Official Journal
of the European Union

EN
L series

2026/1034

18.5.2026

COMMISSION DECISION (EU) 2026/1034

of 23 April 2026

on the consistency of the performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan submitted by Estonia pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council with the Union-wide performance targets for the fourth reference period of the Single European Sky performance and charging scheme

(Notified under document C(2026) 2553)

(Only the Estonian text is authentic)

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 laying down the framework for the creation of the single European sky (the framework Regulation) ([1]), and in particular Article 11(3), point (c) thereof,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) 2024/2803 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2024 on the implementation of the Single European Sky ([2]), and in particular Article 58(3) thereof,

Having regard to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317 of 11 February 2019 laying down a performance and charging scheme in the single European sky and repealing Implementing Regulations (EU) No 390/2013 and (EU) No 391/2013 ([3]), and in particular Article 15(1) and (2) thereof,

Whereas:

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

(1) Pursuant to Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 549/2004, Member States are to draw up plans, either at national level or at the level of functional airspace blocks ('FABs'), including performance targets, for each reference period of the performance and charging scheme for air navigation services and network functions. Those plans are to include local performance targets which are consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for the reference period concerned.

(2) On 12 June 2024, the Commission adopted Union-wide performance targets for the fourth reference period ('RP4', 2025–2029). Those Union-wide performance targets were set out in Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2024/1688 ([4]).

(3) On 1 October 2024, Estonia submitted to the Commission a draft performance plan for RP4. After the verification of completeness of that draft performance plan by the Commission, Estonia submitted an updated draft performance plan ('the draft performance plan') on 15 November 2024.

(4) The Commission found that the cost-efficiency performance targets set by Estonia in the draft performance plan in respect of its *en route* charging zone do not meet the assessment criteria laid down in point 1.4 of Annex IV of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317 and thus are not consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for RP4

([1]) OJ L 96, 31.3.2004, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2004/549/oj.
([2]) OJ L, 2024/2803, 11.11.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/2803/oj.
([3]) OJ L 56, 25.2.2019, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/317/oj.
([4]) Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2024/1688 of 12 June 2024 setting Union-wide performance targets for the air traffic management network for the fourth reference period from 1 January 2025 to 31 December 2029 (OJ L, 2024/1688, 17.6.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec_impl/2024/1688/oj).

(5) On 16 May 2025, the Commission therefore notified Estonia of the findings regarding the inconsistency of the performance targets referred to in recital (4) through Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2025/1040 ([5]). In that Decision, the Commission issued recommendations to Estonia in view of ensuring the consistency of its performance targets with the Union-wide performance targets for RP4.

(6) On 18 August 2025, Estonia submitted a revised draft performance plan for RP4 for assessment by the Commission. Following the verification of completeness of that plan, Estonia submitted an updated version of the revised draft performance plan (the 'revised draft performance plan') on 6 October 2025.

(7) In accordance with Article 15(1) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317, the Commission has assessed the consistency of the local performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan of Estonia on the basis of the assessment criteria laid down in point 1 of Annex IV to that Implementing Regulation, and taking account of local circumstances where relevant.

(8) The Commission has complemented its assessment of the revised draft performance plan with a review of the elements set out in point 2 of Annex IV to that Implementing Regulation. However, the allocation of costs between *en route* and terminal services referred to in point 2.1(d)(vii) of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317 is subject to a separate review by the Commission based on additional information received from Estonia in December 2025. Therefore, the Commission has not drawn any conclusions, at this stage, in respect of the compliance of that cost allocation methodology with points (e) and (f) of Article 15(2) of Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council ([6]) and Article 22(5) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317.

(9) The Performance Review Board ('PRB'), assisting the Commission in the implementation of the performance and charging schemes pursuant to Article 13(2) of Regulation (EU) 2024/2803, has submitted to the Commission its opinion on the performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan of Estonia with regard to the consistency of those targets with the Union-wide performance targets. The findings set out in this Decision have been informed by the detailed technical assessment set out in the PRB opinion ([7]).

COMMISSION ASSESSMENT

Assessment of performance targets in the key performance area of safety

(10) As regards the key performance area of safety, the consistency of the targets included in the revised draft performance plan has been assessed in accordance with point 1.1 of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317.

(11) The performance targets in the key performance area of safety proposed by Estonia in respect of the effectiveness of safety management, broken down per safety management objective and expressed as a level of implementation, are as follows:

([5]) Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2025/1040 of 16 May 2025 on the inconsistency of certain performance targets included in the draft national and functional airspace block performance plans submitted by Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, France, Latvia, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Slovakia pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 549/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council with the Union-wide performance targets for the fourth reference period of the Single European Sky performance and charging scheme (OJ L, 2025/1040, 23.5.2025, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec_impl/2025/1040/oj).

([6]) Regulation (EC) No 550/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 March 2004 on the provision of air navigation services in the single European sky (the service provision Regulation) (OJ L 96, 31.3.2004, p. 10, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2004/550/oj).

([7]) PRB Opinion n° 1-2026 on the assessment of the revised draft performance plans for the fourth reference period (RP4), 28 January 2026.

Estonia	Targets on the effectiveness of safety management, expressed as a level of implementation, ranging from EASA level A to D					
Air navigation service provider	**Safety management objective**	**2025**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
EANS	Safety policy and objectives	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety risk management	D	D	D	D	**D**
	Safety assurance	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety promotion	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety culture	C	C	C	C	**C**

(12) The Commission observes that the safety performance targets proposed by Estonia for the air navigation service provider 'EANS' are equal to the Union-wide performance targets for each year of RP4.

(13) The Commission notes that the revised draft performance plan sets out specific measures for EANS for the achievement of the local safety targets, such as incorporating dedicated human factors expertise into the organization and investing in systems that can support more advanced data analytics for safety trend monitoring

(14) On the basis of the findings set out in recitals 11, 12 and 13, the local safety performance targets included in the revised draft performance should be considered consistent with the Union-wide performance targets.

Assessment of performance targets in the key performance area of environment

(15) As regards the key performance area of environment, the consistency of the targets included in the revised draft performance plan regarding the average horizontal *en route* flight efficiency of the actual trajectory has been assessed based on the criterion laid down in point 1.2 of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317. Accordingly, the proposed environment targets of Estonia have been compared to the relevant *en route* horizontal flight efficiency reference values set out in the European Route Network Improvement Plan ('ERNIP'), drawn up in accordance with Annex I to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/123 ([8]) and available at the time of adopting the Union-wide performance targets for RP4, that is on 2 July 2024.

(16) The performance targets in the key performance area of environment proposed by Estonia and the corresponding national reference values for RP4 from the ERNIP, expressed as the average horizontal *en route* flight efficiency of the actual trajectory, are as follows:

Estonia	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Targets in the key performance area of environment, expressed as the average horizontal *en route* flight efficiency of the actual trajectory	**6,54 %**	**6,53 %**	**6,52 %**	**6,51 %**	**6,50 %**
Reference values	6,54 %	6,53 %	6,52 %	6,51 %	6,50 %

([8]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/123 of 24 January 2019 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of air traffic management (ATM) network functions and repealing Commission Regulation (EU) No 677/2011 (OJ L 28, 31.1.2019, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/123/oj).

(17) The Commission observes that the environment targets proposed by Estonia are equal to the corresponding national reference values for each year of RP4.

(18) The Commission notes that Estonia has implemented cross-border free route airspace together with Latvia, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Norway, which constitutes a key measure for the achievement of the local environment performance targets.

(19) On the basis of the findings set out in recitals 16, 17 and 18, the targets included in the revised draft performance plan should be considered consistent with the Union-wide performance targets in the key performance area of environment.

Assessment of the capacity targets

(20) As regards the key performance area of capacity, the consistency of the targets included in the revised draft performance plan regarding the average *en route* air traffic flow management ('ATFM') delay per flight has been assessed based on the criterion laid down in point 1.3 of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317. Accordingly, the proposed capacity targets of Estonia have been compared to the relevant reference values set out in the Network Operations Plan drawn up in accordance with Article 9 of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/123 and available at the time of adopting the Union-wide performance targets for RP4, that is on 2 July 2024.

(21) The *en route* capacity targets proposed by Estonia for RP4, expressed in minutes of ATFM delay per flight, as well as the corresponding reference values from the Network Operations Plan, are as follows:

Estonia	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Targets in the key performance area of capacity, expressed in minutes of ATFM delay per flight	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,02**
Reference values	0,06	0,04	0,03	0,02	0,02

(22) The Commission observes that the capacity targets proposed by Estonia are equal to the corresponding national reference values for each year of RP4. Estonia explains in the revised draft performance plan that given the historically good performance of EANS in the key performance area of capacity and the significant reduction of traffic due to Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, additional measures for the achievement of the capacity targets in RP4 are not necessary. The Commission notes that Estonia plans to maintain a similar number of air traffic controllers ('ATCOs') working in the Tallinn area control centre ('ACC') during RP4 compared to RP3, which provides flexibility for accommodating potential sudden shifts in traffic flows.

(23) On the basis of the findings set out in recitals 21 and 22, the targets included in the revised draft performance plan should be considered consistent with the Union-wide performance targets in the key performance area of capacity.

Assessment of performance targets in the key performance area of cost-efficiency

(24) In Implementing Decision (EU) 2025/1040, the Commission concluded that the proposed *en route* cost-efficiency targets included in the draft performance plan of Estonia submitted in 2024 were inconsistent with the Union-wide performance targets. Estonia has proposed revised *en route* cost-efficiency targets in its revised draft performance plan.

(25) The table below shows the revised cost-efficiency performance targets proposed by Estonia in the revised draft performance plan.

En route charging zone of Estonia	2019 baseline value	2024 baseline value	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Revised cost-efficiency targets, expressed as determined unit cost (in real terms in 2022 prices)	**38,12 EUR**	**49,55 EUR**	**46,29 EUR**	**46,99 EUR**	**48,00 EUR**	**48,10 EUR**	**48,18 EUR**

(26) The Commission observes that Estonia has revised its local cost-efficiency targets for each year of RP4, which results, in comparison with the draft performance plan submitted in 2024, in a reduction of the determined unit cost ('DUC') for each year of RP4. Furthermore, Estonia has also updated the DUC baseline value for year 2024 to reflect the actual costs incurred in 2024.

(27) The decrease of the DUC referred to in recital (26) results both from the downwards revision of the determined costs and from the updated traffic assumptions for RP4 applied by Estonia in line with the Eurocontrol STATFOR February 2025 base traffic forecast. The numbers of *en route* service units forecasted in the revised draft performance plan for each year of RP4 are presented in the table below.

En route charging zone of Estonia	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Updated traffic forecast (included in the revised draft performance plan), expressed in thousands of *en route* service units	**612**	**626**	**636**	**649**	**658**

(28) The revised determined costs of Estonia for RP4, expressed in real terms in 2022 prices ('EUR2022'), are shown in the table below.

En route charging zone of Estonia	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Revised determined costs in real terms in 2022 prices (included in the revised draft performance plan)	**EUR 28 M**	**EUR 29 M**	**EUR 31 M**	**EUR 31 M**	**EUR 32 M**

(29) The Commission has assessed the consistency of the revised cost-efficiency targets proposed by Estonia based on the criteria laid down in points 1.4(a), (b) and (c) of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317.

(30) Concerning the criterion laid down in point 1.4(a) of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317, the Commission observes that the *en route* DUC trend at charging zone level of -0,6 % over RP4 underperforms the Union-wide trend of -1,2 % over the same period.

(31) Concerning the criterion laid down in point 1.4(b) of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317, the Commission observes that the long-term *en route* DUC trend at charging zone level over the third reference period ('RP3') and RP4 of +2,6 % underperforms the long-term Union-wide trend of -1,0 % over the same period.

(32) The Commission notes, however, that Estonia has lost, as a consequence of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, a significant share of the overflights which it historically used to serve. That traffic reduction continues over RP4 to considerably impact the cost-efficiency performance of the air navigation service provider of Estonia and has, in particular, a negative effect on the long-term DUC trend of Estonia calculated over RP3 and RP4 combined

(33) It is therefore necessary and appropriate to examine, for the purpose of the assessment criterion referred to in recital 31, whether Estonia would meet the Union-wide long-term DUC trend in the absence of the circumstances referred to in recital 32.

(34) To that end, the Commission has recalculated Estonia's long-term DUC trend over RP3 and RP4 in light of the estimated structural loss of traffic for Estonia as a consequence of the war in Ukraine, measured in *en route* service units. That recalculation results in an adjusted long-term DUC trend for Estonia of -4,0 %, which outperforms the long-term Union-wide DUC trend of -1,0 %. Therefore, it is concluded that Estonia fulfils the assessment criterion referred to in recital 31 after taking into account the effect of the significant traffic reduction resulting from the war in Ukraine.

(35) Concerning the criterion laid down in point 1.4(c) of Annex IV to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/317, the Commission observes that the baseline value for the DUC at the level of the charging zone of Estonia of EUR 49,55 in EUR2022 is 5,6 % lower than the average baseline value of EUR 52,48 in EUR2022 of the relevant comparator group set out in Article 7, point (d), of Implementing Decision (EU) 2024/1688.

(36) As outlined in recital 35, it is clear that Estonia's DUC baseline value for 2024 is lower than the average baseline value of the relevant comparator group. Furthermore, as outlined in recitals 32, 33 and 34 when excluding the negative impact of the traffic changes resulting from Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, Estonia meets the Union-wide long-term DUC trend for RP4. Therefore, the Commission considers that the deviation from the Union-wide DUC trend for RP4 referred to in recital 30 does not preclude Estonia's cost-efficiency performance targets from being consistent with the Union-wide cost-efficiency performance targets.

(37) On the basis of the findings set out in recitals 25 to 36, the Commission considers that Estonia has adequately addressed the recommendations set out in Article 3 of Implementing Decision (EU) 2025/1040 with regard to the revision of its local cost-efficiency performance targets. The Commission therefore concludes that the revised cost-efficiency targets included by Estonia in the revised draft performance plan should be considered consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for RP4.

CONCLUSIONS

(38) In the light of all the foregoing, the Commission has found that the performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan of Estonia are consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for RP4,

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

The performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan submitted by Estonia for the fourth reference period ('RP4'), listed in the Annex to this Decision, are consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for RP4 set out in Implementing Decision (EU) 2024/1688.

Article 2

This Decision is addressed to the Republic of Estonia.

Done at Brussels, 23 April 2026.

For the Commission
Apostolos TZITZIKOSTAS
Member of the Commission

ANNEX

Performance targets included in the revised draft performance plan submitted by Estonia pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 549/2004, found to be consistent with the Union-wide performance targets for the fourth reference period

KEY PERFORMANCE AREA OF SAFETY

Effectiveness of safety management

Estonia	**Targets on the effectiveness of safety management, expressed as a level of implementation**, ranging from EASA level A to D					
Air navigation service provider concerned	**Safety management objective**	**2025**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
EANS	Safety policy and objectives	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety risk management	D	D	D	D	**D**
	Safety assurance	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety promotion	C	C	C	C	**C**
	Safety culture	C	C	C	C	**C**

KEY PERFORMANCE AREA OF ENVIRONMENT

Average horizontal *en route* flight efficiency of the actual trajectory

Estonia	**2025**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
Targets in the key performance area of environment, expressed as the average horizontal *en route* flight efficiency of the actual trajectory	**6,54 %**	**6,53 %**	**6,52 %**	**6,51 %**	**6,50 %**

KEY PERFORMANCE AREA OF CAPACITY

Average *en route* ATFM delay in minutes per flight

Estonia	**2025**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
Targets in the key performance area of capacity, expressed in minutes of ATFM delay per flight	**0,06**	**0,04**	**0,03**	**0,02**	**0,02**

KEY PERFORMANCE AREA OF COST-EFFICIENCY

Determined unit cost for *en route* air navigation services

***En route* charging zone of Estonia**	**2019 baseline value**	**2024 baseline value**	**2025**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
Revised cost-efficiency targets, expressed as determined *en route* unit cost (in real terms in 2022 prices)	**38,12 EUR**	**49,55 EUR**	**46,29 EUR**	**46,99 EUR**	**48,00 EUR**	**48,10 EUR**	**48,18 EUR**