

The Response of BAR UK to the DfT consultation:

MANAGING AIR TRANSPORT DURING THE LONDON 2012 OLYMPICS – PROPOSALS
TO EXTEND AIRPORT SLOT COORDINATION

Introduction

The Board of Airline Representatives in the UK (BAR UK) Ltd represents the interests of 87 scheduled airlines with a UK presence.

The response to this consultation is made largely from that perspective; hence, a number of questions asked have not been responded to.

In particular, BAR UK and its member airlines totally subscribe to the philosophy of protecting ‘business as usual’ as per Paragraph 10 of the consultation. This has to be the datum set as a minimum objective.

Consultation Questions and BAR UK Responses

- **Question 1: Do you agree in principle that slot coordination should be introduced across South East airports during the Games period, and if not, what alternative approach would you advocate?**
Response: *Agreed. The other options, expressed in Paragraphs 14-18 are not deemed practical to achieve the objectives sought.*
- **Question 2: Which airports and airfields should be included in the temporary coordination scheme, and based on what criteria? Do you have any views on possible additions to or exclusions from the initial list of airports at Annex B?**
Response: *As an observation, it is surprising to notice the absence of Enstone, Fairford, Dunsfold and Lasham from the list in Annex B.*
- **Question 3: Over what period should the scheme be put in place?**
Response: *BAR UK believes more clarity is required in respect of projected additional movements. The dates of the Paralympics (29 August-09 September) still fall largely within the summer peak period for air travel. A judgement cannot really be made based on an expectation that air traffic movements additional to business as usual is expected to be much lower.*
- **Question 4: Should powers be taken to enable the Secretary of State or the coordinator to be the final arbiter of a temporarily coordinated airport’s capacity if necessary?**
Response: *No comment.*
- **Question 5: What measures should be introduced to encourage and if necessary enforce compliance so as to ensure the scheme is effective?**
Response: *BAR UK agrees that, whatever the sanctions employed, they need to address any abuse on a dissuasive basis, not a on a reactive basis.*

- **Question 6: Does the indicative timetable in paragraph 44 above strike the right balance? If not, what changes would you suggest?**
Response: Agree with the proposed timetable.

- **Question 7: What arrangements would you advocate to help deter deliberate abuse of the scheme?**
Response: No comment.

- **Question 8: What measures could be used to ensure sufficient operating flexibility within the system, without undermining the purposes of the scheme?**
Response: No comment.

- **Question 9: Do you agree that a single coordination committee should be temporarily designated for all coordinated airports in the South East? If so, how should it be established and maintained? If not, what alternative would you propose?**
Response: No comment.

- **Question 10: Do you have any comments on the proposal that flights carrying Heads of State or Heads of Government should not be exempt from the proposed arrangements?**
Response: BAR UK agrees with the proposal that any non-State Visit flights should not be exempt unless, of course, they are scheduled passenger flights operating into airports already slot-controlled.

- **Question 11: Do you agree that the coordinator's additional costs should be in principle be borne by all operators using coordinated airports during the Games period? If not, what alternative proposal would you suggest for recovering ACL's additional costs?**
Response: BAR UK agrees with the proposal.

- **Question 12: (If appropriate) What are the likely net costs or net benefits to your business of the proposals set out in this paper, as against the status quo or other options?**
– **Response:** Not applicable to BAR UK.

- **Question 13: Are there any other relevant issues which you feel have not been addressed in this paper, or any other suggestions or comments you would like to put forward?**
– **Response:** No comments offered.