

Public Consultation on Air Passengers' Rights

Profile of the respondent	
Do you reply as:	on behalf of an organisation
Type of organisation	Airport
Name of the organisation (max. 100 characters):	
Gatwick Airport Limited	
Name of contact person:	
Andrew Walker	
E-mail address:	
andrew.walker@gatwickairport.com	
Country of Residence:	UK - United Kingdom
Meta Informations	
Creation date	
01-03-2010	
Last update date	
User name	
null	
Case Number	
474121731031106010	
Invitation Ref.	
Status	
N	
1. Introduction	
2. QUESTIONS RELATED TO MISHANDLED LUGGAGE	
2.1. The Liability Regulation (889/2002)	
2.1.1. Information, monitoring and sanctioning powers regarding the application of the Liability Regulation	
(1) Do you think that the information and the rights currently given to passengers regarding lost, damaged or delayed luggage are sufficient?	No opinion
Comments (max. 1000 characters):	
This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.	
(2) Do you think that the appointment of a specific enforcement body in each Member State under EU law to handle complaints and to enforce effectively the Regulation in the event of breaches – also through appropriate sanctions – would help to improve the current situation?	No opinion
Comments (max. 1000 characters):	
2. QUESTIONS RELATED TO MISHANDLED LUGGAGE	

2.1.2. The Liability Regulation - The amount of compensation in cases of mishandled luggage

(3) In your view, what is the best way to address compensation for mishandled luggage? Please give your opinion on the following:

Change the current maximum compensation in the European Union	Strongly disagree
Award automatic compensation to passengers whose luggage has been delayed for a certain time due to mishandling – for example until the following day	Somewhat disagree
Increase this automatic compensation after a reasonable period of time, for instance if the delayed luggage is handed over more than 48 hours after the arrival of the flight	Somewhat disagree
Provide for unlimited liability in the event of losses due to mishandled mobility equipment for passengers with reduced mobility in the European Union	Strongly disagree

other measures

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

The costs of customer compensation schemes are ultimately borne by passengers and so any compensation needs to be reasonable and proportionate. Nevertheless there may be a case for a modest increase in the compensation levels available for mobility equipment or where passengers experience very significant delays with luggage.

2. Questions related to mishandled luggage

- 2.1.3. The Liability Regulation - Conditions on the carriage of luggage

(4) Do you think that air carriers ensure that sufficient information on their policy on fees, size and weight of checked-in and hand luggage is provided early and clearly in the booking process?	No opinion
---	------------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(5) Do you think that rules on the size and weight of checked-in and hand luggage should be harmonised among air carriers?	No opinion
--	------------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

Changing the balance between checked-in and carry-on luggage could have significant implications for the operation of the airport and the quality of service experienced by passengers and so any further regulation in respect of these matters would require careful consultation and consideration of the costs and benefits.

2.2. Directive 96/67

(7) Do you think that it would be advisable to require minimum compulsory training for ground handlers (in particular for staff in charge of handling baggage)?	No
---	----

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

Gatwick Airport already has the ability to impose minimum conditions on ground handlers and so no further regulation is necessary.

3. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE APR REGULATION (261/2004)

3.1. Reporting obligations under the APR Regulation

(9) Do you think that air carriers should regularly report to the national enforcement bodies on their implementation of the APR Regulation, notably on the number of incidents, the routes and peaks of the day/year where incidents happen more often, or the redress offered to passengers under the Regulation?	Yes
---	-----

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
Additional reporting would increase market transparency.

(10) Do you think that the national enforcement bodies should regularly report on their activities, including a description of the action taken to implement the APR et the PRM Regulations, details of the sanctions applied, statistics on complaints and sanctions applied, and information on major court cases?	Yes
--	-----

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
Additional reporting would increase market transparency.

3.2. APR Regulation - Air carrier complaint handling and settlement of disputes

(11) Do you think the complaint handling procedures of air carriers should be harmonised?	No answer
---	-----------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(12) Do you think that air carriers should in all events be obliged to provide passengers with a motivated response to their specific complaints within a fixed deadline and be sanctioned if they do not comply?	No answer
---	-----------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
It is not clear what this question means - what is 'motivated response'?

4. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE PRM REGULATION (1107/2006)

(13) For PRMs using mobility or respiratory equipment or required to travel with an assistant during flights, do you think that air carriers should harmonise their policies or provide better information on these issues?	No answer
---	-----------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(14) Do you think the pre-notification at least 48 hours encouraged by regulation 1107 should be made compulsory, in order to provide better assistance to PRMs?	Yes
--	-----

Comments (max. 1000 characters):
Making prenotification compulsory would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of PRM services at Gatwick Airport.

5. BUSINESS PRACTICES WHOSE IMPACT ON PASSENGERS MAY MERIT THE COMMISSION'S ATTENTION

5.1. Reservation and check-in on-line

(15) Do you think that the new e-booking and check-in practices introduced by air carriers should be harmonised?	No
--	----

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This should be determined by the market and further regulation would not be appropriate.

(16) Which kind of new specific measures to protect passengers in such cases could be introduced in the EU? Please give your views on:

Fixing a minimum time for passengers to detect an error in their reservation or check-in online and ask the air carrier to correct it at no cost?	Somewhat disagree
---	-------------------

Ensuring that passengers are not charged unreasonable fees if they check in at the airport?	Somewhat disagree
---	-------------------

Other measures (please specify)

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

5.2. BUSINESS PRACTICES WHOSE IMPACT ON PASSENGERS MAY MERIT THE COMMISSION'S ATTENTION - Rescheduling of flights

(17) Do you think that minimum rules regarding passengers' rights in the case of rescheduling of flights should be agreed?	No opinion
--	------------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(18) What kind of new, specific measures to protect passengers in such cases could be introduced in the EU? Please give your views on:

Giving passengers, whose departing flight is rescheduled by more than 5 hours, the choice of not flying and being reimbursed the price of the whole ticket, including the return flight whenever the passenger has a return ticket.	No opinion
---	------------

Obliging air carriers to make all reasonable efforts to use all possible means of communication at their disposal to inform passengers of changes within a reasonable time to allow them decide whether to accept them.	No opinion
---	------------

Other measures (please specify)

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

5.3. BUSINESS PRACTICES WHOSE IMPACT ON PASSENGERS MAY MERIT THE COMMISSION'S ATTENTION - The so-called "no-show policy"

(19) Do you think that minimum rules regarding passengers' rights should be agreed, through EU law or voluntary agreements, to restrict and clarify conditions for the use of a "no-show policy"?	No opinion
---	------------

5.4. BUSINESS PRACTICES WHOSE IMPACT ON PASSENGERS MAY MERIT THE COMMISSION'S ATTENTION - Reduced space between plane rows

(20) Do you think that the minimum distance between plane rows ensured by current safety rules should be further regulated?	No opinion
---	------------

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

6. QUESTIONS RELATING TO AIR CARRIER INSOLVENCY

ANNEX ON AIRLINE INSOLVENCY

SECTION A: THE CURRENT SITUATION AS TO INSOLVENCY

(1) What kinds of protection schemes against airline insolvency are currently available in your country for standalone products? (tick all that apply)

Don't know

(2) If you have chosen more than one scheme (in Q1), please estimate the market share for each scheme in your country (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(3) On a scale of 1 - 5 (with 5 = highest), how would you rate the effectiveness of the current insolvency protection requirements/schemes for standalone airline tickets in your country?

SECTION B: THE POSSIBLE FUTURE AS TO INSOLVENCY

(4) Rules on airlines' financial fitness have been recently reinforced. To which extent do you consider that they address the problem of airline insolvency effectively? Have you noticed improvements since they came into force? Please give reasons for your answer (max. 1000 characters).

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(5) Do you think it should be compulsory, optional or not required at all when offering **standalone airline tickets** (i.e. not as part of a package) to provide specific protection (or insurance), so that passengers would be **reimbursed for money paid over or repatriated** if the **airline went bankrupt**?

No opinion

(6) If compulsory, what kind of protection schemes against airline insolvency would be the most adequate? Please choose only one option.

Other (please specify)

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(7) At which level do you think that rules on insolvency protection should be adopted? Please choose only one option.

Don't know

Comments (max. 1000 characters):

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(8) In your experience, what would be the cost of the different insolvency protection schemes (see Q5 and Q6) for the industry, public authorities and passengers? Please quantify if possible. (max. 1000 characters)

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(9) In your experience, what would be the benefit of the different insolvency protection schemes (see Q5 and Q6) for the industry, public authorities and passengers? Please quantify if possible. (max. 1000 characters)

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(10) How much do you think the price of a single air ticket might increase as a result of introducing protection (guarantee fund or insurance) against airlines going bankrupt to cover repatriation, reimbursement of money paid prior to departure and accommodation and meals where necessary? (max. 1000 characters)

This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.

(11) As to the answer to question 10, should the

No opinion

cost of such protection in your opinion be charged as either	
Comments (max. 500 characters):	
This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.	
(12) Do you think the same remedies / protection measures should apply for both repatriation and reimbursement?	No opinion
Final comments (max. 4000 characters):	
This is largely a matter for airlines and consumer groups. We do not have sufficient information to comment.	