8.2 shows the peak declared capacity per hour for each of the study airports in Europe and Brazil. In general the declared capacity for all airports in Europe exceeds the respective declared capacity in Brazil.

The peak capacity for Brasília (SBBR), Galeão (SBGL), and Guarulhos (SBGR) range about the peak capacity declared for the single-runway airport Gatwick (EGKK). The number at those airports ranges around 50% of the major hubs in Europe, i.e. Paris Charles de Gaulle (LFPG), Amsterdam (EHAM), and Frankfurt (EDDF).

As mentioned before, the capacity process takes into account a variety of local considerations. A potential avenue for further research could be a closer investigation of the variances of the declared capacity in line with the local runway system characteristics.

²Amsterdam (EHAM) operates at fixed capacity with 6 runways, London Heathrow has maximised the runway throughput with 2 independent runways, Gatwick airport is reportedly the most efficient single runway operation in Europe




Figure 8.1: Evolution of Declared Capacities at Brazilian Airports.




Figure 8.2: Peak declared capacity

8.2 Peak Arrival Throughput

The peak arrival throughput measures the 95th percentile of the hourly number of landings observed at an airport. The measure gives an indication of the “busy-hour” landing rates. It is an indication to what extent arrival traffic is serviced at an airport. For congested airports, the throughput provides a measure of the effectively realized capacity. Throughput is a measure of demand and comprises already air traffic flow or sequencing measures applied by ATM or ATC in the en-route and terminal phase. For non-congested airports, throughput serves as a measure of showing the level of demand at this airport.




Figure 8.3: Variation of arrival throughput at study airports

Figure 8.3 shows a constant behaviour of the peak arrival throughput across the whole time horizon. Noteworthy exemption is Brasilia (SBBR). At SBBR a reduction of the peak arrival throughput is observed in 2017 in comparison to the previous year. Brasilia Airport started independent operations on its two runways in 2016. As a result - and after a period of standardisation of procedures for aircrew and controllers - its traffic was possibly better dispersed through the day, thus reducing peak arrivals from 2017.

For the majority of the European airports, Figure 8.3 depicts little variation over the years. These study airports represent the busiest 10 airports and accordingly the peak arrival throughput per hour presents an upper limit based on the airspace user demand and traffic patterns. The increase observed in peak arrival throughput at Paris (LFPG), Madrid (LEMD), Rome (LIRF), and

Munich (EDDM) are in line with additional demand during peak hours. The continual increase in peak arrival throughput across the last years signals a potential concentration on feeder flights.

The relative constant pattern of the peak arrival throughput observed for many airports suggests that traffic patterns during the busiest hours remained fairly constant. Potential changes to the airspace user demand have widely occurred outside the peak hours. This suggests that arrival management of air traffic services in Brazil and Europe is able to sustain the demand.

8.3 Peak Departure Throughput

In analogy to the arrival throughput, the departure throughput is determined as the 95th percentile of the hourly number of departures. The measure serves as a indication of the “busy-hour” departure rates.




Figure 8.4: Variation of departure throughput at study airports

The peak departure throughput at the study airports shows a similar behaviour than observed for the arrival throughput reported above. This suggests widely homogenous demand patterns, i.e. schedules, across the different seasons.

SBBR shows a significant decrease as of 2017, which could also be the result of even distribution of flights after 2016 runway and procedures changes.

In Europe, Rome (LIRF) has seen a drop in 2017 as well, which have then

remained fairly constant over the last years, based on a debunking of the out-bounds. Frankfurt (EDDF) and Madrid (LEMD) experienced a step increase in 2018 and 2019 that is in line with additional routes served. The annual traffic increase observed at Paris (LFPG) is also reflected in an increase in the peak departure throughput accommodating these additional flights also during peak hours. The systematic constant observed performance at Heathrow (EGLL), Gatwick (EGKK), Barcelona (LEBL), and Zurich (LSZH) evidences that these airports and air traffic services operate at their capacity limits during peak hours.

8.4 Declared Capacity and Peak Throughput

Operational efficiency is driven by the effective utilisation of the deployed capacity during peak times. In this initial comparison report the difference between the peak arrival rate and its capacity is analysed in order to demonstrate which airports have more and less “slack” between the peak movement and their capacity. Figure 8.5 orders all study airports based on their declared arrival capacities and compares these values with the observed peak arrival throughput.




Figure 8.5: Comparison of declared capacity and throughput for arrival phase.

For the majority of the airports, the approximated arrival capacity is higher than the observed peak throughput. In Europe, Amsterdam (EHAM), Frankfurt (EDDF), and Munich (EDDM) show a higher peak throughput than the declared

capacity. Peak arrival operations at Zurich (LSZH) are slightly higher than the declared capacity. In Brazil, the realised peak arrival throughput at Sao Paulo (SBSP) exceeds the capacity value as well. At these airports, it appears that during the peak hours (i.e. the top 5% of all hourly arrivals) better than declared arrival throughputs can be realised. This might be linked to the methodology of the capacity declaration process that may follow a more modulated approach accounting for a wider varied aircraft mix. It will be interesting to research in future comparisons how the peak hour demand is managed in comparison to less busier hours and its underlying driving factors.

8.5 Capacity Utilisation

Based on the previous, this section explores level of utilisation of the declared capacity. The measure aims to display the maximum hourly throughput (UTC hour) across the time horizon and compare it to the declared capacity for the respective airport runway system. In the current section, the time horizon is the whole year of 2019. Particularly for this indicator, it is assumed that arrivals and departures account for about 50% of movements over a year. Thus, the ratio of the observed arrivals to the declared arrival capacity should be broadly consistent with the ratio of total movements (arrivals and departures) and the total declared capacity.

Figure 8.6 shows the achieved maximum throughput level vs the declared capacity values.

The maximum capacity of Brazilian airports tend to be lower than the European airports. However, the utilised capacity is not that different. The utilisation rate shows also similarities in terms of banks (arrival peaks) for airports with the arrival utilisation rate significantly higher than the equal share percentage of 50%. This behaviour is characteristic at airports where dominant airspce users serve departures with inbound feeder flights. While in Europe utilised capacity ranges from 54% to 69%, in Brazil it goes from only 50% in SBPA, SBCT, and SBGL, up to 78% in SBSP. SBSP and SBRJ are the Brazilian airports with the most constrained scenarios from that perspective, with capacity utilization at least similar (or above) European airports. Further exploration of those values is recommended due to the KPI's assumptions relative to arrivals and departures balance, as stated beforehand.




Figure 8.6: Level of capacity utilisation in 2019.

Chapter 9

Efficiency

Operational efficiency is a critical component in assessing the management and execution of operations. It provides insights in the management of arrival and departure flows and the associated separation and synchronisation activities. Inefficiencies can have impact on user operations in terms of experiencing delays or excessive fuel burn. The measures reported in this study are based on comparing the observed travel time during taxi-out, taxi-in, and during the arrival phase with an associated reference time. The determined difference (i.e. additional times) measure the level of inefficiencies. It must be noted that high performance operations will still yield a certain share of measured additional times. Operational efficiency is therefore aiming at the minimisation of these additional times as they cannot be zero.

9.1 Additional Taxi-In Time

The additional taxi-in time measures the travel time of an arriving flight from its touchdown (i.e. actual landing time [ALDT]) to its stand/gate position (i.e. actual in-block time [AIBT]). The travel time is compared to a reference time. The reference time is determined for flights arriving at the same runway and/or the same stand/gate position. The additional time provides a pointer on the management of the outbound traffic.

Due to data availability (i.e. no stand/gate information), the reference times for the Brazilian airports have been computed on the airport level. It needs to be noted that an aggregation on the airport level may be influenced by the predominant runway and frequently used stand/parking positions. This phenomenon merits further study in one of the future editions.

Figure 9.1 shows the variation of the observed additional taxi-in times.

For the majority of Brazilian airports, the average additional taxi-in time ranges




Figure 9.1: Additional taxi-in time

at or below 2 minutes per arrival. For all airports an improvement in terms of reduction of the additional taxi-in time can be observed across the horizon of this report. Galeão (SBGL), Porto Alegre (SBPA), and Santos Dumont (SBRJ), with an additional taxi-in time ranging around 3 minutes per arrival, exhibit the highest observed taxi-times.

Some factors may have contributed to the reduction in additional taxi-in time over the years:

- Demand reduction after the economic crisis in 2015;
- Improved tower and ground control performance due to increased traffic during the 2014 Soccer World Cup;
- Infrastructure improvements due to works for major events such as Confederations Cup, Soccer World Cup and Olympics. Many of these works were only completed in the years following the events;
- Result of efficiency gains over time after airports were privatized (granted to the private sector); and
- Result of efficiency gains with the efforts of Brazilian Aviation community in implementing study groups for operational developments such as AGILE GRU, AGILE RIO, AGILE CAMPINAS and GEPEA (Airspace Planning Study Group).

The majority of European airports shows a fairly stable average additional taxi-

in time. A high variation across the years is observed at Rome (LIRF) and London Heathrow (EGLL). At Heathrow, 2018 marks the year of introducing time-based separation on final on a 24hr basis. In combination with the high share of observed ATFM delay in 2018 and 2019, there is a higher number of aircraft on the surface, which results in longer taxi-in times or holding on the taxiway system. The threshold of 2 min of additional taxi-in time is also observed for European airports. Rome (LIRF) ranges at or above 3 min of additional taxi-in time.

In both regions additional taxi-in times around or below 2 minutes per arrival are observed for the majority of study airports. Higher additional taxi-in times are measured at the busiest and most constrained airports. Future research may be oriented towards identifying underlying causes driving the observed taxi-in performance.

9.2 Additional Taxi-Out Time

In analogy to the previous section, the additional taxi-out time addresses the travel time of a departing aircraft blocking-off at its stand/gate position (i.e. actual off-block time [AOBT]) until the aircraft takes off (i.e. actual take-off time [ATOT]). This travel time is compared to an associated reference time.

As mentioned above, the taxi-times at Brazilian airports are determined on the airport level. The inclusion of stand/gate positions is foreseen for future iterations.

On average the additional taxi-out time varies across the airports in Brazil. Salvador (SBSV) observes an additional taxi-out time ranging between 7 and 8 minutes in 2018 and 2019. Taxi-out performance at Curitiba (SBCT) ranges even under 2 minutes per departure. The average additional taxi-out performance did deteriorate at Porto Alegre (SBPA) between 2016 and 2019. Conversely, a higher level of performance is observed at Brasília (SBBR).

Brasília (SBBR) may have improved the additional taxi-out time after privatization. Following the process, a variety of infrastructure and operational improvement programmes had been implemented. This resulted in an enhanced gate use layout, pushback operations and streamlined gate/runway allocation (i.e. reduced taxi distance). Salvador (SBSV), as already mentioned, was strongly impacted by works at the main taxiway over the last years. At the end of the works, the additional taxi-out time was reduced.

The additional taxi-out time ranges for most of the European airports at or below 4 minutes per departure. Departing traffic at London Gatwick (EGKK) observe the highest average additional taxi-out time well above 6 minutes per departure with Rome (LIRF) and London Heathrow (EGLL) ranging between 5 and 6 minutes per outbound flight. These airports also observe an increasing trend for the additional times measured over the last years.




Figure 9.2: Additional taxi-out time

9.3 Additional Time in Terminal Airspace

For this comparison report, an initial look at the efficiency of arrival airspace operations has been performed. Due to data constraints, this use-case analysis addresses the additional time spent in the airspace within 100NM of the study airports in the year 2018.

Conceptually, the additional time in the terminal airspace measures the difference between the excess time of a flight approaching the airport from a specific direction and a reference time based on similar trajectories. To establish similarity, flights are grouped by entry sector/direction, landing runway, and aircraft type. The entry sector/direction and landing runway determines the procedural aspects of the arrival. The aircraft type support to differentiate varying travel and arrival speeds of the aircraft mix observed at the airports.

With a view to establish related reference times, groupings of similar arrival flight profiles have been identified. This identification is based on a visual procedure to identify arrival sectors. Figure 9.3 shows an example for an airport in Brazil, i.e. SBGR. In this particular example, marked groups of arrivals from about 320 to 50 degrees have been grouped into one arrival sector. With the continued technical cooperation between the performance groups in DECEA and EUROCONTROL, the methodology and supporting data processing will be broadened in future reports.




Figure 9.3: Count of arrivals from different approach direction (bearing)




Figure 9.4: Mapping of additional time in arrival airspace to arrival traffic

Fig. 9.4 shows several clusters of observed additional times in the terminal airspace. The lower level of air traffic in the Brazilian region results also in less constrained procedures. The majority of Brazilian study airports accrue for relative small additional times well below a threshold of 3.5 minutes per arrival. A similar low level of additional time is observed for EDDM, LFPG, and EDDF in 2018. As shown above, SBGR shows similar traffic levels to LSZH and LIRF. For this triplet, an additional time of about 4 minutes per arrival have been observed in 2018. This signals a similar level of traffic and associated arrival separation and synchronisation techniques. Within the European context, EGLL exhibits a relatively high additional time in terminal airspace of above 7 minutes per arrival. This is due to the operational concept applied at EGLL entailing aircraft to be loaded into stacks to ensure continuous pressure on the arrival runway.

Chapter 10

Conclusions

This initial Brazil-Europe operational ANS performance comparison report completes the first phase of the joint DECEA Performance Section and EUROCONTROL PRU collaboration project.

The project aims at the development of a joint and common understanding of agreed metrics and definitions to compare, understand, and improve air navigation service (ANS) performance. Based on the availability of associated data and priorities of both groups, this report uses a subset of the KPIs coordinated by ICAO under the on-going update of the ICAO GANP. The comparison shows similarities and differences in the observed performance in both regions. Based on this, several ideas for future research have been identified to further develop and complement the performance framework.

The first part of this report examined commonalities and differences in terms of air traffic management and performance influencing factors, such as air traffic demand and fleet composition. These factors can have a large influence on the observed performance. Overall, air navigation service provision is more fragmented in Europe with local/national ANSPs and their respective control units. The integrated civil/military service provision is inherent to the organisation of DECEA. Irrespective of the airspace volume, the large difference in numbers of control units in Europe and Brazil demonstrate this. Both systems operate a central flow management center.

In terms of air traffic and its growth, Brazil has observed lower demand following the economic crisis in 2015. However, the peak day traffic and throughput at the studied airports remained fairly constant over the 2016-2019 horizon. Traffic and capacity levels for the busiest Brazilian airports are similar to the traffic levels observed at the lower end of the top-10 airports in Europe. In that respect, performance and challenges within both regions are comparable. Additional diversity in terms of air traffic is observed across the Brazilian airports as there is a significant share of light types serviced. Within the European context, the

share of light types are mostly negligible. A higher share of wide-body (Heavy) aircraft operate from the European airports with a higher level of international connectivity from the study airports. This is more nuanced in Brazil.

Within the KPA Predictability, European airports seems to have a more even dispersion of early/late flight occurrences. Although the departure punctuality was somewhat well-distributed in Brazilian airports, arrival punctuality still shows great variations due to manual controls. Thus, this aspect is potentially suitable for future improvements, and studies within the present collaboration. In addition, capacity comparisons showed some contrasts between the two regions. While Brazil recently improved overall airports declared capacity, European airports remained at similar levels. However, although some Brazilian airports display high capacity values, comparable to its European counterparts, these, in average, maintain higher declared capacity values and handles significant arrival and departure peaks.

Operational efficiency in this report is measured for the taxi-in and taxi-out phase, and additional time in terminal airspace. Similar patterns are observed at the different airports in both regions. Generally, an average additional taxi-in time of less than 2 minutes per arrival marks higher performance. Congested airports range above 3 minutes per arrival or higher. Within Brazil, taxi-in performance increased over the last years for most of the airports. Abstracting smaller variations, the taxi-in performance in Europe is widely constant for most airports. Lower levels of performance have been observed at Rome (LIRF) and London Heathrow (EGLL) that suggest that changes to the local traffic levels and operational procedures have an impact.

Regarding the chosen study airports, the taxi-out performance is more varied in Brazil than in Europe. A threshold of 4 minutes per departure marks the majority of airports and the observed taxi-out performance in Europe. Amsterdam Schiphol acting as a best-in-class with an observed taxi-out performance ranging around 3 minutes per departure. This level is achieved by several airports in Brazil. Taxi-out performance improved in general over the last years at most Brazilian airports and can be linked to the wider implementation of surface movement enhancement programmes.

This initial report will be updated throughout the coming years under the umbrella of the DECEA-EUROCONTROL memorandum of cooperation. Future editions will also enable to complement data time series and support the development of further use-case analyses. The lessons learnt of this joint project will also be coordinated with the PBWG and ICAO GANP Study sub-group concerned with the further development of the GANP KPIs.

Chapter 11

References

Bibliography

(2016). Description of the potential performance indicators in the GANP 2016.

ICAO (2005). *Global Air Traffic Management Operational Concept*. Doc 9854, AN/458. International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, Canada, first edition edition.

ICAO (2016). *Capacity & Efficiency, Global Air Navigation Plan 2016-2030 (Doc 9750)*. Doc 9750. International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, Canada, fifth edition edition.