



The Airport-Airline Relationship

Dr. Michael Tretheway

Istanbul Technical University
Air Transportation Management
M.Sc. Program

Airport Planning and Management

Module 02

March 2015

The Airport Use Agreement



Airlines Must enter into Contract with Airport

- Use of airport requires airline to sign an agreement with the airport
 - Airport Use Agreement
 - A contractual relationship
 - Specifies obligations of each party
- Two types
 - Signatory airline
 - Usually has greater obligations of airline, but for lower fees
 - Non-signatory
 - This still requires signing a contract
 - Higher fees, lower priorities
- Airline has large number of contracts
 - TK: 260+ destinations
 - Some low frequency, some high frequency
 - Plus other airports for charter services
- Airline may have GSAs at other airports

Airline Use Agreement

- There is no universal standard agreement
- Agreements tend to be similar within a given country
- But will vary substantially between nations

What is covered?

- Rights, privileges, and obligations for each party
 - and defines how the airport is to be used by the airlines
- Business arrangement
 - Premises and facilities leased by the airlines and the degree of control by the lessee
 - (e.g., exclusively leased, preferentially leased, leased in common, etc.)
 - Ticket counters, boarding gates, lounges, offices
 - Maybe baggage systems
- Rate-setting methodology with the airlines
 - (e.g., compensatory, residual, hybrid)
- Control over the expenses at the airport, if any
- General party responsibilities and obligations
 - for indemnification, insurance, environmental issues, and other governmental inclusion

Responsibilities of the Airline

- Payment of landing fees and security charges
- Collection of 'Airport Improvement Fee' (AIF) or 'Passenger Facility Charge' (PFC)
- Maintenance and repair obligations (e.g., terminal complex space, apron area, etc.)
- Ownership of improvements
 - But landlord has guidance on improvements
 - Improvements are usually tradable

Responsibilities of the Airline

- Agreement usually implies a collective agreement among all the airlines and the airport
 - Collectively the airlines may guarantee coverage of the airport's costs
 - This is true for residual pricing agreements
 - Even with compensatory agreements there may be collective guarantees
- Airport revenue bonds
 - Used in some nations
 - Common in U.S.
 - Airlines collectively guarantee an airport's bond payments
 - Airlines willing to do so as it means the airport has lower risk and hence lower financing costs
 - Airline realize that ultimately they will end up paying an airport's expenses
 - Airports pay landing fees into a trust fund
 - Trust fund first pays the interest (and principal) of airport bonds
 - Then excess is transferred to the airport

Responsibilities of the Airline

- Conditions of use
 - Fees
 - Payment terms
 - Provision of data
 - Number of passengers
 - Broken down by revenue and non-revenue
 - Noise procedures
 - Payment of property taxes
 - Operational issues
 - Radio frequencies
 - Gate scheduling process

Slots

- Will be covered later in the course
- Slot coordination role varies by airport
 - Largest carrier
 - Independent slot controller
 - UK airports, Toronto – Airport Coordination Ltd., AC Canada
 - Airports
 - Airports increasingly seeking role of slot coordinator
They want to control access and productivity of their assets
 - Government
 - FAA in US as key airports

Responsibilities of the Airport

- Airport must provide signatory airlines with
 - Operational data
 - Financial data
 - Capital and operating plans
 - Right to audit airport finances
- Airport usually convenes an consultative committee of the airlines
- Airport must operate the airport adhering to all applicable safety regulations
- And must carry insurance
 - Insurance companies may impose their own standards on the airport
- Airport must show and adhere to its pricing methodology

Other Airline – Airport Agreements

- Airline Use Agreement
- Specific agreements for lease of space and facilities in the airport terminal
 - Office space
 - Space for lounges
 - Australia – airline has right to operate retail within its lounges
 - Most airports do not allow this
 - Sublease for gates, ticket counters
 - Exclusive use – no other airline may use
 - Preferred use – airline has priority on use of gate
 - but when not in use airport may assign use to other airlines
 - Common use – airport schedules all use
 - Terminal lease
 - Some airlines lease entire terminals
 - E.g., Terminal 1 in Chicago O’Hare
 - United designed and has exclusive use
 - Has concession rights within terminal

Other Airline – Airport Agreements

- Land lease for
 - Operations centre
 - Maintenance facilities
 - Cargo facilities
- Provision of services by airport
 - Ex) Hamburg airport can provide (51 subsidiary companies)
 - Customer service (check-in, boarding)
 - Ground handling
 - Fuelling
 - Crew transport
 - Passenger transport
- Right to operate ground handling
- Airline consortium agreements
 - Some airports allow fuelling consortia

Signatory vs. Non-signatory Airlines



Signatory Status – example of US airports

- Airports have access to municipal bond market as a method to fund capital improvements
 - Interest income on municipal bonds is tax free
- Financial markets look for commitment from the airlines that:
 - They plan to operate at the airport
 - Pay fees in accordance agreement for the full term of any outstanding bonds
- Signing a long-term agreement signifies a commitment to a payment stream to the airport
 - In return for lower fees being charged to signatory airlines
 - Lower financing cost is benefit ultimately enjoyed by airline
 - (*residual* rate-setting)

Signatory Status

- Signatory airlines may also play significant role in airport investment decisions if they agree to the **majority-in-interest (MII)** clauses in the use agreement
 - **MII**: signatory airlines have to approve all significant planned developments or changes at airport
- MII clauses can be a problematic if non-signatory airlines are prevented from gaining access to terminal space and gates
 - Some cases in US (E.g., MSP) where airlines refused terminal expansion that was intended to accommodate new entrants
- As a result, increasing use of **`use it or lose it`** clauses
 - **`Use it or lose it`**: control of assets are returned to airport if airline does not use facilities as intended

Non-signatory Status

- Non-signatory airlines are those that are not willing to commit a revenue stream for the full term of any outstanding bonds
- Simpler agreement, but usually pay higher landing fees and rents than do signatory airlines
- Non-signatory airlines generally operate limited or seasonal service

Rate-Setting Methodologies

- **Residual:** airlines assume the financial risk and guarantee to provide the airport with sufficient revenue to cover its operating and debt-service costs
 - Airport deducts an agreed amount of non-airline revenue from its expenses, leaving the airlines responsible for the remaining (residual) amount
 - Other general points:
 - Airport has less incentive for maximizing non-aeronautical revenue sources
 - Airport has less incentive for controlling operating expenses
 - As a trade off, airports generally have weaker balance sheets, reduced debt service coverage margins, and limited liquidity
 - With limited available cash, airports generally have a higher cost of capital

Rate-Setting Methodologies

- **Compensatory:** airline pays for only the cost of facilities used or leased at a specific airport
 - Usually at mature airports that have achieved successful revenue generation
 - Airport bears financial risk, but retains concession revenue for discretionary capital improvements
 - Other general points:
 - Airport has incentive to maximize non-aeronautical revenue
 - Airports generally have higher levels of liquidity and discretionary cash
 - Airports generally carry stronger operating and debt service coverage margins

Ground Handling



Ground Handling Overview

- Ground handling services cover passenger handling, baggage handling, freight and mail handling, ramp handling, fuel and oil handling, and aircraft services and maintenance
- Airport determines who provides ground handling services
- Sometimes airport operator provides ground handling services but provided by airline or handling at most airports
- Historically, the national airline or airport operator have had a monopoly in ground handling

Self Operation and Regulations

- Some airport operators earn significant revenues from provision of ground handling services to airlines
 - Not in North America, common in Europe
 - Often was a monopoly or near monopoly in the past
 - Sometimes over half the total income of the airport
 - A study (1992) of European airports showed 44 percent of aircraft movements were handled by airport operators
- Providers of monopoly services claim that providing competition would duplicate resources, lower efficiency, and increase congestion
- Critics argue that monopolies push up prices and tend to reduce service standards

Self Operation and Regulations

- In 1996, EU adopted the Ground Handling Directive
 - End all ground handling monopolies and duopolies within the EU
 - Open up the market to third party handlers
 - Recognize the right of airlines to self-handle
 - In North America, often there is no right to self handle
 - Airport determines how many total GHs and whether some will be independent non-airline
 - EC concept is to guarantee some choice for airlines in provision of ground handling services
- Key features:
 - For airports with >1M pax, airlines have right to self-handle
 - For airports with >2M pax, third party handling allowed
 - At least one handler must be independent from airport operator or dominant airlines with more than 25% of traffic

Contract Ground Handling

- To avoid congestion, there are typically limits on how many airlines can provide ground handling services
- Airlines with less-frequent service or fewer resources at a particular airport sometimes subcontract ground handling to another airline or third-party handler
- According to IATA, conservative estimates indicate airlines outsource more than 50% of ground handling
- In cases where airport doesn't provide service, it will earn rental fees and perhaps a small concession from the airlines/agents providing the ground handling

PFCs and AIFs



Passenger Facility Charge



- Created by legislation (1992)
 - Formally, a tax (49 US Code § 40117)
- Currently, up to \$4.50 per enplanement
 - Assessed on connecting passengers
 - Not indexed to inflation (hence, declining value)
- Administered by FAA, airlines collect
 - Airlines receive a collection fee (currently, 11 cents – 2.4%)
- PFC requires airport application for a capital project
 - Life limited to specific project/program
 - Significant accounting rules



- No legislation, not a tax
- First fees collected 1994 (YVR)
 - Direct collection method, from passenger, prior to security
 - Airline collection today, but via contract with airlines (contract between National Airlines Council of Canada and individual airports)
- No limit on the fee (presently \$25 at YYZ)
- Most airports do not assess AIF on connecting passengers
- Airlines receive collection fee (4% - 7% depending on airport size)

Airport Improvement Fee

- If airlines collect fee for airport:
 - Fee can only be used to finance a specific capital program
 - Airlines review and either:
 - Approve
 - Disapprove and delay collection for 3 years
- Airport can collect fee itself and ignore airlines or use AIF for operations
 - Currently all AIF airports in the NACC agreement

Commonality?

- **Both US and Canada both use PFC/AIFs as financing vehicle for major capital programs**
- **Airports in both countries recognise the sensitivity of airlines and passengers to the total package of fees charged**
 - Hence they seek to minimise use and magnitude of PFC/AIF
- **However, without access to paid in equity capital PFC/AIF is necessary**
 - Debt markets will not provide 100% debt financing to airports
 - There must be equity of some form
 - Reserves or 'Retained Earnings' from PFC/AIF provide the needed 'equity'

Commonality

- **Both have consultation and review of capital programs**
 - US: by FAA by regulation and granting process
 - Canada: by contract with major customers

Differences

- **Canadian airports have much greater flexibility in their use of AIFs**
 - This has enabled the airports to undertake massive remedial and deficiency capital investments following a decade of neglect by former operator (current landlord)
 - It will also allow Canadian airports to meet the onerous end-of-lease provisions they face
 - Canadian airports not constrained by inflation

Differences

- **Canadian AIFs are not revenues against which depreciation is charged**
 - AIF collection begins in advance of project
 - It does not write down the construction-in-process values
 - Nor is construction in progress depreciated against the AIF
 - When asset is put into use
 - Asset is depreciated against revenues per GAAP/IFRS
 - AIFs/PFCs are means to finance projects when there is no access to paid in equity capital

Strategic Relationship of Airport to Airline



Airport critically affects Airline

- **Connectivity**
 - Severe airport congestion
 - reduces routes/flights an airline can operate
 - Increases connection times
 - As airline unable to time flights for rapid connections
- **Operating Cost**
 - Unreliable airport service increases airline costs
 - Operating costs of flights
 - Overtime of customer service staff
 - Interrupted trip expense

Airport Critically Affects Airline

- Aircraft Productivity
 - Long taxi distances
 - E.g., 5th runway at AMS
 - DFW crossings of active runways
 - *This is a function of airport design*
 - Operational delays on airfield
 - Inadequate de-icing facilities, causing delays
 - Delays in reassigning gates
 - Etc.
- These all increase time aircraft must spend on the ground
 - Reduces number of flight cycles an aircraft can perform during the day
 - Especially important for aircraft making multiple short/medium haul flights

Example - Runway

- Airport with 2 independent runways in primary wind direction, but single runway in cross wind
 - Average taxi time/delay increases from 15 minutes to 60 minutes
 - Average of 500 operations per day
 - \$3500 per hour aircraft operating cost
 - Delay conditions 25% of time
 - Annual operating cost: \$120 mn
- Additional costs
 - Misconnected passengers
 - 500 misconnected pax per event @ \$300 cost (staff, pax cost, lost revenue)
 - \$15 mn annual
 - Lost pax from low service
 - At YYZ, one estimate was that airport improvements would increase traffic 5%
 - Increase in revenue was \$600mn per annum
 - Increases in traffic was largely via increased load factor, so high profit leverage

Example - Terminal

- Airline that moved to new terminal found traffic increased 3% almost immediately
 - Surveys found that some pax were intentionally booking other airline due to poor travel experience

Airport Strategic Air Access Forum

- Traditional airline-airport relationship
 - Was junior VP level station manager
 - Reported to a VP-"real estate"
 - Orientation was cost control
 - Opposed most airport investment
"a bus station standard is all we need"
 - Perceived terminal investment as being driven by desire of airport to increase non-aeronautical revenue, at expense of airline fees
- Strategic dialogue desired
 - Engage all major airlines at one session
 - But dialogue was at CEO level
 - E.g., CEOs of AA, CX, KE, AC
 - Included senior officers of inspection and security agencies
 - Message: lack of airport capacity decreases our aircraft productivity, increases our costs, reduces our connectivity and market scope, and decreases our shareholder value

Hubs and Gateways

- Hub: airline has substantial operations
 - and self connects flights
- Gateway: airlines interconnect
 - Alliances, of course
 - But substantial non-alliance interconnects
- Congested and inadequate hubs and gateway
 - Perhaps single most important destroyer of airline value
 - Economics of hub are powerful
 - Revenue and cost
 - This is source of market scope
 - And driver of customer satisfaction
 - Effectiveness of connections
 - Customer experience
 - Service redundancy for higher flight completion rates

Government Policy



Advocacy for Government Policy

- Traditional airport – government owned and operated
 - Airport perceived it had no role in commenting on government policy or advocating for changes or awards
 - If airport was local government (e.g., US), it would be more likely to provide letters of support for route awards
 - Offering discounts to airlines was rarely done
 - Quantity discounts
 - Discounts or other incentives for new services

Advocacy for Government Policy

- Modern airport
 - Privatized
 - Or local based not-for-profit airport authority
 - These organizations have “letters patent” which specify the purpose of the organization
 - Often the key objective is operation and development of the airport for the economic development of community
 - But increasingly also government run airports
- Government policy strongly affects airports
 - Revenue
 - Open air access increases revenues
 - Customer Service
 - Staffing of security and border processing (Customs, immigration, agriculture)
 - Cargo gateways more effective with 24/7 customs services
 - Costs
 - Regulations imposed on airports
 - Rent to government land owner

Advocacy for Government Policy

- There are many common areas for airline-airport advocacy to government
 - Border services staffing and policies
 - Security services staffing and policies
 - Visa policies
 - Often airports and airlines suggest changes to visa policies
 - Online visas
 - Visa exemption countries
 - In-transit visa requirements
 - Visa offices and processes in foreign countries
 - National Tourism marketing
 - Which countries are targeted and staffed
 - Marketing support for new air services
 - Airport rents and taxes
 - Regulations

Advocacy for Government Policy

- There are areas where airline and airport interests differ
 - International route policy
 - Airports tend to support open skies relationships
 - Enables airports to seek new routes
 - And to seek competing services in order to keep costs down
 - Entrant airlines often seek airport support for their application for a route right or for start of negotiations
 - Incumbent carriers may strongly oppose the airport
 - And exert pressure on airport to not support
 - Example: second home carrier designation on transpacific route
 - Incumbent argued that it would be unable to sustain competition and would fail
 - Airport indicated it would delay support for 2nd designation for 3 years but at end of period strongly supported 2nd designation
 - Currently some airlines exerting strong pressure (service threats) on airport supporting GCC carriers

Advocacy for Government Policy

- There are areas where airline and airport interests differ
 - Passenger facility charge increase in US
 - Airports seeking increase from \$4.50 to \$8.00
 - Partly an inflation adjustment
 - Airlines strongly opposing
 - Increases price of travel
- Airport grants for terminal expansions to facilitate competition
 - Was an issue in US in 1980s/90s when a number of US hubs were dominated by a single carrier

Fees



Airport Fees & Charges

- Generally an adversarial relationship on fees between airport and airlines
- Airlines seek
 - Transparency of costs
 - Clearly articulated methodology and strategy
 - Fees that cover costs but leave no profit
 - Cost control
 - Operating costs
 - Especially capital projects
 - These are largest cost item for an airport
 - Capital investments embed new operating costs

Airport Fees & Charges

- Airports seek
 - Right to impose charges
 - Critical to airport bond rating and equity costs
 - Coverage of all costs
 - Return on their investment
 - Even not-for-profit airport organizations seek return on capital to generate equity capital to fund future projects
 - Right to decide capital projects unencumbered by current customers
 - Flexibility to offer incentives for new services



Thank You