

**Gatwick Airport  
CAA Decision on Modification to  
the Statement of Standards and Rebates to Include  
Three Additional Elements**

**27 March 2009**

***Civil Aviation Authority  
CAA House, 45-59 Kingsway, London, WC2B 6TE***

(page left intentionally blank)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Introduction ..... 5

2. The CAA Proposal for Consultation ..... 7

3. Responses to the Consultation ..... 11

4. CAA Analysis ..... 13

5. CAA Decision ..... 17

(page left intentionally blank)

## 1. Introduction

### Purpose of this document

- 1.1 This document sets out the CAA's decision on the specification of three further service elements to the Statement of Standards and Rebates for Gatwick Airport.

### Background

- 1.2 In March 2008, the CAA published its decision in respect of Heathrow and Gatwick for the five-year period commencing 1 April 2008 (the fifth quinquennium, or Q5)<sup>1</sup>. In addition to setting a price cap for each airport, this decision also implemented remedies to public interest findings by the Competition Commission. One such finding was in relation to service quality at the airports.
- 1.3 The CAA had introduced a scheme of standards and rebates in 2003 at Heathrow and Gatwick as the remedy to a public interest finding by the Competition Commission (CC) made in 2002 as part of its five yearly review of the BAA London airports. The scheme largely followed the recommendations of the CC at that time. The CC made a further public interest finding in 2007 at the last review and the scheme was extended and the amounts of potential rebates increased as part of the CAA's 2008 decision.
- 1.4 The basis of the scheme is that the airport operator is required to pay specified rebates to airlines whenever its quality of service fails to meet specified service standards as published from time to time by the CAA following consultation with GAL and its users. The CAA duly published a Statement of Standards and Rebates setting out the detail of the standards required and the scale of rebates to be paid as part of its March 2008 decision.
- 1.5 The CAA indicated at that time that it intended to introduce three further service quality elements for Gatwick (which were introduced for Heathrow) by 1 April 2009. The relevant elements were:
- transfer search;
  - staff search; and
  - control posts search
- 1.6 The CAA deferred setting standards for these measures in March 2008 because discussions between GAL and airlines as to the performance

---

<sup>1</sup> Economic Regulation of Heathrow and Gatwick Airports 2008-2013, CAA decision, 11 March 2008

standards and timetable for implementation of new measures were less well advanced than those at Heathrow. Gatwick had proposed a plan for defining standards and processes, recruiting staff, measuring trial performance, and finally consulting on an amendment to the service quality rebate scheme. The CAA considered in its March 2008 decision that this was a pragmatic way forward, and proposed (subject to the outcome of a consultation in 2008/09) to introduce a new service quality standard and rebate for the three additional measures from April 2009 at the latest. The airport operator has duly followed this process and the airport operator and AOC subsequently made alternative proposals for the specification of these measures in January 2009.

- 1.7 The CAA published formal proposals for consultation to modify the Statement of Standards and Rebates on 3 March 2009 based on the airport and airline propositions. The CAA has received responses from Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL), the Gatwick Airline Operators Committee (AOC), the Air Transport Users Council (AUC) and the Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee (GACC).
- 1.8 The CAA sets out the CAA's decision after taking full account of responses. The CAA's proposals in early March are set out in section 1, the points raised by respondents are summarised in section 3, the CAA's analysis is set out in section 4 and the CAA's decision is set out in section 5.
- 1.9 If you have any immediate questions on this document please contact Mike Goodliffe on 020 7453 6226 or by e-mail to [mike.goodliffe@caa.co.uk](mailto:mike.goodliffe@caa.co.uk).

## 2. The CAA Proposal for Consultation

### Introduction

- 2.1 In its proposals of early March 2009, the CAA noted the efforts of both parties and the success in agreeing some of the detail in specifying standards in these areas but recognised that there was an appreciable gap between the parties on the central issue of what the standards should be.
- 2.2 It stated that, in principle, the standards should be consistent with what was assumed as part of the cost and traffic projections underpinning the CAA's decision in March 2008, but, in practice, these were not set out explicitly at the time. This very lack of clarity and consensus in early 2008 necessitated the subsequent process during 2008/9 of refining the measures, establishing evidence on trial performance and consultation between airport operator and airlines, leading to final consultation on CAA proposals. It was therefore necessary to apply judgement based upon the available evidence and arguments. In the absence of a clearly defined set of standards the CAA had regard to the following:
- the level of performance being achieved during the trial;
  - the standards set for Heathrow in March 2008; and
  - the relative importance of achieving particular standards to the criticality of operating to the benefit of passengers.

### Points of Agreement

- 2.3 The CAA considered there had been agreement between GAL and the airlines during earlier consultation on:
- the scope of the measures;
  - the measurement periods given the practicalities and costs involved in measurement. (The CAA noted that there might, however, be a case for extending these periods in future if either experience of the scheme in practice suggests evidence that the boundaries for measurement periods lead to particular troughs in performance outside the measured times, or better techniques of measurement substantially reduce the costs of measurement over longer periods); and
  - some agreement on exemptions for evacuations and for UK Borders Agency processing. (While there was not explicit agreement on the detail of these exemptions, the airport had put forward a proposition that the evacuation exemption should be for an equivalent period to exemptions for passenger search, and the detainee exemption should be for the period of processing plus a period of 30 minutes thereafter. The CAA's provisional view was that this appeared to be a reasonable

approach and has drafted its proposed modification accordingly).

- 2.4 The CAA indicated that it would be looking for the airport and airlines to set out more fully in their response the existing processes whereby exemptions would be dealt with.

### **Points of disagreement**

- 2.5 The CAA considered the following areas of disagreement.

#### *Transfer Search*

- 2.6 The CAA noted that airside transfers were a relatively small portion (circa 11 per cent) of Gatwick's traffic. The CAA accepted that the nature of this traffic was that many flights have no transferring passengers but that significant numbers might present from individual flights. In these circumstances, there was a question around whether the resourcing required to provide a very high level of service could be justified relative to the numbers receiving the benefit.
- 2.7 At Heathrow, where the proportion of transfer passengers is much higher and where there should consequently be a smoother profile of transferring passengers, the CAA had set a standard for Q5 of 95 per cent within 10 minutes (although the CAA had indicated that it was its intention to increase the standard to 95 per cent within 5 minutes at the start of the next price control period (Q6) in April 2013). In these circumstances, the CAA took the provisional view that it did not seem reasonable to set a higher standard for transfer traffic for Gatwick compared to Heathrow, and the CAA therefore proposed that the standard should be that for 95 per cent of the measured time passengers have to queue less than 10 minutes.
- 2.8 GAL had argued that it should be a requirement, even for this less stringent standard than the airlines were seeking, that all airlines using this facility should provide passenger usage data to GAL a minimum of 7 days in advance for this standard to apply. While the CAA considered such collaboration was important to deliver a good quality of service, its provisional view was that such a requirement could effectively negate the standard (due to individual airlines not conforming precisely), and would be disproportionate. The CAA therefore did not include this provision as part of the proposal. However, the CAA stated that it would be interested to understand airlines' intentions in this regard.

#### *Staff Search*

- 2.9 The CAA noted that long queues for staff search had the potential to affect airline operations with a direct impact on passengers where this led to late departure. Delays in staff search might also impact the operation of a wide range of other airline and commercial activities at the airport.

- 2.10 Despite the measurement trials being conducted in peak periods, performance for staff search appeared to have been good with a relatively low level of occurrences of queuing times greater than 5 minutes and only very rare occurrences in particular terminals greater than 10 minutes. GAL had suggested that this performance might be more difficult to sustain in future with increasing numbers of contractor staff. The two trials also suggested that there might have been some reduction in queuing performance between Summer 2008 and Winter 2008/09.
- 2.11 The standard set at Heathrow was that for 95 per cent of the measured time, staff should have to queue for less than 10 minutes. Both the airport and airlines agreed that the staff search standard should, optimally, reach the higher standard applied to central search standard. While the airlines had believed that this should be achieved from the start of Q5, HAL considered that improved practices on the part of users would be necessary to achieve this without incurring additional cost. The CAA recognised that it might be some time before improved processes on all sides could deliver appropriate levels of service at the right cost.
- 2.12 The CAA's provisional view was that the situation for Heathrow could be distinguished from the situation at Gatwick where performance during the measurement trials appeared to demonstrate that Gatwick was already achieving a 95 per cent within 5 minutes standard at most staff search points. This appeared to suggest that the resourcing assumptions that formed the basis of the March 2008 were consistent with a higher standard at Gatwick than was set for Heathrow. The CAA therefore proposed a standard of 95 per cent of queue times within 5 minutes.
- 2.13 One risk identified for Gatwick was that airline crews would place an increasing burden on the time taken to conduct searches due to presenting with baggage beyond what would be considered as hand baggage in terms of passenger search. The CAA's provisional view was that a condition of adopting a higher standard for Jubilee House/Concorde House would be restrictions on crew baggage to the allowance for passengers. If airlines were not prepared for such a condition to apply then the CAA would revert to a 95/10 standard in its final decision.

#### *Control Posts*

- 2.14 The CAA recognised that control post queuing could be a critical aspect of the operational performance of airlines and other users of the airports, with a very strong impact on passengers when it led to flight delays. The performance during the winter measurement trial was identified as:

	<b>Greater than 10 Mins</b>	<b>Greater than 15 Mins</b>	<b>Greater than 20 Mins</b>
Queens Gate	5.4%	2.5%	0.6%
Tower Gate <sup>2</sup>	7.4%	3.3%	2.2%

- 2.15 The standard set at Heathrow had been that for 95 per cent of the measured time staff should have to queue less than 20 minutes. The standard at Heathrow had been set in the context of limited information on its performance at the time, evidence that there was a problem at some control posts, and some uncertainty about the impact of the opening of T5 and the subsequent programme of airline moves between terminals. The introduction of any standard was therefore inevitably based on limited information about airport operations, which were subject to considerable prospective change. At Gatwick there was a stronger point of reference, and unless there were changes to requirements, less uncertainty about delivery.
- 2.16 The CAA's provisional view was that a 10 minute standard might be too testing and a 20 minute standard too loose. The CAA therefore proposed a 15-minute standard.

### **Rounding**

- 2.17 For the avoidance of doubt the CAA set out that it would expect the performance in terms of queuing time for all three measures to be reported to 2 places of decimals of a minute, and for a standard of 95/10 to be met if the length of the queue were 9.99 minutes on 95.00 per cent of occasions or more.

---

<sup>2</sup> The queue times include a number of periods of long queues due to the processing of detainees. These periods would be excluded in calculating the standard and rebate.

### **3. Responses to the Consultation**

#### **General**

- 3.1 The CAA received responses from GAL, the AOC, the AUC and the GACC.
- 3.2 The AUC and GACC have endorsed the addition of three additional measures to the standards and rebates scheme for Gatwick.
- 3.3 The AOC raised issues around what had been assumed as part of the March 2008 settlement. It considered that it was not clear exactly how much opex was allowed for against these three standards (in March 2008) or how much had been spent in improving the service to date. It considered this to be important when reviewing the results of the trial conducted for these measures.
- 3.4 GAL has also set out the processes whereby exemptions would be dealt with.

#### **Transfer search**

- 3.5 GAL agreed with a 95/10 level although this should still require transfer data from airlines 7 days in advance (and there should be an exclusion if best efforts were not made to provide this).
- 3.6 The AOC argued that documents of the airport/airline Joint Steering Group (JSG) presented by GAL clearly demonstrated that the projections (for the March 2008 determination) were based on a standard of “95 per cent within 5 minutes” for transfer searches and although there was uncertainty over control posts (where there were no measurements), additional opex was allowed for improvements. The AOC saw no basis for departing from the “95 per cent within 5 minutes” and it was important to keep a consistent single 5 minute queue time for all passengers and staff subject to security searches. In addition, the AOC argued that smaller numbers of transfer passengers (now estimated to be 6%) should make it easier to meet its preferred target and that queuing time should be minimised for long haul passengers who often arrived overnight and would be tired. The AOC also argued that airlines would prefer to retain higher standards with a more “proportionate” adjustment – specific exclusions or small reduction in standards.
- 3.7 The AUC supported a standard of 95% within 10 minutes, on the grounds that transfer security processes should not be over resourced at Gatwick.

#### **Staff search**

- 3.8 GAL was confident that a less than 5 minute queue could be maintained most of the time, but was concerned about the effect of additional building contractors etc. It considered that it would not be efficient to have additional resources for short periods and that it would be equitable to have the same

standard as at Heathrow. GAL welcomed the proposal that the standard for Concorde House and Jubilee House should be 95/10 unless airlines apply restrictions on crew baggage to the allowance for passengers.

- 3.9 The AOC argued that the JSG documents presented by GAL clearly demonstrated that the projections (for the March 2008 determination) were based on a standard of “95 per cent within 5 minutes” for staff searches and although there was uncertainty over control posts (where there were no measurements), additional opex was allowed for improvements. The AOC saw no basis for departing from the “95 per cent within 5 minutes” and suggested that it was important to keep a consistent single 5 minute queue time for all passengers and staff subject to security searches. The AOC considered that it was not operationally feasible at the moment for all longhaul airlines to restrict crew baggage to the amount carried by either passengers or shorthaul airline crews and that the infrastructure provided for staff searches at each terminal was inadequate for the complex airline mix at Gatwick and, inevitably, led to inefficient operational processes.
- 3.10 The AUC supported the proposal for 95 per cent of queue times within five minutes. It considered that airlines should co-operate with the same restrictions on cabin luggage as passengers if they wanted standards of search comparable to that offered to passengers.

### **Control posts**

- 3.11 GAL understood the CAA's approach to their proposal for this standard and was pleased that the CAA had recognised that 95/10 was not a realistic target for this type of control post.
- 3.12 The AOC supported the CAA's compromise of a 15 minute standard at the two specified posts across the operating day.

## 4. CAA Analysis

### General

4.1 The CAA reaffirms that, in principle, the standards should be consistent with what was assumed as part of the cost and traffic projections underpinning the CAA's decision in March 2008, but, in practice, these were not set out explicitly at the time. This very lack of clarity and consensus in early 2008 necessitated the subsequent process during 2008/9 of refining the measures, establishing evidence on trial performance and consultation between airport operator and airlines, leading to final consultation on CAA proposals. It was therefore necessary to apply judgement based upon the available evidence and arguments. In the absence of a clearly defined set of standards the CAA had regard to the following:

- the level of performance being achieved during the trial;
- the standards set for Heathrow in March 2008; and
- the relative importance of achieving particular standards to the criticality of operating to the benefit of passengers.

### Transfer search

4.2 The CAA accepts that there is evidence from the minutes from JSG minutes from December 2007 and January 2008 that the parties had in mind a baseline assumption for transfer search of 95 per cent within 5 minutes. There was, however, still an element of uncertainty around the modelling and the standard that should apply. Indeed a process was put in place (of which this paper is the concluding step) to determine what that standard should be.

4.3 Against this there is a small and apparently declining proportion of transfer traffic at Gatwick. On the one hand, this means that any given standard should be easier to meet for a given level of resource devoted to transfer passengers. On the other, the relative lumpiness and unpredictability of transfer traffic flows can be expected to rise (as they are spread over a smaller number of flights which may individually still involve a significant number of transferring passengers).

4.4 While the CAA notes that transfer passengers might place a high value on being processed smoothly after a long flight, they are also likely to place a higher burden on facilities because they will present sporadically in what could be significant numbers.

4.5 To the extent that meeting a high level of service standard for transferring passengers would require a larger degree of slack in staffing, this is likely to place further pressure on central search (for any given level of overall search resources). In this context, the CAA notes the AUC comment that transfer

search should not be over resourced.

- 4.6 Planning to accommodate these flows in an efficient manner – given that this may require tactical management of security staff between central search for originating passengers and transfer passengers – would require reliable, robust and timely reporting of transfer volumes. GAL believed that they would need access to these data to meet effectively even the ten minute standard. The AOC reported that, in principle, those long-haul airlines carrying substantial volumes of transfers would be prepared to provide data but that this should not be a formal condition and, to be accurate, would have to be provided within 7 days (rather than with at least 7 days notice as proposed by GAL).
- 4.7 The CAA is not drawn to the AOC alternative suggestion of a more stringent condition with specific exemptions. This would appear to make what is already a complex scheme more complex to administer, for a portion of traffic which it estimates is now only 6% of traffic at the airport overall.
- 4.8 Taking these factors together, the CAA believes that a standard which requires the transfer security queue to be less than 10 minutes on 95 per cent of occasions is reasonable and is no worse than Heathrow where transfer passengers are a much higher proportion of passengers overall. The CAA has therefore decided to confirm the standard which it proposed earlier.
- 4.9 The CAA would, however, be disposed to consider a higher standard in the future if all airlines were prepared to be subject to a binding protocol of providing information on transfer traffic in a timeframe that would be sufficient for the airport to make tactical plans to accommodate it.

#### **Staff search**

- 4.10 Long queues for staff search have the potential to affect airline operations, with a direct impact on passengers where this leads to late departure. Delays in staff search may also impact the operation of a wide range of other airline and commercial activities at the airport.
- 4.11 This measure was effectively split in the proposals between the staff search in the main terminals and the staff search in Jubilee House and Concorde House.

#### *North and South Terminal*

- 4.12 The results of the trial suggested that GAL was able to meet the higher standard that the CAA proposed. GAL itself acknowledged that it is confident of meeting a 5 minute queue standard most of the time but that it is concerned about peak periods and about the effects of significant additional contractors on site as a result of the capital expenditure process. GAL did

not consider it appropriate to add more resource in terms of manpower and capital to provide this level of service for short periods.

- 4.13 While the CAA notes that this standard might be under greater stress at some points in the future, it believes that the trial has demonstrated that the standard has been achievable even in relatively busy periods in August and the week before Christmas. On balance, the CAA believes it reasonable to confirm the 5 minute standard for staff search in the terminals.

#### *Jubilee House/Concorde House*

- 4.14 The CAA acknowledges that long queues for crew search have the potential to affect airline operations with a direct impact on passengers where this leads to late departure. One risk for Gatwick is that airline crews place an increasing burden on the time taken to conduct searches due to presenting with baggage beyond what would be considered as hand baggage in terms of passenger search. The CAA's provisional view in the consultation was that a condition of adopting a higher standard for Jubilee House/Concorde House would be restrictions on crew baggage to the allowance for passengers. If airlines were not prepared for such a condition to apply then the CAA would revert to a 95/10 standard in its final decision.
- 4.15 The AOC has indicated that it is not operationally feasible at the moment for all long-haul airlines to restrict crew baggage to the amount carried by either passengers or short-haul airline crews. The CAA has therefore decided that its final decision should be to revert to a standard of staff queues at these locations of 95% of times measured falling within the 10 minute test.
- 4.16 While the CAA has not decided to implement the higher standard in this decision, it would be well disposed to consider a higher standard in the future if all airlines were prepared to put appropriate restrictions on the baggage carried through the staff search<sup>3</sup>.

#### **Control posts**

- 4.17 No party has objected to the proposal that the standard should be that the queue should be no longer than 15 minutes 95% of the time. The CAA has therefore decided to confirm its proposal.

#### **Exclusions**

- 4.18 No respondent has commented on the CAA's proposal that there should be an exclusion for Tower Gate while it is closed for the UK Border Agency to process detainees and for 30 minutes thereafter. The CAA therefore confirms this proposal.

---

<sup>3</sup> This would not necessarily require the airline to place restrictions on the baggage that staff could take on flights, but might require large bags to be screened through alternative processes.

- 4.19 The CAA confirms that the exclusion for security queues for two hours following evacuations will also apply to transfer search, staff search and control posts.

### **Rounding**

- 4.20 No respondent has commented on the CAA's proposals for rounding. The CAA therefore confirms that the CAA would expect the performance in terms of queuing time for all three measures to be reported to 2 places of decimals of a minute, and for a standard of 95/10 to be met if the length of the queue is 9.99 minutes on 95.00 per cent of occasions or more.

## 5. CAA Decision

- 5.1 The CAA has decided to make the following amendments to the Statement of Standards and Rebates to take effect from 1 April 2009.
- 5.2 New Table H-4 below replaces the existing Table H-4.
- 5.3 New Table H-5 below replaces the existing Table H5.
- 5.4 Add after paragraph H-14 third bullet
- in respect of the Tower Gate control post at Gatwick Airport, when closed at the request of the UK Border Agency to process detainees and, in such circumstances, for 30 minutes after it is subsequently re-opened;
- 5.5 For the avoidance of doubt, the exemption for security queues for two hours following evacuations applies to transfer search, staff search and control post search as well as to Central security queues.

**Table H-4 Gatwick South Terminal**

Element	Metric	Relevant time over which performance counts for rebates <sup>4</sup>	Standard <sub>i</sub>	Rebate per month P <sub>ij</sub> (for all j)	Maximum annual rebate ANNMAX <sub>i</sub>
Departure lounge seat availability	Moving average QSM score	(1) For 2008/9 period since and including April 2008: (2) for 2009/10 onwards, last 12 months.	3.8	0.0600%	0.3600%
Cleanliness			4	0.0600%	0.3600%
Way-finding			4.1	0.0600%	0.3600%
Flight information			4.2	0.0600%	0.3600%
Central security <sup>5</sup> queues	Times queue <5 minutes	02:30-22:30 or period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.1283%	0.7698%
	Times queue ≤ 15 minutes		98%		
Passenger sensitive equipment (general)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Arrivals reclaim (baggage carousels)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Passenger sensitive equipment (priority)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0750%	0.4500%
Stands	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0583%	0.3498%
Jetties	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0583%	0.3498%
Pier service	Moving average % passengers pier served	(1) For 2008/9 period since and including April 2008: (2) for 2009/10 onwards, last 12 months.	As set out in paragraph H.16 <sup>6</sup>	0.0750%	0.4500%
Fixed electrical ground power	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0417%	0.2502%
Transfer search	Times queue <10 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0750%	0.4500%
Staff search (South Terminal)	Times queue <5 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0292%	0.1749%
Staff search (Jubilee House & Concorde House)	Times queue <10 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0292%	0.1749%
Control posts search <sup>7</sup>	Times queue <15 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0583%	0.3498%

<sup>4</sup> Where relevant, if the airport and the local AOC fail to agree a period for a particular element, the default time period will be the period specified for central search.

<sup>5</sup> Both tests need to be met for the standard to be met.

<sup>6</sup> This paragraph refers to Annex H of the CAA's March 2008 decision.

<sup>7</sup> The measured element for control posts will be the average for the airport as a whole and will therefore be at the same level for all relevant terminals at Gatwick.

**Table H-5 Gatwick North Terminal**

Element	Metric	Relevant time over which performance counts for rebates <sup>8</sup>	Standard <sub>i</sub>	Rebate per month P <sub>ij</sub> (for all j)	Maximum annual rebate ANNMAX <sub>i</sub>
Departure lounge seat availability	Moving average QSM score	(1) For 2008/9 period since and including April 2008: (2) for 2009/10 onwards, last 12 months.	3.8	0.0600%	0.3600%
Cleanliness			4	0.0600%	0.3600%
Way-finding			4.1	0.0600%	0.3600%
Flight information			4.2	0.0600%	0.3600%
Central security queues <sup>9</sup>	Times <5 minutes	02:30-22:30 or period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.1283%	0.7698%
	Times ≤ 15 minutes		98%		
Passenger sensitive equipment (general)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Arrivals reclaim (baggage carousels)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Passenger sensitive equipment (priority)	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Stands	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0517%	0.3102%
Jetties	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0517%	0.3102%
Pier service	Moving average % passengers pier served	(1) For 2008/9 period since and including April 2008: (2) for 2009/10 onwards, last 12 months.	As set out in paragraph H.16 <sup>10</sup>	0.0667%	0.4002%
Fixed electrical ground power	% time available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0367%	0.2202%
Inter terminal transit system	% time one car available	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	99%	0.0517%	0.3102%
	% time two cars available		97%		
Transfer search	Times <10 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0667%	0.4002%
Staff search (North Terminal)	Times <5 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0259%	0.1551%
Staff search (Jubilee House & Concorde House)	Times <10 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0259%	0.1551%
Control posts search <sup>11</sup>	Times <15 minutes	Period agreed locally between airport and terminal AOC	95%	0.0517%	0.3102%

<sup>8</sup> Where relevant, if the airport and the local AOC fail to agree a period for a particular element, the default time period will be the period specified for central search.

<sup>9</sup> Both tests need to be met for the standard to be met.

<sup>10</sup> This paragraph refers to annex H of the CAA's March 2008 decision.

<sup>11</sup> The measured element for control posts will be the average for the airport as a whole and will therefore be at the same level for all relevant terminals at Gatwick.