

# MetaCDM WP 200 interviews

Roger Gardner  
MetaCDM workshop 2  
12<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# WP 200 – Networking, fact-finding and on-site visits

## OBJECTIVES

- Obtain a comprehensive picture of airport CDM in practice, and fill in gaps from WP100
  - On-site interviews at major airports affected by disruption
    - Current and best practices
    - Instrumentation and data sources
    - Deicing/snow removal operations
    - Other disruption-specific operations
    - The status of CDM and coordination activities
  - Covering all major stakeholders including ground transportation providers...

# Networking, fact-finding and on-site visits

- Interviewees included:
  - Airlines (Legacy, low cost & freight)
  - Airports (large and small), handling agents
  - Air navigation service providers
  - Blue light services, Border agencies
  - Ground transportation providers, Trade bodies
  - Government Departments and local authorities
- Airports: CDG, Frankfurt, Heathrow, Brussels, Toulouse, Luton
- More interviews pending

# Interview scope (1)

- PLANNING - irregular operations (IROPS) logistics organization plus crisis and contingency planning
- CDM ENGAGEMENT - crisis connections and extent of integration beyond your organizational boundaries
- ALERT PROCESS - 'Horizon scanning' and upstream alert processes
- COMMUNICATION DOWNSTREAM - communication procedures for engaging dependent organisations, and passenger involvement

# Interview scope (2)

- TRAINING - simulation and training approach
- TOOLS - systems, data, modeling and scenarios
- NEW TECHNOLOGIES - ideas, CDM concepts, and CDM-enabling technologies
- PERFORMANCE - performance measurement, KPIs and improvement processes
- EFFECTIVENESS - obstacles to optimum crisis management
- SCOPE TO IMPROVE - key actions by your organization and others

# Interview scope (3)

- COST –influence upon crisis management, planning and execution
- REGULATION – effect upon execution of crisis management
- CONTINGENCY – catering for travellers/passengers faced with disruption
- COMPLAINTS – complaint topics in crisis situations

# Commentary - general

- Interviewees cautious about revealing competitive information
- Strong correlation between airport size/capacity and CDM interest and resourcing
- Lines of authority and data and information incompatibility across borders are obstacles
- Passenger focus intense at larger airports with dedicated resource
- Human interaction is the core of CDM and resilience – tools are subordinate

# Contingency

- Where there is no resident airline, handling agents have focal responsibility
- Smaller airport handling issues: where are taxis for diverted aircraft arriving at 2.00am?

# Regulation

- Operationally benign
- Duty of care obligations and compensation through EU 261 causes concern
- No push for new or changed regulation



# Performance and effectiveness

- Metrics exist, especially for larger airports but tend to be confidential
- Smaller airports and service companies focus on simple deliverables such as pax throughput and baggage to belts and generally do not have KPIs;
- Airlines bear the major cost risk related to passengers with airports addressing terminal ;
- Fora exist for continued analysis and learning at all levels – this is BAU for larger businesses

# Cost

- Safety paramount and no cost compromises
- Concerns about the effects of EU 261, Denied Boarding regs and compensation upon airline bottom lines;
- Investment is made as needed, especially as part of lessons learned after a crisis
- Commercial reputation is a significant cost risk
- Worth revisiting costs benefit analysis at a system level

# MetaCDM Resilience of airports

Roger Gardner  
MetaCDM workshop 2  
12<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# Planning (1)

- Civil contingencies legislation dictates some responder actions for national infrastructure assets
- Government has a hierarchy of groups to respond as necessary – involves govt departments, authorities and airports
- High level constraints, e.g. regulations and CAA emergency planning requirements
- Airport area resilience fora exist to engage necessary organisations

# Planning (2)

- Airport size dependency
  - Larger airports: have Bronze/Silver/Gold hierarchy with clear interface
  - Smaller airports usually have part of one person running simpler systems
- AOCs of crucial importance in priming relationships and response capability
- Notified event severity dictates type of response: calls/emails or convening a meeting
- Contingency routes to/from airports available in the event of crises

# Experience (1)

- APOCs hold critical position but connection between airside and landside CDM needs to be enhanced
- Learning from experience – major work done to react to events, e.g. ash cloud or major snow events
- Media engagement mixed: good for information dissemination but sometimes negative about planning
- Too little inter-agency engagement on exercises
- Growing anxiety about cyber threats and initiation of preparedness action

# Experience (2)

- Too little mutual knowledge of different stakeholders' constraints impedes effectiveness
- Authorities offer equipment loans or reciprocal support to get through emergencies
- Comprehensive package of welfare practice at larger airports
- Airports and airlines have 'call off' contracts with hotels and coach companies for when crises strike
- Harmonisation needed in CDM rules and tools across borders

# Experience (3)

- Ability to connect departure and arrival tools across border would be valuable
- Interface between apron and runway leaves scope for improvement
- Valuable to have web access to other airports' CDM status info or a CDM network
- Potential of datalink to transmit information not adequately exploited
- Some CDM 'bolt on' elements, e.g. slot exchange, add value



# MetaCDM Information sharing and decision-making between stakeholders

Roger Gardner  
MetaCDM workshop 2  
12<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# CDM engagement

- Size dependency
  - Large airports need and can afford the systems and have resources
  - Medium/smaller sized airports slow to engage
  - the baggage of CDM is too onerous for small airports
- Desire of small airports to see a low-cost CDM 'lite' system – dialogue with Eurocontrol

# Alert process

- Upstream notification generally work well
  - Security issues via state agencies and ‘blue light’ services – airports in ‘receive mode’
  - Safety notifications through certification authorities and airlines/ANSPs
  - Embassy alert network, origin airport and Eurocontrol intelligence is important
  - Media important for some categories of alert
- Data conflict
  - Weather dependency upon Met providers but issue of inconsistency needs addressing

# Alert process (2)

- Growing interest in space weather
- Regular self-help scanning of the web for notice of potential problems (domestic as well as international, e.g. strikes);

# Communication downstream

- Problem of unifying/linking systems between stakeholders, especially for smaller airports;
- Use of local media inadequate;
- Some authorities currently looking at comms scenarios and improvement strategies;
- Pressures to restore normal operations - passenger and welfare issues at risk of being prioritised below airline and handler logistics

# Tools

- Larger airports guidance set out in details and regularly updated but relies mainly upon manual interaction rather than automated systems, except for fire;
- Lack of commonality of systems and conflict in interfaces especially difficult for smaller airports that cannot justify the expense of new systems;
- Lower level systems exist to deal with aspects such such as crew 'out of hours'
- Value in developing generic guidance (e.g. through EU/CAAs) and exploring national networks;

# Training

- National exercises organised by government, also involve highways
- Continuous exercises and scenarios at larger airports and airlines but mainly in-house, e.g. lunch time modules and computer training
- Ground transport providers conduct smaller exercises at up to weekly frequency
- Smaller airports undertake periodic ‘desk top’ exercises but resource constrained – low impact/low investment
- Service companies may not do own training

# New technologies

- Not generally seen as critical at the operational level as reliant upon human interface and likely to remain so but....
- ....access to CDM on smartphone would help some handles and contractors
- Value in more research and analysis in predictive modelling
- Need to exploit social media and active tracking capabilities to a greater degree
- Greater potential in improving the passenger experience
- Can be low tech, e.g. colour coding for pax flows



# MetaCDM passenger expectations and information sharing with passengers

Roger Gardner  
MetaCDM workshop 2  
12<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# Expectations

- Benchmarking undertaken against other airport activity and performance
- Airports expect airlines to provide passenger support and will recharge when left to react and provide solutions
- Airlines expected to provide transfers, hotels, re-booking advice, etc related to completing a journey or arranging an alternative
- Passenger group fora organised to gather feedback

# Response

- Emphasis on the vulnerable
- Airports will provide blankets, seating, children's kits and water where needed but expect airlines to provide food
- Passenger rights information handed out
- Social media activated by airports for messaging
- Multi-lingual airport staff reservists deployed in terminals when needed to provide information, telephone access, hotel and transport guidance, etc
- Some passenger focused charities act as crisis responders

# Complaints

- Focus groups used by larger airports to gather messages and learn lessons – continuous improvement process
- Civil aviation authorities conduct surveys and disseminate results, airlines survey findings remain confidential
- Though airports bear the heat of public reaction during crises, complaints usually go to airlines
- Passengers dislike lack of notice of events occurring
- Some organisations use voice tape reviews to improve passenger interface

# MetaCDM – Scope to improve

Roger Gardner  
MetaCDM workshop 2  
12<sup>th</sup> November 2013

# Scope to Improve

- Benefits from joint exercises and training but major exercise cost is an issue
- Scope to strengthen international resilience through enhancing Air Service Agreements (ASAs)
- Scope for better operational B2B messaging
- Draw upon airline experience of CDM at different airports and disseminate
- Deicing inadequately reflected in timings, e.g. TSAT

# Scope to improve (2)

- Terminal queue management
- Uncertainty analysis to support information stability
- Better information about CDM benefits, e.g. by airline
- Weather forecasting/prediction/severity research
- Ability to deploy other transport modes to ease cancellation problems