

AUN2014 : Airports in Urban Networks 15-16 Apr 2014 CNIT - Paris la Défense (France)



META-CDM: Multimodal, Efficient Transportation in Airports and Collaborative Decision Making

Laplace, Isabelle, ENAC, France \* Marzuoli, Aude, ENAC, France Feron, Eric, ENAC, France \* *isabelle.laplace@enac.fr* 



### Introduction



- A-CDM Airports : Munich, Brussels, Paris-Charles de Gaulle, Frankfurt, London-Heathrow, Helsinki-Vantaa, Düsseldorf and Zurich.
- Total of 250 million passengers a year welcome at these airports
- Meta-CDM objectives : study the conditions under which Collaborative Decision Making can help the transportation system deal under perturbed conditions with a passenger centric approach
- Method: litterature review, interviews & workshops



### Outline



- Benefits of Information Sharing
  - >At the network level
  - > At the airport level
- Bridging the airside and the landside multimodality
- Performance Indicators
- Conclusion



Conclusion

Meta CDM



### Benefits of Information Sharing



- Greatest benefits of A-CDM :
  - Better common situational awareness between stakeholders at the airport
  - Increase in operational predictability
  - Better arrival estimates, that benefit the stakeholders and the passengers
- Yet, in case of disruptive events, A-CDM procedures are no longer adapted.





## Benefits of Information Sharing – Network Level



- Disruptive events and their snowball effects highlight the need for information sharing between different airport platforms.
- Example : Snow Storm Winter 2010 in Europe.
  - Closure of London Heathrow
  - Flights rerouted to Paris CDG
  - Paris CDG closed

Flights rerouted to Toulouse Blagnac (A380s)



Benefits of Information Sharing – Airport Level



- Fail soft mode of A-CDM during disruptive events
- Communications between humans lead to delays in information transmission
- Passengers are generally at the bottom of the information cycle



## Benefits of Information Sharing – Airport Level



- Frankfurt Terminal Colour Concept :
  - In case of crisis, a dedicated team from Fraport and Lufthansa deploys in the terminals
  - Each area of the terminal is color-coded: optimized orientation & information
  - Staff uses applications on tablets to inform each pax on the possible solutions



## Benefits of Information Sharing – Airport Level



- Frankfurt Terminal Colour Concept Successful several times because:
  - Communication channels well-defined
  - Easy to understand for passengers & staff
  - Helps reduce waiting times and provides assistance to pax
- However:
  - System not directly linked to the CDM system
  - Not prevent from the slowness of the human system communication between airside stakeholders during disruptive events



### Benefits of Information Sharing



- Several aspects remain to be addressed :
  - In case of computer deficiency, often all stakeholders have their own contingency plan but no common one
  - CDM solutions are currently tailored to each airport – the interfacing between several airports for 'network-CDM' is still a big problem
  - For spoke airports, tailored solutions may be needed for CDM implementation



- Performance Indicators
- Conclusion



## Bridging the airside and the landside



- Main drivers of multimodality development:
  - Presence of airside and landside congestion at airports
  - Societal and environmental pressure
  - ➤To reduce operating costs
  - > To increase the catchment area



# Bridging the airside and the landside



- Main obstacles to multimodality :
  - High investments needed
  - Limited coordination and collaboration incentives between intermodal stakeholders who perceive each other as competitors
  - Lack of communication to passengers on multimodal products
  - Poor perception of rail in certain countries
  - >Less competitive rail outside of the core
    - European area



## Bridging the airside and the landside



 Some airports have specific agreements with rail companies in crisis situations. Ex : Toulouse Blagnac



### Outline



- Benefits of Information Sharing
  - >At the network level
  - >At the airport level
- Bridging the airside and the landside multimodality
- Performance Indicators
- Conclusion



Performance Indicators : traditional perspective



- Currently the benefits of CDM are only quantified in tons of fuel saved and seldom in adherence to slots.
- At CDG, 3 performance evaluation levels :
  At the airport level, for inter-airport comparison
  Internally to test CDM-tools efficiency
  Within each major stakeholder (privately)
- Airports interviewed agree that KPIs definition and processing need improvement



### Performance Indicators : passengers' perspective



- Disrupted passengers (journey interrupted by a capacity reduction) are only 3% of the total passengers, but suffer 39% of the total passenger delay.
- Passengers rely more and more on personal devices to checkin at airport and go through security.
- Empower passengers to play a more active role in deciding how to pursue their journey when it has been disrupted



### Performance Indicators : passengers' perspective



 Passenger-oriented metrics (Cook) to reflect the door-todoor passenger journey (departure and arrival delays, cancelled flights, missed connections, re-routes, etc.)

 Even though stakeholders are aware of the importance of passenger-oriented metrics, the processes to include them in the overall performance monitoring and reporting remain to be defined and implemented.



### Conclusion



- Benefits of extending Airport CDM to include the landside should be significant for passengers
- Final outputs of the project: landside-CDM concept & future research paths
- Final workshop: 14 & 15 May 2014 at ENAC (Toulouse)

