

Canadian Airline Industry

Gaps in the CTA Review

Fred Lazar
Schulich School of Business
York University
Toronto



**Air Transport in Canada
Symposium** *TIME FOR REAL CHANGE
POWERED BY PILOTS*



<http://canadaairtransport.alpa.org>

**April 29
2016** 

Ottawa Marriott Hotel
Ottawa, ON, Canada

CTA Review

Terms of Reference:

“How the **vitality of the Canadian aviation sector**, air connectivity, and Canada’s ability to attract visitors and transiting travellers can be maintained and augmented in light of the range of cost factors and **competitive global markets.**”



CTA Review

Recommendations targeted to following objectives:

- Increasing competition
- Supporting and improving health of the air transport sector in Canada
- Supporting and strengthening governance in the sector



CTA Review

But system marked by:

- Weak accountability constraints on fees and charges;
- High costs for users and operators;
- **Aggressive capital expenditure programs at airports;** and
- **Limited competition.**

Almost got it right!



What Do We Know?

- **Direct and indirect taxes**
 - User fees (FY 2014) – airport rents (\$294M), Air Travellers Security Charge (\$662M, federal federal fuel taxes (\$97M)
- **Importance of hub carriers** for airports, region, and country
 - Consider Dubai without Emirates; Atlanta without Delta
- **Importance of connectivity for productivity**
 - Subsidize activities with positive externalities; do not tax
 - Gulf States, Turkey, and China understand



What We Should Know

- **Governance pathetic at airport authorities**
 - Airport authorities creation of Liberals
 - Corporate governance not much better with private companies (remember O&Y, Nortel, RIM, Barrick, and Valeant once among most valuable companies on TSX)
- **No regulatory oversight of capital investments and fees**
 - GTAA: original plans – \$3-4B; 2011 gross debt – \$7.7B; 2015 – \$6.3B
 - GTAA: net interest expense in 2015 – \$358M; ground rents – \$128M
- **Limited competition globally**
 - Schumpeter, Porter – flaws in economic models of competition
 - ULCC unable to attract financing in Canada – private markets telling government something something
 - Seat densities main cost advantage of ULCC – legacy carriers have learned (shortcoming of (shortcoming of CSeries)



Going Forward

- Eliminate rents
 - Reimburse GTAA for acquisition of T3(?)
- Eliminate security fees
- Change governance structure for airports
 - Airline representation, regulatory oversight
- Big data and CATSA
 - Politics and fear of profiling
- Technology
 - RFID, facial recognition
- Level playing fields
 - Prohibited subsidies, actionable subsidies



Going Forward

- Climate change – level playing fields
- Privatization
 - Not panacea
 - Private capital readily available – in form of debt
 - Is there need for equity capital?
- Ignore self-serving drivels of airlines such as Qatar

“One or two airlines cannot possibly connect Canadians to the world in a convenient way and still provide competitive fares to consumers. Foreign airlines have an important providing new destinations, better connectivity through their networks, and competitive Canadians.”



CTA Review – Right

- Light-touch regulations covering fees and charges (almost right)
- Requiring airline reps on boards of airports
- Consultation for major capital investments
- Replace “one size fits all” passenger screening
- Reducing ATSC
- Reducing or eliminating fuel taxes on international flights
- Include fair trade and competition requirements in all new and expanded air service agreements



CTA Review – Wrong

- Policy governing air transport has yielded excellent airport facilities and air navigation systems; financially sound carriers
- Privatization of airports (not necessary)
- Light-touch regulation
- Adopt policies and stable, predictable regulatory frameworks that de-risk investor cash flows and inspire greater confidence among institutional investors in P3 and private infrastructure projects
- Minimum allowance of seven flights per week in all new and existing air service agreements
- Consumer protection and compensation
- Views on competition

