



COMMERCE COMMISSION

## **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE FOR SPECIFIED AIRPORT SERVICES**

### **TECHNICAL WORKING SESSION**

**13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2010, 10AM – 2PM**

**WELLINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, DEHAVILLAND ROOM**

### **SESSION AGENDA**

#### **Purpose of the Working Session**

The purpose of this session is to obtain further feedback on technical matters and practical implementation considerations that require further clarification from submitters, with respect to the Commission's information disclosure draft Determinations. This will further assist the Commission to determine how best to specify information disclosure requirements for specified airport services.

Please find attached a list of working session discussion topics (Appendix 1), and a revised draft Schedule that outlines practical changes effected by the Commission's proposed responses (Appendix 2).

The Commission's intended approach is to discuss only items listed in the attached list of Discussion Topics (Appendix 1) and the amendments to the draft Schedule (Appendix 2). Attendees will also have the opportunity to discuss defined terms within the draft Determination that they consider require alternative definitions or further clarification. Issues related to the broad regulatory framework, or discussion of information disclosure themes or high-level direction are out of scope for this working session. Interested persons have already been consulted on these matters.

The Commission has not made final decisions on any matter relating to information disclosure requirements for specified airport services. Following the workshop, the Commission will consult on the technical drafting of the information disclosure determination.

## **Working Session Agenda**

**10 am – 10:15 pm**            **Introduction & overview of Part 4 Information Disclosure for airports**

The purpose of the introduction is to confirm with participants the scope of the working session, and to briefly outline the topics for discussion.

**10:15 pm – 12.15 pm**        **Session 1: Discussion of technical issues and implementation considerations**

Please see the attached Topics for Discussion (Appendix 1) and the spreadsheet of draft amendments to certain Schedules within the Determination (Appendix 2).

**12.15pm -1pm**                **Lunch**

**1pm – 2pm**                    **Session 2: Definitions**

The purpose of this session is to obtain further feedback as required on draft definitions as listed in Schedule 1 ('Defined Terms') of the draft Determination.

**2pm**                            **Session ends**

## APPENDIX 1: TABLE OF DISCUSSION TOPICS

This table sets out certain technical issues raised by submitters in response to the draft Reasons Paper and draft Determination, published by the Commission on 29 May 2010. It includes only issues that the Commission considers require further input from interested persons in order to inform the Commission's final decisions.

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
<i>Historical Financial Information</i>				
3.1	<p><b>Safety, security and environmental expenditure</b></p> <p>Should Schedules 3a, 5b and 6 have separate disclosure of safety and security operational expenses, and/or security, safety and environmental' capital expenditure?</p>	<p>NZAA Sub Para 52-54.</p> <p>BARNZ Cross-sub, pg 10.</p>	<p>Separate disclosure of these items should not be required as it would be difficult to separate these items from other expenditure categories.</p> <p>Q: What impact, if any, would the removal of this separate disclosure have on interested persons?</p> <p>Q: If separate disclosure was to be retained, how should this expenditure be defined in order to clearly separate it from other expenditure categories?</p>	<p>Schedules 3a and 5b would be amended by removing separate disclosure of safety and security operational expenses, and/or security, safety and environmental' capital expenditure.</p> <p>The list of defined terms would be amended by removing 'safety and security opex' and 'security, safety and environmental' capex'.</p>
3.2	<p><b>Segmented regulatory profit schedule</b></p> <p>Should Schedule 6 which reports on segmented regulatory profit retain the column eliminations/transfers?</p>	<p>NZAA Sub ID template 6a</p> <p>BARNZ Cross-sub, pg 12</p>	<p>The eliminations/transfers column should be removed.</p> <p>Q: What is the appropriate accounting treatment for the regulatory reporting of revenue by segmented activities? In particular, how should revenue, which relates to multiple activities, be reported?</p>	<p>Schedule 6 to be amended by removing the eliminations/transfers column.</p>
<i>Quality</i>				
4.1	<p><b>Definition of arrival &amp; departure time</b></p> <p>BARNZ proposes that arrival and departure time be defined in respect of on-block and off-block apron times, and notes that this would be in accordance with a US Department of Transport definition of on-</p>	<p>BARNZ sub pp 12, 14; BARNZ determination edits pp 16, 32</p> <p>NZAA cross-sub</p>	<p>The Airbiz study determined the number of flights and passengers during a busy hour and/or busy day by using (1) Airways Corporation's flight touchdown and lift-off data and (2) airlines' passenger volume data. The draft determination (through its arrival and departure time definitions) requires that the busy hour</p>	<p>No change is proposed if on-block and off-block passenger data is not available.</p> <p>Workshop discussion on whether on-block and off-block passenger data is available and would improve</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
	time delays.	pp23, 25	<p>and busy days in the throughput disclosures be time-stamped using touchdown and lift-off times.</p> <p>Because the throughput disclosures of passenger volume data are used exclusively for assessing passenger terminal utilisation, it may be better for the passenger volume data to be time-stamped with the-block and off-block apron times (if consistent data is available). This would provide a better representation of the number of people in the terminal at one time as it removes the error due to variation in aircraft taxiing and queuing times. This could potentially be implemented by amending the arrival and departure times definitions with: “in respect of the Schedule 14 passenger arrival/departure disclosures, is the on-block arrival time / off-block departure time.</p> <p>The draft definition of an on-time departure delay does not specify whether the delay is to the off-block or lift-off time. It is desirable that the disclosed on-time delays include the delays arising from interruptions to each material service, which include runway and taxiway services. This suggests that on-time delays should be assessed in respect of lift-off times.</p>	assessments of the capacity utilisation of specified passenger terminal activities.

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.2	<p><b>Schedule 13 (aircraft movements)</b>  <b>Disclosure of busy day stand access</b></p> <p>The draft determination indicated that capacity utilisation of air stands is intended to be revealed by reporting the busy day usage of each type of stand for each category of aircraft. Parties proposed changing the categories of aircraft, but NZAA indicated that disclosure of stand use for each category may be impractical as aircraft movement data from Airways Corporation does not record the stand allocated to each flight. NZAA proposed instead reporting total runway movements and an average “per stand” figure.</p> <p>BARNZ considers stand capacity utilisation to be essential to understanding the utilisation of airport facilities and notes that the means of access relates directly to consumer demands; and proposes limiting the disclosure to domestic jet flights and international flights.</p>	<p>NZAA sub, paras 64, 65; NZAA template edits</p> <p>BARNZ cross-sub, p 15.</p>	<p>A record of stand usage by stand type and aircraft category would need to be kept on at least a daily basis in order to provide reliable busy day data.</p>	<p>Require disclosure of busy day stand access by aircraft category.</p> <p>Change the aircraft categories in the disclosure to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. International [jet];</li> <li>2. Domestic [jet],</li> <li>3. Domestic turbo-prop; and</li> <li>4. Domestic General Aviation,</li> </ol> <p>and label the calculated totals as “Total aircraft movements during busy day”.</p> <p>Workshop discussion on solutions to data availability concern.</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.3	<p><b>Schedule 16b (terminal access) annual stand allocation figures</b></p> <p>NZAA has indicated that disclosure of annual usage of each type of stand by domestic flights and by international flights may be impractical as aircraft movement data received from Airways Corporation does not record the stand allocated to each flight.</p> <p>NZAA proposes that this disclosure requirement be removed.</p> <p>BARNZ suggests limiting the scope to disclose stand usage by domestic jet flights and international flights only.</p>	<p>NZAA sub para 70; NZAA template edits</p> <p>BARNZ sub p21; BARNZ template edits; BARNZ cross-sub pp 17–18.</p>	<p>At the December workshop submitting parties proposed that the total numbers of airbridge, bussing, and walking movements per financial year be disclosed.</p>	<p>The Commission seeks further information relevant to assessing the benefit to interested persons and the cost of disclosing this information.</p>
4.4	<p><b>Definition of Busy Day</b></p> <p>Airbiz recommended the 95th percentile day i.e. the 18th ranked day) as the appropriate measure “for consistency across airports and over time”. BARNZ proposed that the runway movement busy day be the day in which the runway movement busy hour occurs.</p>	<p>Airbiz Final Report 14 May 2010;</p> <p>BARNZ determination edits p53</p>	<p>Busy day trends are likely to be more identifiable if the 18<sup>th</sup> ranked day definition is used as the busy day will then be selected by whole-of-day performance rather than performance during an individual hour of the day.</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Workshop discussion on whether the 18<sup>th</sup> ranked day definition remains the most appropriate.</p>
4.5	<p><b>Definition of “Passenger”</b></p> <p>Commission staff have noted that since “passenger” is not a defined term in the draft determination, the ability of interested persons to compare disclosed information based on passenger numbers may be impaired.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The term “passenger” should refer to all persons transported on a commercial flight, including children but excluding airline staff servicing the flight. This should be irrespective of whether charges are levied on or on behalf of them by airports and airlines. However, this proposed definition may need to be tempered if the cost of making the required flight data available to airports is excessive.</p>	<p>“Passenger” becomes a defined term.</p> <p>Passenger is defined as meaning all persons transported on a commercial flight, excluding airline staff servicing the flight.</p> <p>Workshop discussion on definition of passenger.</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.6	<p><b>Schedule 14 floor area definitions</b></p> <p>Parties propose excluding “landside circulation inbound” from the definition of functional components for capacity utilisation reporting, since this component exists only at Wellington airport.</p> <p>BARNZ proposes that the definition of “passenger facilities functional floor space” be deleted.</p>	<p>Airbiz sub Sc14.3 &amp; Sc1.5</p> <p>BARNZ cross-sub p150; BARNZ determination edits p36</p> <p>NZAA cross-sub template schedule 14.</p>	<p>Does the landside circulation inbound floor space at Wellington clearly fall within the definition of the arrivals concourse floor space?</p> <p>Although “passenger facilities” is no longer considered by the Commission and submitting parties to be a functional component, retaining the functional floor space definition for these facilities would ensure the floor space area of functional components item (xiv): total terminal areas providing passenger facilities and service is unchanged. Does the passenger facilities floor space area clearly fall within the floor space definitions of the other functional areas?</p>	<p>Delete “landside circulation inbound” from the definition of functional components.</p> <p>Delete the definition of “passenger facilities functional floor space”.</p> <p>Workshop discussion on whether these floor space areas fall within the definitions of the remaining functional areas.</p>
4.7	<p><b>Number of definitions concerning functional components</b></p> <p>Definitions: Parties consider that the number of definitions relating to functional components should be reduced, largely to reduce the risk of confusion and error.</p>	<p>Airbiz sub Sc1.1</p> <p>NZAA cross-sub, p 19</p>	<p>The draft determination requires that a busy hour for passenger numbers be disclosed in respect of each combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ passenger terminal (domestic, international, combined); and</li> <li>▪ passenger flow direction (inbound, outbound).</li> </ul> <p>The draft determination similarly requires that the throughput of passengers during the busy hour be disclosed in respect of each combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ functional component of the passenger terminal;</li> <li>▪ passenger terminal (domestic, international, combined);</li> <li>▪ passenger flow direction (inbound, outbound).</li> </ul> <p>The definitions of each combination are intended to ensure the consistency of disclosures.</p>	<p>The busy hour definitions, currently defined for each functional component of the passenger terminal ([functional component name]—busy hour), be deleted and incorporated into a single “busy hour—for passenger numbers” definition.</p> <p>Workshop discussion to identify any fundamental concerns regarding the definitions associated with functional components.</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.8	<p><b>Schedule 12 interruptions to material services should exclude 3rd party services</b></p> <p>NZAA has proposed that, due to the difficulty of collecting information, the scope of this disclosure be limited to airbridges owned by the airport. BARNZ proposes an explanatory note be added to Schedule 12 stating “Disclosure of interruptions should not include interruptions to any assets owned and managed by a third party, and which are not being provided on behalf of, or under contract with, the Airport”.</p>	<p>NZAA template Schedule 12</p> <p>BARNZ cross-sub p14</p>	<p>Disclosures concerning interruptions to material services (including airbridges) should be limited to interruptions to the supply of specified airport services. By definition, specified airport services are services supplied by AIAL, CIAL or WIAL.</p>	<p>Workshop discussion to consider BARNZ’ proposal or modifying the definition of “interruption”.</p>
4.9	<p><b>Schedule 14: Disclosure of passenger numbers, passenger/m<sup>2</sup> ratios, or both</b></p> <p>Parties propose that, for each functional component of the passenger terminal, the throughput of passengers during the busy hour be disclosed as a ratio (passengers per 100m<sup>2</sup>) rather than as a headcount.</p>	<p>Airbiz sub Sc14.2</p> <p>NZAA cross-sub template 14</p> <p>BARNZ cross-sub, p 15.</p>	<p>Disclosing the components of each capacity utilisation ratio improves clarity and assists interested persons to identify trends. Passengers per 100m<sup>2</sup> is only one of the capacity utilisation ratios that may be derived; others are percentage of maximum throughput at bio security screening etc.</p>	<p>Schedule 12 to specify that passenger throughput be disclosed by headcount, labelling the template input cells: “Throughput of passengers during the busy hour (No)”</p> <p>Workshop discussion to consider whether any issues need to be resolved concerning the disclosure of passenger throughput by headcount.</p>
4.10	<p><b>Standardisation of terminology in floor area definitions</b></p> <p>Definitions of passport control (inbound) and passport control (outbound) floor space as proposed have variously referred to customs “booths” and customs “tables” and definitions of security screening floor space refer to “stations” and “counters”.</p>	<p>BARNZ sub p15; BARNZ determination edits p46</p> <p>NZAA cross-sub p27; NZAA cross-sub determination edits p40.</p>	<p>The determination should use industry-agreed terms</p>	<p>Workshop discussion to propose appropriate terms</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.11	<p><b>Definitions of combined transit and transfer passengers</b></p> <p>Parties propose deleting the definitions of and references to “inbound combined transit and transfer passengers” and “outbound combined transit and transfer passengers”.</p> <p>These terms appear in the draft definitions of "baggage outbound—throughput of passengers"; "baggage reclaim—throughput of passengers"; and "check-in—throughput of passengers", and are used for netting off the number of international and domestic transit and transfer passengers at combined domestic/international functional components.</p>	<p>Airbiz sub Sc1.8 BARNZ determination edits pg 35, 44</p>	<p>The definition of “inbound combined transit and transfer passengers” is not required. The term is used exclusively in the “baggage reclaim—throughput of passengers” definition where it relates to combined domestic /international baggage reclaim facilities. Combined baggage reclaim facilities do not exist, and this draft definition will be amended.</p> <p>The term “outbound combined transit and transfer passengers” appears in the definitions of “baggage outbound—throughput of passengers” and “check-in—throughput of passengers” where it relates once again to combined domestic /international facilities where the number of international and domestic transit and transfer passengers must be subtracted from the total number of domestic and international outbound passengers. These combined facilities exist only at WIAL which currently possesses no facilities for international transit and transfer passengers. The draft definitions avoid the presumption that such facilities will not be introduced in the future.</p>	<p>Definition of “inbound combined transit and transfer passengers” removed.</p> <p>Definition of “baggage reclaim—throughput of passengers” removed.</p> <p>Workshop discussion to identify any fundamental concerns regarding the use of the term “outbound combined transit and transfer passengers”.</p>
4.12	<p><b>Schedule 16a (number of flights &amp; MCTOW) list of aircraft types</b></p> <p>NZAA proposes aggregating the last 20% of aircraft in each weight category as “Others”.</p> <p>BARNZ notes that this could result in as few as 2 or 3 aircraft types being disclosed and that even with a lower threshold this would have excluded the need to disclose A380 usage following the expansion of the AIAL runway. BARNZ suggests listing 95% of aircraft types per weight category plus all types for which capex was expended in last 10 yrs.</p>	<p>NZAA sub para 69; NZAA cross-sub, p36; NZAA cross-sub template schedule 15</p> <p>BARNZ cross-sub, pp 16–17, Appendix 1</p>	<p>The draft disclosure requirement should be revised if the cost of disclosure is likely to outweigh the benefit.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Workshop discussion to identify any fundamental concerns regarding the disclosure of all aircraft types in schedule 16a.</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
4.13	<p><b>Schedule 12 Fixed electrical ground power units.</b></p> <p>NZAA proposes that the requirement to disclose the proportion of time that FEGP supply is unavailable be removed since FEGP is an elective service not available at all airports. NZAA suggests FEGP is not sufficiently important to warrant additional disclosure and notes that it not clear how non-availability would be calculated and planned maintenance treated.</p> <p>BARNZ noted that CIAL is currently discussing with airlines whether to install ground power units as part of the current terminal project and suggested that the use of ground power units is likely to become more common given the environmental benefits of reducing aviation fuel usage through Auxiliary Power Units.</p>	<p>NZAA sub para 62 BARNZ cross-sub, pp 14-15</p>	<p>At the December workshop submitting parties proposed that the proportion of time that FEGP supply is unavailable be disclosed.</p>	<p>The Commission seeks further information relevant to assessing the benefit to interested persons and the cost of disclosing this information.</p> <p>Options for resolving issues around maintenance might include reformulating the disclosure requirement, bringing in more in line with the other reliability disclosures, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “The total number of aircraft movements during the financial year where FEGP was requested but was not available.”</li> <li>▪ “The percentage of time that FEGP is not available due to interruptions.”</li> </ul>
4.14	<p><b>Transition provisions concerning schedule 12</b></p> <p>NZAA proposed (supported by BARNZ) that the requirement to disclose interruptions by party responsible be removed in the transitional year, effected by inserting the following subclause in the determination: “15.6(c) interruptions by party responsible, as otherwise required to be disclosed in accordance with the Report on Reliability Measures as set out in Schedule 12”.</p>	<p>NZAA determination edits para 15.6 BARNZ cross-sub p9</p>	<p>The number and duration of interruptions was required under the AAA disclosure regulations. During the transitional year, because the party responsible will have not been identified, the disclosed information is expected to be entered in the "undetermined reasons" entry cells.</p>	<p>Subclause 15.6(c) added to clarify that during the transitional year, information should be entered in the “undetermined reasons” entry cells of the schedule 12 template.</p>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
<i>Forecast Total Revenue and Supporting Information</i>				
5.1	<p><b>Demand Forecasts - inclusion of international transit and transfer passengers</b></p> <p>BARNZ consider that these passenger categories should be included. BARNZ consider that a materiality threshold (suggested 5%) should be incorporated. NZAA does not believe this disclosure is necessary.</p>	<p>BARNZ – submission, page 23; Cross-submission p.20. NZAA cross-submission, pp41-2</p>	<p>Transit and transfer passengers should be disclosed. The Commission considers that Airports should have such information available. Potential 5% materiality threshold.</p> <p>For consideration: Is a materiality threshold necessary?</p>	<p>Amendments to Clause 9.1 to require disclosure of this category if exceeding 5% of total international (arrival and departure) demand.</p>
5.2	<p><b>Key capital expenditure projects - Determination of appropriate threshold for disclosure</b></p> <p>BARNZ considers that Commission’s proposed \$30 million is too high, will not capture sufficient projects. NZAA agrees with the Commission’s proposed threshold, or five largest projects in five years, subject to a minimum project value.</p>	<p>BARNZ submission - Page 2-3, page 8, page 14 and page 18, Page 23, Appendix A. NZAA cross-submission paragraph 8.</p>	<p>Approaches based on thresholds and project size are susceptible to gaming. An alternative approach is proposed.</p> <p>The Commission seeks submitters’ views on the proposed alternative approach.</p>	<p>Change of approach to disclosure based on Key capital expenditure projects comprising 80% of total capex over the five year forecast period.</p>
<i>Pricing Disclosures</i>				
6.1	<p><b>Price Setting Event</b></p> <p>BARNZ noted that AIAL reset terminal services charge and jet fuel pipeline charge annually and airlines prefer it this way as airlines value the transparency the annual forecasting and wash-up processes provide, as well as the opportunities these processes provide for airlines to engage with the airport. BARNZ suspects that AIAL would seek to move away from the annual resetting process if the Commission requires airports to disclose information as described in Clause 9.</p>	<p>NZAA Sub, pg 47 BARNZ Sub, pg 9</p>	<p>To exclude charge reset/adjusted annually (e.g. jet fuel pipe line charge, joint user hydrant line charge, or wash-up of terminal services charge)</p> <p>The Commission seeks the industry’s views on the list of charges/prices, including 1) proper industry definitions of jet fuel pipeline charge, joint user hydrant line charge; and 2) proper industry definition of Wash-up (The Commission’s proposed definition being – a wash-up means annual adjustment of prices reflecting actual use and actual costs incurred for the current financial year)</p>	<p>Proposed definition: With respect to a <b>Specified Airport Service</b>, means the process and result of setting price by an <b>Airport</b> in respect of that <b>Specified Airport Service</b>, pursuant to sections 4A and/or 4B of the Airports Authorities Act 1966, <i>but excluding the following services to the extent that each constitutes a <b>Specified Airport Service</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) jet fuel pipeline charge;</li> <li>(b) joint user hydrant line charge;</li> <li>(c) wash-up of terminal services charge.</li> </ul>

Item No.	Issue	References	Initial response	Proposed Changes to Determination
6.2	<p><b>Separate disclosure of pricing statistics regarding terminal services</b></p> <p>Should the pricing statistics regarding passenger services income and terminal services income be disclosed separately?</p> <p>BARNZ noted that the term “terminal services charge” is likely to cause confusion as this term is defined differently by different airports. Terminal services charge may cover other terminal services in addition to access to terminals.</p>	<p>BARNZ Sub, pg 16</p> <p>NZAA Cross-sub, pg 24</p>	<p>Not to require a separate disclosure of pricing statistics regarding terminal services.</p> <p>Instead, require airports to disclose the pricing statistics regarding the total income from all terminal income (sum of all income regarding terminal services), i.e. a ratio of total income from all terminal charges to passenger numbers (i.e. domestic and international passenger numbers).</p> <p>The Commission seeks the industry’s view on the proposed changes.</p>	Refer Schedule 18 (Appendix 2)
6.3	<p><b>Pricing Statistics</b></p> <p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Requirement to disclose per passenger pricing statistics of the General Aviation flights (under 3 tonnes MCTOW)</li> <li>2) Disclosure of parking charges</li> </ol> <p>Weight breaks for domestic and international flights (3 tonnes MCTOW /30 tonnes MCTOW)?</p>	<p>BARNZ Sub, pg 21-23</p> <p>NZAA Cross-sub, pg 38-41</p>	<p>To incorporated the submissions and cross-submissions and update Schedule 18.</p> <p>The Commission seeks the industry’s view on the proposed changes.</p>	Relevant changes made to Schedule 18.

## APPENDIX 2: DRAFT CHANGES TO PRICING SCHEDULE

This draft Schedule incorporates the Commission's proposed changes referred to in item 6.3 above.

### Schedule 18: Report on Pricing Statistics

	Regulated Airport For Year Ended	Airport Company 31 March 2011
<b>SCHEDULE 18: REPORT ON PRICING STATISTICS</b>		
ref	Consultation draft 31 May 2010	
6		<b>Average charge (\$/unit) *</b>
7		
8	<b>Average net operating revenue per passenger</b>	-
9		
10	<b>Airfield activities</b>	
11	Average landing charge per passenger for domestic flights between 3 tonnes MCTOW and 30 tonnes MCTOW	
12	Average landing charge per passenger for domestic flights 30 tonnes MCTOW and over	
13	Average landing charge per passenger for international flights	
14		
15	Average landing charge per tonne MCTOW for domestic flights under 3 tonnes MCTOW	
16	Average landing charge per tonne MCTOW for domestic flights between 3 tonnes MCTOW and 30 tonnes MCTOW	
17	Average landing charge per tonne MCTOW for domestic flights 30 tonnes MCTOW and over	
18	Average landing charge per tonne MCTOW for international flights	
24		
25	<b>Specified passenger terminal</b>	
26	Average total terminal charge per domestic passenger	
27	Average total terminal charge per international passenger	
28		
33		Page 28

**Changes made:**

- 1) Deleted "Average landing charge per passenger for domestic flights under 3 tonnes MCTOW".  
Because GA aircrafts under 3 tonnes MCTOW do not have fee paying passengers, and GA aircrafts are unlikely to use the terminal and thus airports are unlikely to have records of any passengers.
- 2) Added a weight break of 30 tonnes for domestic flights.
- 3) Deleted "Average parking charge per aircraft per day for aircraft under 6 tonnes MCTOW" and "Average parking charge per aircraft per day for aircraft 6 tonnes MCTOW and over"  
  
Because parking charges are not often charged in NZ and BARNZ suggested the disclosure of **the revenue earned from parking charges** as an alternative disclosure.
- 4) Deleted "Average freight landing charge per tonne MCTOW" and "Average freight income per tonne MCTOW"  
Because passenger aircrafts carry freight as well.
- 5) Replaced the ratios under "Specified passenger terminal" with "Average total terminal charge per domestic/international passenger".  
Because BARNZ noted it does not see the value of a separate disclosure of passenger services charge and terminal services charge.  
**Need to define "Total terminal charge", which is the sum of passenger services charge and terminal services charge.**