



Data link Network Operational Status Report

July 2020

This report is the 'Data link Network Operational Status Report' as identified in the DPMF Report Catalogue available from the [DPMF OneSky team web site](#). It provides a summary of the operational status and technical performance of data link in Europe.

A definition of the metrics used in this report is available in the DPMF Report Catalogue, the identifier for each metric is shown in angled brackets e.g. <N-1>.


NB 1: Between the end of July and the middle of December 2019 the data for EDYY and EDUU is incomplete with no data at all for some flights and just partial data for some flights. So data for EDUU and EDYY is not representative and any total counts of flights etc. are underestimated in that period.

NB 2: As from 1st January 2020 this report now also includes data from EPWW (Warsaw).

Operational Status

Figure 1 on the following page provides a status and performance summary for each FIR/UIR. The format has changed from previous reports and any feedback on the new format is welcome. The top map shows the operational status of each centre (<N-4>). The map below shows which centres are currently providing LISAT data to NM. The table on the right shows per centre: i) the number of flights operating above FL285, ii) The Provider Abort rate (only for those centres providing LISAT data to NM), iii) what percentage of flights indicate that they are capable of performing CPDLC over the ATN (i.e. file 'J1') and iv) what percentage of the flights operating above FL285 are actually seen using CPDLC over the ATN.

Implementation Status



Statistics

Ats Code	Total Flights	PA Rate	% J1 Capable	% Using..
EDUU	76461	2.3	74%	39%
EDYY	61184	2.3	73%	49%
EETT	5421		56%	
EFIN	2846		72%	
EGPX	15875	7.7	71%	22%
EGTT	48972	3.4	74%	51%
EISN	13062		59%	
EKDK	13414		72%	
ENOR	9022		84%	
EPWW	23286	4.0	76%	38%
EVRR	8047		62%	
EYVL	7602		65%	
GCCC	7564		88%	
LBSR	27954		75%	
LCCC	8444		55%	
LDZO	30317		79%	
LECB	31483		80%	
LECM	36979		81%	
LFBB	32158		79%	
LFEE	36193		76%	
LFFF	22849		70%	
LFMM	40827		73%	
LFRR	35419		80%	
LGGG	27871		71%	
LHCC	32163		79%	
LIBB	12610		71%	
LIMM	27369		74%	
LIRR	27097		74%	
LJLA	14602	4.1	80%	42%
LKAA	23598	6.1	74%	41%
LMMM	2875		48%	
LOVV	37157		78%	
LPPC	16051		85%	
LRBB	24242		74%	
LSAG	19354	3.1	75%	42%
LSAZ	18985	2.8	71%	44%
LZBB	17178		76%	

Providing Data to NM




Figure 1: Current operational status of data link over the ATN

Classification:TLP : White

ANSPs with service limitations

The table below explains the limitations of service for those centres shown in yellow in 'Implementation Status' map on Figure 1 i.e. those centres that provide data link but not in full compliance with (EC) No 29/2009 as amended.

Centre	Limitation of service
LPPC	Only the DLIC service is provided.
LFEE, LFFF, LFMM	DLIC, ACM, AMC services provided (no ACL).
LFRR, LFBB	DLIC, ACM, AMC and ACL service provided, but no downlink messages of ACL are supported.
EFIN	DLIC, ACL, ACM, AMC but only for the SITA network.
LBSR	DLIC, ACL, ACM, AMC but only for the SITA network.

CPDLC / ATN Flights

Figure 2 presents data only for flights operating above FL285 in the DLS airspace. It shows what percentage of flights in that airspace¹ file 'J1' in their flight plan <N-1> and what percentage indicate in the flight plan that the aircraft is exempt. For July 2020 72.2% of flights indicated the capability to perform CPDLC over ATN/VDL Mode 2 and 19.4% indicate they are exempt.




Figure 2: Proportion of flights capable of using CPDLC over ATN/ VDL Mode 2

For those centres providing data to the DPMF (see Figure 4 below) an average of 43% of flights logged on to data link over the month.

¹ EHAFFIR, LOVV FIR, LECBUIR, LIBBUIR, EBURUIR, GCCCUIRN, GCCCUIRS, LFFFUIR, EDVVUIR, LPPCFIR, EGGTUIR, LECMUIR, LIMMUIR, EDUUUIR, LIRRUIR, EGPXUIR, EISNUIR, LZBBFIR, LRBBFIR, LHCCFIR, EKDKFIR, LJLAFIR, LCCCFIR, LKAAFIR, LBSRFIR, EPWWFIR, EFINFIR, LGGGUIR, LMMMUIR, EVRRUIR, ESAAUIR, EETTUIR, EYVLUIR.

Technical Performance

Overall Provider Abort Rate

Figure 3 below shows the PA rate <0-23> aggregated for all ANSPs providing data to LISAT². The target value is 1 PA per 100 hours CPDLC (shown as a dashed line on the graph below). The overall average rate for July 2020 was 3.2 PAs per 100 hours.




Figure 3: PA rate

Figure 4 below shows the PA rate of aircraft on the Logon List against aircraft not on the Logon List using only data from centres that do not support the Logon List³.




Figure 4: Logon Listed Aircraft PA rate

² Currently MUAC, Skyguide, DFS, NATS, ANS CZ, Slovenia Control and PANSA. ENAIRE and DSNA have started to provide data but it is still being validated and so is not included in this report.

³ EDUU,EGTT,EGPX,LKAA,LJLA,EPWW.

PA rate per ACSP

Figure 5 below shows the PA rate per ACSP for aircraft on the Logon List. The ACSP information is taken from the declarations made by the aircraft operators when adding their aircraft to the Logon List; 'BOTH' implies that the aircraft may use ARINC or SITA.




Figure 5: ACSP PA rate

Weekly PA rate per Centre




Figure 6: Weekly PA Rate per Centre

Weekly PA Rate for Major Aircraft Operators

Figure 7 below shows the weekly PA rate for the three aircraft operators with the lowest average PA rate and the three aircraft operators with the highest average PA rate from a list of the top 30 aircraft operators in terms of usage of CPDLC/ATN over the past 15 weeks. The large variations in the individual PA rate after mid-March is due to the very low level of traffic and so is probably not significant.




Figure 7: Top 3 and bottom 3 PA Rate for Major Aircraft Operators

Weekly PA Rate for 5 biggest CPDLC users

Figure 8 below shows the weekly PA rate for the five aircraft operators that have used CPDLC most over the past 15 weeks.




Figure 8: PA Rate of the 5 biggest users of CPDLC

Weekly PA Rate for various aircraft types

The figures below show the weekly PA rate for specific aircraft types for the five aircraft operators using CPDLC the most over the past 15 weeks with the particular aircraft type.

Airbus A320 Family




Figure 9: A320 Family (A318/319/320/321/20N/21N) Aircraft Operator PA Rates

Boeing B737 Family




Figure 10: B737 Family Aircraft Operator PA Rates

Technical Round Trip Delay

Figure 11 below shows the 95th and 99th percentile of the technical round trip delay <0-2><0-3>. It represents the delay between when a message is uplinked and the ground system receives the corresponding application level acknowledgement (aggregated for all systems providing data to LISAT).



Figure 11: Technical Round Trip Delay

Technical Continuity

The graph below shows a new metric measuring the “Technical Continuity” (<0-25>). This is the probability that a LACK is received for an uplink message before the technical response timer expires i.e. within 40 seconds.




Figure 12: Technical Continuity

N.B The way this metric is currently calculated is not correct; it is presenting the probability of the TRTD being less than 40 seconds, but the TRTD is only calculated for uplink messages which receive a LACK. So the graph below represents an optimistic view of the true performance since some uplink messages do not receive a LACK at all.

VDL Mode 2 Performance

The following metrics⁴ are computed based on the available data from the VGS logs provided each month to the DPMF by ARINC and SITA. These logs contain the AVLC traffic recorded at each VGS during the 24hrs of the first Friday⁵ of each month.

AVLC Round Trip Time for the first Friday of the month.

The graph below shows the cumulative distributions per frequency (and per CSP) for the AVLC Round Trip Time (RTT) of acknowledged AVLC INFO frames conveying ATN packet to Logon-List aircraft and considering all the VGS logs. The 95th and the 99th percentile of ED-120 together with the 95th and the 99.9th percentile of ED-228A are also provided for comparison purposes and tabulated values are reported in the legend. Please note the logarithmic scale of the RTT.




Figure 13: AVLC Round Trip Time

Important note: SITA is providing logs for all their users whereas ARINC is only providing data for their 9 largest ATN users (SAS, EZY, DLH group, BAW, EIN, IBE, BOS, VLG and FIN) as well as non-AOC users. Moreover, ARINC is providing logs for all their European VGSs whereas SITA is only providing logs of VGSs from which they have access to (mainly: Norway, Sweden, UK, The Netherlands, Germany, Czech Rep., France, Switzerland, Austria and Spain). Therefore the CSPs data does not represent the behaviour of their network as a whole. The trend information for each CSP is valuable and useful but the comparison between the two CSPs is problematic since different data sets are being compared.

⁴ The Channel load, the AVLC RTT distribution and the number of retransmission distribution are defined in the DPMF report catalogue.

⁵ Friday is observed to have the highest flight traffic of the week.

Number of retransmissions for the first Friday of the month.

The graph below shows the cumulative distributions per frequency (and per CSP for the CSC) for the number of retransmissions needed before acknowledgement of uplink AVLC INFO frames conveying ATN packet to Logon-List aircraft considering all the VGS logs. N=0 represents successes on the first attempt, N=1 to N=5 represent successes on the first to the fifth retransmissions and N>5 represents N2T1 events.




Figure 14: AVLC Uplink INFO frame retransmission count

Important note: SITA is providing logs for all their users whereas ARINC is only providing data for their 9 largest ATN users (SAS, EZY, DLH group, BAW, EIN, IBE, BOS, VLG and FIN) as well as non-AOC users. Moreover, ARINC is providing logs for all their European VGSs whereas SITA is only providing logs of VGSs from which they have access to (mainly: Norway, Sweden, UK, The Netherlands, Germany, Czech Rep., France, Switzerland, Austria and Spain). Therefore the CSPs data does not represent the behaviour of their network as a whole. The trend information for each CSP is valuable and useful but the comparison between the two CSPs is problematic since different data sets are being compared.

AVLC Round Trip Time per frequency trend

The following set of graphs show the 95th and the 99th percentile of the AVLC RTT (in seconds) of acknowledged AVLC INFO frames conveying ATN packet to Logon-List aircraft for the first Friday of each month for each frequency with the CSC split over the two CSPs. The RTT axis has a logarithmic scale with the same range for the different frequencies. The graphs also shows the number of AVLC frames taken into account in the percentiles calculations (Frame count in linear scale).




Figure 15: AVLC Uplink INFO Round Trip Time per Frequency

Important note: SITA is providing logs for all their users whereas ARINC is only providing data for their 9 largest ATN users (SAS, EZY, DLH group, BAW, EIN, IBE, BOS, VLG and FIN) as well as non-AOC users. Moreover, ARINC is providing logs for all their European VGSs whereas SITA is only providing logs of VGSs from which they have access to (mainly: Norway, Sweden, UK, The Netherlands, Germany, Czech Rep., France, Switzerland, Austria and Spain). Therefore the CSPs data does not represent the behaviour of their network as a whole. The trend information for each CSP is valuable and useful but the comparison between the two CSPs is problematic since different data sets are being compared.

Uplink delivery success rate

The following set of graphs show the uplink delivery rate of AVL INFO frames conveying ATN packet to Logon-List aircraft for the first Friday of each month for each frequency with the CSC split over the two CSPs. It is the probability that an AVL uplink INFO frame is correctly delivered to the aircraft (ACK received). The graphs also shows the number of AVL frames taken into account in the calculations (Msg count in linear scale = AVL frame count sent on first attempt).




Figure 16: AVL Retransmission rate per frequency

Important note: SITA is providing logs for all their users whereas ARINC is only providing data for their 9 largest ATN users (SAS, EZY, DLH group, BAW, EIN, IBE, BOS, VLG and FIN) as well as non-AOC users. Moreover, ARINC is providing logs for all their European VGSs whereas SITA is only providing logs of VGSs from which they have access to (mainly: Norway, Sweden, UK, The Netherlands, Germany, Czech Rep., France, Switzerland, Austria and Spain). Therefore the CSPs data does not represent the behaviour of their network as a whole. The trend information for each CSP is valuable and useful but the comparison between the two CSPs is problematic since different data sets are being compared.

Channel load per frequency trend

The following set of graphs show the channel load per AVLC payload type (ATN, AOA and AVLC protocol related frames⁶) for the first Friday of each month for each frequency with the CSC split over the two CSPs. The channel load is expressed in megabytes with the same range for the different frequencies.




Figure 17: AVLC Channel load per frequency

Important note: SITA is providing logs for all their users whereas ARINC is only providing data for their 9 largest ATN users (SAS, EZY, DLH group, BAW, EIN, IBE, BOS, VLG and FIN) as well as non-AOC users. Moreover, ARINC is providing logs for all their European VGSs whereas SITA is only providing logs of VGSs from which they have access to (mainly: Norway, Sweden, UK, The Netherlands, Germany, Czech Rep., France, Switzerland, Austria and Spain). Therefore the CSPs data does not represent the behaviour of their network as a whole. The trend information for each CSP is valuable and useful but the comparison between the two CSPs is problematic since different data sets are being compared.

⁶ i.e. RR, SREJ, XID, ...

©2020 The European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL). This document is published by EUROCONTROL for information purposes. It may be copied in whole or in part, provided that EUROCONTROL is mentioned as the source and the extent justified by the non-commercial use (not for sale). The information in this document may not be modified without prior written permission from EUROCONTROL.