

ATC CAPACITY SHARING & ROUTE CHARGING

ENGAGE SUMMER SCHOOL 2021

PhD Student: Natália Solčianska (University of Trieste) Supervisor: Prof. Lorenzo Castelli (University of Trieste)



I. Airspace Architecture Study (SJU)

- ✓ A proposal for the future architecture of the European airspace
- 2. Legal and economic aspects of ATM data service provision (Helios, Integra)
 - Policy options to deliver a defragmentation of European skies through virtualization and the free flow of data among trusted users across borders
- **3.** RoMiAD Role of Markets in AAS Deployment (Think Research) Engage KTN Catalyst project
 - ✓ Financial benefits of ATM modernization as proposed in AAS and the market mechanisms that would best enable the necessary transformations
 - ✓ Theoretical background and motivation for our research





Source: SESAR JU: Airspace Architecture Study 2019



FOCUS areas & SOLUTIONS to deploy AAS









Delays, delays & delays....

En-route ATFM ATC C & ATC S delays (2019)









Virtual Centre designation Which ACCs are the best to form VC(s)?

- I. Where are the capacity issues ?
 - Which of these are recurring ?
- 2. Where are the spare capacities ?
- 3. How these capacities can be balanced ? linear programming to determine the collaborations
- 4. What kind of capacity sharing, where ?
- 5. Where are the delegation models actually beneficial?



Assumptions per ACC and per each time interval:

Overload (number of sectors)

Additional sectors nee to be open to accommodate delayed flights

 $\frac{\sum delayed \ flights}{avg \ sector \ capacity}$

Spare capacity (number of sectors)

ACC with additional capacity (low sectors utilization) and/or less sectors opened than *actually available*

$$\sum_{c<40\%} S + (\text{NOP} - \text{OS})$$

NOP – opening schemes declared in Network Operations Plan (EUROCONTROL, 2019)

OS – Actual Opening Scheme (R-NEST)

Overloaded and spare capacities in terms of sectors





Linear programming model to designate & evaluate Virtual Centres

- Determine *collaborations* between pairs of ACCs to improve efficiency
- Collaboration two ACCs form a Virtual Centre, providing ATC services to each other when needed
- Efficiency reducing delays per ACC, while the cost of the solution does not exceed the cost of the delay





Model flow

For each ACC and each time interval, we identify:

- capacity shortage / spare capacity
- the number of delayed flights and their delay value
- number of currently opened sectors
- actual maximum capacity
- number of sectors in max configuration (airspace capacity)
- capacity of sector(s)

The optimisation part of the model, determines the set of collaborations which minimise the delay.



Route charging & Virtual Centre

- Each State in given Virtual Centre has own Charging Zone & UR
 - \odot Which UR is AU charged?
 - $\,\circ\,$ Cross-ANSPs compensation
- Single Charging Zone / Single UR per Virtual Center
 - $\,\circ\,$ Supported by regulation proposal (SES 2+)
 - $\circ~$ Not acceptable by ANSPs / FABs
 - \circ Revenue distribution mechanism
 - $\,\circ\,$ Find an optimal UR value



Current work

For limited group of ACCs:

- Which pre-defined capacity sharing is beneficial where ?
- How much collaboration is needed to resolve capacity issues?
- To what extend we can improve the efficiency using pre-determined capacity sharing arrangement?

Initial results to be submitted to SIDs 2021



Future work

Capacity-on-Demand

- Implementing the cost of capacity provision and the cost of delay in the model
- Expanding geographical are of interest
- How much can be dynamic capacity sharing beneficial ?

Route charging

- Does the current Charging Methodology enable complex cross- border on-demand ATC?
- Is the single Unit Rate easier to reach if collaborations are in place?



Thank you for your attention

natalia.solcianska@phd.units.it

