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Background

The Civil Aviation Authority’s (CAA) principal function has been to promote safety in civil aviation at a reasonable cost since its establishment in 1992. At a broad level this role encompasses:

- The provision of educational or training material
- Controlling the entry of individuals and organisations into the civil aviation system
- Taking appropriate enforcement action including carrying out inspections and audits
- Governing the Aviation Security Service which is a stand-alone business unit of the CAA
- Providing a national search and rescue co-ordination centre.

Further to these key New Zealand based roles, the CAA provides civil aviation advice and assistance to Samoa, the Cook Islands and Niue.

Previously in 1995 and 1998 colmar brunton conducted research for the CAA as to levels of staff and customer satisfaction. Beyond simply understanding and improving levels of satisfaction, these studies led to changes and improvements being made within the organisation of the CAA itself.

It is now a priority to update the CAA’s understanding of how customers perceive and experience the services and provision of services from the CAA. To this end colmar brunton was commissioned to conduct research among all key customer groups to measure levels of satisfaction, and compare these levels to the 1998 study to monitor changes over time. Further, a study of staff attitudes was also conducted.

The CAA’s customer base is spread across New Zealand and encompasses a broad range of organisations and stakeholder types. These include key stakeholders such as:

- Aircraft owners
- Air traffic controllers
- Pilots
- Maintenance engineers and inspectors
- Security services
- Flight engineers
- Medical staff
- Service providers and aircraft supplies

This document presents colmar brunton’s findings and conclusions as a result of this study and where possible compares results to 1998 levels of performance. It is divided into two key sections: customers and staff.
Objectives

CAA Customers

The overall objective of the study was to monitor levels of satisfaction among CAA customers in order to assess effectiveness of the changes introduced by the CAA. More specifically the research objectives for this group of stakeholders was as follows:

- Profile CAA stakeholder groups;
  - Location
  - Experience
  - Nature of business
  - Position (of individual)
- Assess nature and quality of contact with CAA;
  - Frequency
  - Division/department
  - Nature of contact
  - Desired nature* and level of contact
- Measure profile/awareness of CAA roles and responsibilities
- Assess performance on key service attributes and delivery of key responsibilities
- Determine importance of key aspects of staff service delivery and performance on those aspects
- Assess communications and information delivery and materials;
  - Publications’ content and usefulness
  - Readership and use of publications
  - Information forums – use and rating
  - Gaps in information/communications
  - Including Vector, CAA News, Circulars etc
- Provide overall and KPI measures of performance
- Identify incidence and extent of behaviour change as a result of CAA initiatives and influence*
  - Significance and nature of change
- Assess attitudes to best practice and the CAA’s role in developing and promoting best practice*
- Measure customer attitudes and reaction to the new medical system*
  - Satisfaction with nature of system
  - Satisfaction with CAA’s delivery
- Measure customer attitudes to the auditing and certification process*
  - Satisfaction with nature of process
  - Satisfaction with CAA’s delivery
- Assess branding of CAA and preferred profile and imagery*

These objectives include many areas that were included in the 1998 study as well as several new sections for inclusion in this update. These additions are denoted above by an “*” in the above list of objectives. Where possible, comparisons to 1998 levels have been made.
Methodology

CAA Customers

Overall
Due to the expanded objectives of the 2003 study it was important that we develop a full understanding of all new issues before designing the main body of the study – the quantitative stage. Consequently, prior to the main survey we conducted a series of in-depth exploratory qualitative interviews making this part of the project a two stage process.

Qualitative Understanding
The main objective of this stage was to provide customer feedback and input into the design of the questionnaire used for Stage 2. This was particularly important for the new aspects of the study:

- Attitudes to best practice and CAA’s role in developing and promoting best practice
- Attitudes and reaction to the new medical system
- Attitudes to the auditing and certification process
- Branding and imagery of CAA

(The summary report on this initial stage of the project is included in the Appendix)

As in previous CAA surveys of customer satisfaction, one-on-one, in-depth interviews were utilised to gather information.

Contacts were drawn from CAA’s database, targeting roles and responsibilities reflecting key aspects of the CAA customer base. The following table summarises the composition of the qualitative sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Aircraft Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Controller Licence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Maintenance Engineer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Maintenance Approval</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Certification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots Licence (Aeroplane)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots Licence (Helicopter)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all conducted in Auckland, participants were chosen so as to include a range of individuals and organisations, management and staff.

Each interview lasted 1½ to 2 hours at a time and place most convenient for participants. Each received $80 vouchers to show our appreciation for their time and effort.

A copy of the discussion guide used in each interview is included in the Appendix.
Quantitative Measurement

Previous surveys of CAA customer satisfaction had utilised telephone interviewing – with an average length of 18 minutes. This length of interview is considered at the extreme end of what can be asked of research participants – particularly business people. Therefore with the objectives of the study expanding in 2003 a new approach had to be devised.

The approach used can be summarised as phone-mail-phone. It involved an initial telephone call to recruit eligible participants. Participants were defined as eligible if they had had at least one formal contact with the CAA in the last 12 months. The nature of the survey and their required involvement was described, and if they were willing to take part, contact and postal details were collected. An appointment time was also made to call them back.

To encourage participation and thank participants for their time, an incentive of a series of 5 $200 prize draws was offered.

Following this a self-completion survey was sent out for them to complete. The survey instrument was carefully designed to be as clear and simple as possible for customers to complete as well as keeping the time required to a minimum.

At a time agreed with the customer during recruitment, they were called back by a trained interviewer. During this call participants simply read out their answers to each question to the interviewer who keyed them straight into our computer.

If there had been any problems with delivery or the respondent simply hadn’t completed the survey this call also acted as a reminder, with another call made later to retrieve responses. In fact, one problem we continually encountered during fieldwork was the difficulty participants had with keeping to their appointed time for recontact. Busy working lives meant that the research was given lower priority and fieldwork had to be extended to reach the targeted sample size.

This overall approach reduces or circumvents the traditional problems of self-completion surveys such as non-response bias, incomplete responses and incorrect responses, since the interviewer can spot a missing question or incorrect response and clarify with the participant. By talking to the interviewer, participants can also clarify any doubts or queries they have with the survey. Turnaround time is also improved over a self-completion survey since we do not rely on participants completing the questionnaire and mailing it back. Lastly, this approach guarantees a better response rate and spread of interviews across all sub-groups since we are not reliant simply on the returns we receive.

This approach created a sample of 302 interviews with CAA customers (Sample Composition is included in the Appendix). This is a very similar sample size to the 1998 study of 330.

Participants were found by approaching customers included on CAA’s database. These were first ordered alphabetically and then contacts were selected using interval sampling, ensuring a representative sample was created.
A total of 400 CAA customers were recruited for the survey. Quotas had been put in place to ensure these 400 recruits would allow analysis of findings by specific types of customer. In particular quotas were put on the following customer groups at recruitment; ACFT, AME, ATL, CPL, PPL and SCP.

The final sample of 302 did not have quotas placed on it, however the final sample was post-weighted by the actual spread of CAA customers across all types to correct the imbalance created by the recruitment quotas. (Details of the 2003 quotas and weighting are included in the Appendix.)

The questionnaire itself was designed so as to allow as much comparability to 1998 as possible, despite the change in overall methodology. Questions relating to the new objectives were designed and confirmed in close consultation with the CAA. (A copy of the questionnaire is included in the Appendix.)
Executive Summary

Customers

Nature And Level Of Contact

- Customers currently in frequent contact with the CAA would generally prefer less contact.

- However, three in ten (29%) would still prefer at least 3 written or telephone contacts per year, and these are characterised by the following profile:
  - Operations Managers, Chief Executives, Managers
  - ACFT customers
  - Customers with 40 years experience or more
  - Engineering companies, Aircraft Operators

- A majority of customers (78%) are happy with the current level of contact with senior CAA management. A small percentage (16%) would like more such contact and are characterised by:
  - Lower North Island (excl. Wellington), South Island (excl. Christchurch)
  - Customers with 40 years experience or more
  - Customers who currently have frequent CAA contact

- One in three customers (33%) would like a single point of contact at the CAA. Characterised by:
  - Waikato/BOP/Central North Island
  - Customers new to the industry (less than 5 years)
  - Customers who would also like more contact with senior CAA management

- Licensing/Certification is most common reason for contact with the CAA, followed by Audits/Inspections/Spot Checks, Aviation Safety Educational Information, Accounts/Fees/Charges, and Rules/Standards.

- Consequently, Personnel Licensing and Field Safety Advisors are the departments of the CAA that are most commonly contacted.

Roles And Responsibilities

- Main responsibility of the CAA is perceived to be “managing the whole aviation environment”. More specifically the most commonly associated roles of the CAA are:
  - Certification and issuing licences
  - Ensuring compliance with rules and standards
  - Maintaining or ensuring safety standards
  - Conducting audits and inspections
These roles and responsibilities closely follow the nature of contact most customers have with the CAA.

- **Key Strengths:**
  - Service from Field Safety Advisors
  - Having a high profile in the industry
  - Maintaining safety
  - Having international credibility

- Providing value for money is given the lowest rating in survey, though it has improved significantly since 1998.

- However, all ratings demonstrate significant improvement since 1998 or have remained unchanged.

- **First Priority:**
  - Having units which communicate with each other when appropriate
  - Having an organisational structure that allows staff to do their job effectively and efficiently
  - Enforcing its rules effectively in the aviation industry
  - Providing value for money

- While equal proportions of customers view the current role of the CAA as enforcing rules or educating and guiding operators, a clear majority would prefer the emphasis to be on education rather than enforcement.

- Quantifying attitudes identified in the qualitative portion of the study highlighted some positive and negative attitudes towards the CAA. However, on none of these do large proportions of customers have strong feelings and therefore are not a priority to address at this time. On the positive side:
  - 80% of customers agree that the CAA “works more in consultation with customers than it has in the past”
  - 61% of customers do not believe that the “CAA does not have enough industry experience”
  - 71% of customers believe “the CAA is fairer and more consistent now than in the past”

  On the negative side:
  - 69% of customers believe “CAA processes are too paper driven and slow moving”
  - 63% of customers believe “bureaucracy means there is a lack of accountability at the CAA”

**Level Of Service**

- **Key Strengths:**
  - All attributes are rated relatively similarly and typically around the middle (5-7) of the scale,
  - Except “fast turnaround times

- No improvements noted since 1998.

- **First Priority:**
  - Fast turnaround times
Knowledge And Performance Of Staff

- Key Strengths:
  - Having useful aviation knowledge
  - Having useful industry knowledge
  - Being responsive to your queries

- Almost all attributes demonstrate significant improvements since 1998.

- First Priority:
  - Providing solutions
  - Communicating with each other

Communications And Information

- The combined Vector and CAA News publication is widely read and easily outperforms all other CAA publications as a communications vehicle.

- Opinion is evenly divided on preference for format of Vector/CAA News. Therefore our recommendation is to keep the current format, however if there are significant reasons or savings that warrant a change then only a maximum of 37% of customers will view the change at all negatively.

- Key Strengths:
  - Providing useful information
  - Providing credible information
  - Providing accurate information
  - Providing interesting information

- All attributes have improved since 1998, particularly “providing open and honest communication” and “communicating rules so that they are easy to understand”.

- First Priority:
  - Providing relevant information
  - Providing interesting information

However, it is likely that there are other areas of the CAA’s operation that deserve more immediate focus than publication and communications.
Forums, Workshops, Seminars

- Seven in ten customers (69%) had attended no forums, workshops or seminars in the last 12 months.

- AV Kiwi Seminars and CAA Safety Seminars are the most popular, with AV Kiwi Seminars receiving extremely positive feedback.

- Key Strengths:
  - All aspects of these initiatives receive high ratings among those customers who have attended at least one.

- All attributes also show significant improvement since 1998.

- First Priority:
  - The high ratings given to all attributes of CAA forums, seminars and workshops mean there are no urgent areas in need of attention.
  - Focus should in fact be on improving attendance and involvement.

Overall Satisfaction

- A slight improvement in rating overall since 1998.

- Key strengths:
  - Forums, seminars and workshops
  - Communications and publications

- First priority:
  - Delivery of roles and responsibilities
    - Maintain;
      - Maintain safety
      - Reliability
    - Focus on;
      - Having units which communicate with each other when appropriate
      - Having an organisational structure that allows staff to do their job effectively and efficiently
      - Providing value for money
  - Level of service
    - Maintain;
      - Providing a consistent service
      - Being client focussed
    - Focus on;
      - Fast turnaround time
Variations In Satisfaction

- Overall few large variations by customer type.

- Customers who tend to be more satisfied overall:
  - PPL customers
  - Christchurch/Canterbury
  - 1-2 contacts per year

- Customers who tend to be less satisfied overall:
  - ATPL customers
  - CPL customers
  - 3 or more contact per year

Influence Of CAA On Behaviour

- Most customers are aware of and recognise the input of the CAA on their way of doing business to at least some extent.

- However two thirds believe their organisation listens to what the CAA recommends, but only adopts things that are practical.

- Vector/CAA News are clearly the most influential form of communication in terms of impacting on behaviour, with auditing of second most importance.

Best Practice

- Six in ten customers (58%) believe “most” CAA recommendations represent global best practice, however few (5%) believe “all” recommendations do so.

- One in three (34%) believe only “some” or “none” of the CAA’s recommendations represent global best practice.

- However vast majority of customers (80%) believe NZ aviation industry reflects global best practice.

- Evidence exists of organisations selectively implementing CAA recommendations based on commercial considerations, and long held attitudes of knowing a better way.
• Key Strengths in recommending Best Practice:
  - Accident and incident investigation
  - Aviation law
  - Advisory circular development
  - Aircraft certification
  - Role development
  - Audit and monitoring

• First Priority:
  - Aviation medical
  - Sport and recreational sector
  - Public and industry relations
  - Research and development
  - Engineering
  - Business management
  - Aircraft design
  - Engineering
  - Finance

Auditing And Certification

• Opinion is evenly divided on most issues leaving room for improvement on these issues.

• However for two issues large majorities demonstrate positive attitudes towards the CAA:
  "The CAA is the best organisation to conduct auditing, surveillance and certification."
  "The information provided by the CAA is accurate and up to date."

Revised Medical System

• Key Strengths:
  - Obtaining information or advice from your medical examiner about your medical status
  - Having ready access to a medical examiner

• First Priority:
  - Improving understanding of the process
  - Making customers aware of their review options
Image Of The CAA

• Key Strengths:
  - Authoritative
  - Professional
  - Approachable

• Key Weaknesses:
  - Bureaucratic
  - Pedantic
  - Providing feedback
  - Transparency
  - Reliability
  - Practicality
  - Responsiveness
Conclusions

Among customers and employees interviews there is a clear consensus that the CAA has improved its operation, service delivery and customer relationships significantly since 1998. There are few, if any, areas where performance has declined.

Clearly however there are strengths and weaknesses which require different areas of the CAA’s operation to be given priority over other areas. To complicate this, different stakeholder groups can exhibit different perceptions and perspectives of the same area which means that area might be a strength among one group, and a weakness among another. A key example of this disparity are CAA publications and communications which are rated extremely highly by customers, and less highly by employees.

However if we take customer perceptions as most important in order to improve performance, there are clearly two areas of the CAA’s operation which should be given first priority:

- Delivery of roles and responsibilities
- Level of service.

While ensuring maintenance of performance in those areas for which the CAA currently receives high ratings, the specific aspects of service within these two areas that should be given first priority are:

- Having units which communicate with each other when appropriate
- Having an organisational structure that allows staff to do their job effectively and efficiently
- Enforcing its rules effectively in the aviation industry
- Providing value for money
- Having fast turnaround times.

A common theme that runs throughout the data among customers, and one which is highlighted by four of the five elements listed above, is the perception of bureaucracy within the CAA. This was also identified in the qualitative stage as being an issue that is both widespread and detracting from overall perceptions of the CAA.

For instance customers tend to believe the CAA:

- Is too paper driven
- Has slow turnaround times
- Has departments that don't communicate with each other
- Has a structure that does not allow effective and efficient operation
- Has a lack of accountability
- Has an image of bureaucracy and of being pedantic
- Has processes that take a long time to complete.
These perceptions will be a significant influence on not only overall perceptions of the CAA and its performance, but also in terms of customer willingness to implement best practice as recommended by the CAA. The study clearly shows there are significant numbers of operators in New Zealand who do not view even “most” CAA recommendations as representing best practice and who certainly would not implement a majority of CAA initiatives and recommendations.

Customer perceptions of bureaucracy will also have a strong impact on perceptions of the attribute given the lowest rating of all – value for money. It will be difficult for customers to give this attribute a higher rating while their perception of bureaucracy, paper driven and time consuming processes, and inefficient organisational structure and communications remains strong.

A complicating factor for the CAA in terms of correcting this perception is the disparity in rating of these key issues between employees and customers. CAA employees rate the CAA’s provision of value for money extremely highly, while also giving positive ratings to the CAA organisational structure and communications. This belief may work to hinder improvements in customer perceptions of bureaucracy, since CAA staff already believe they are delivering to a high standard on these aspects.

Perhaps one of the factors contributing to customer perceptions of bureaucracy at the CAA is the fact that currently there is no single point of contact for each customer at the CAA. Perhaps the introduction of such a system would aid in correcting or improving perceptions of bureaucracy at the CAA.

The profile of those customers who are most in favour of this proposed structure certainly lends some weight to this argument. The proposal is more likely to be favoured by newer entrants to the aviation industry who do not yet have the years of the experience necessary to have established contacts within the CAA. A formalised account management structure would certainly negate their confusion and difficulties, as well as making the process of making enquiries or dealing with the CAA appear less bureaucratic. This structure would specifically address lower customer ratings of the CAA’s organisational structure, and of inter-departmental communication.

Conversely, customers with many years experience in the industry are less likely to prefer to have a specific account manager since they have a range of informal contacts within the CAA. However this group are also more likely to want more contact with the CAA so that they can feel their knowledge is more respected and acknowledged. This group are also more likely to view fewer CAA recommendations as representing best practice. Having a dedicated account management structure may be a way for the CAA to ensure that more of its recommendations are implemented by this at-risk group, while also giving these customers the opportunity to have more contact with the CAA.
Customer Satisfaction
1.0 Nature and Level of Contact

The first section of the survey dealt with contact with the CAA in terms of current frequency, desired frequency, account management and subject matter.

1.1 Frequency of Contact

Customers were asked about the number of times they had written/telephone and face to face contact with the CAA in the last 12 months, and then how many times they would like to have such contact over the same period.

In 1998 contact was not defined in this way; the survey asked about “formal” and “informal” contact. There were also no questions regarding preferred level of contact and therefore the 1998 results have been omitted from the summaries below.

Overall there is a consensus among many CAA customers to want less contact with the CAA than more than they are currently receiving. For instance, one third of customers (34%) who had 3 or more face to face contacts would prefer no more than 2.

Obviously some of this desire will stem from CAA’s role as a regulatory body ensuring rules and regulations are adhered to. Such a role will at times entail contact that customers would rather avoid, and hence their demand for less contact.
However, there is also a group of customers who would prefer a high level of liaison with the CAA. This group are characterised by the following profile:

- Operations Managers
- Chief Executives
- Managers
- ACFT customers
- Customers with more than 40 years in the industry
- Engineering companies and Aircraft Operators
- Lower North Island (excluding Wellington)

This group of customers are more likely to want more contact with the CAA – i.e. at least 3 telephone, written or face to face contacts per year.

**1.2 Account Management**

**Senior Management Involvement**

Customers were then asked about the level of contact they had with senior managers at the CAA and whether they would like less, more or the same level of contact as currently.

"Please indicate below overall how much contact you personally would like to have with senior managers of the CAA."

The results of this question are summarised below.

![Desired Level of Contact With Senior CAA Managers](image-url)
Most customers (76%) are completely satisfied with the level of contact they currently have with senior managers, and only 1 in 6 (16%) would like more of this kind of contact. Those customers who would like more senior contact are more likely to be:
- Lower North Island (excluding Wellington)
- South Island (excluding Christchurch and Canterbury)
- Customers with more than 40 years in the industry
- Customers who currently have frequent (3+) telephone or written contacts

**Single Point of Contact**

The survey then asked about demand for a single point of contact for customers at the CAA.

"Are you happy with the current arrangements in terms of how you contact the CAA, or would you prefer to have someone at the CAA who is designated to look after your concerns, and who is your point of contact regarding any problems or queries?"

The majority of CAA customers (67%) are happy with their current set-up in terms of how and who they contact at the CAA. However, there is a significant proportion (33%) who would prefer a single point of contact. This type of customers is more likely to be:
- Waikato/BOP/Central North Island
- Customers new to the industry (less than 5 years)
- Customers who would also like more contact with senior CAA management

Interestingly, customers with 40 years or more experience are less likely to want a single point of contact. Conversely this group are more likely to want more contact both overall and with senior management. Clearly this experienced group have many contacts and great knowledge of the industry, and therefore want to feel more involved and acknowledged through greater contact particularly with senior management. At the same time their contacts mean they have no need for a single point of contact.
The findings of the qualitative study reinforce this conclusion as it was apparent that customers use individual personal contacts at the CAA for all enquiries regardless of their nature. They are contacting individuals, not departments.

However, while old hands are clearly comfortable with the current system, newer entrants who are less familiar with both personnel and procedures may welcome a more structured approach that a single point of contact would offer.

1.3 Nature of Contact In Last 12 Months

Customers were asked about what they had contact with the CAA about.

"Please indicate what subjects you have had contact with the CAA about during the last 12 months."

The results of this question are summarised below. A similar question was asked in 1998 and these results are included on the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Contact</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Licensing/Certification</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit/Inspections/Spot Checks</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Safety Educational Information</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts/Fees/Charges</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules/Standards</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Safety Technical Information</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical or Educational Issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Occurrence Investigation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Investigation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/International Relations</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the comparison above between 1998 and 2003 it will be immediately noted that all types of contact have increased since 1998. However, this will be due largely to research methodology rather than a true increase in each type of contact. In 1998 this question in the telephone interview was “unprompted”, meaning that respondents were not read the list of types. In 2003 the self-completion approach meant that all respondents saw these options when they answered, hence the increase in nomination of each type. The 2003 figures should be regarded as more accurate because of this difference.
Clearly however, one thing has not changed since 1998 and that is the predominance of contact with the CAA for licensing and certification issues over and above all other reasons for contact. Audits, inspections and spot checks are the next most common reason for contact, along with aviation safety, accounts and rules/standards.

1.4 Divisions/Departments Contacted

Customers were also asked about the divisions and departments they had contact with in the last 12 months.

"Please indicate which of the following CAA divisions or departments you have had contact with in the last 12 months."

This question is summarised below.

As per the findings in the previous section, Licensing is the most commonly contacted CAA department though it is level with Field Safety Advisors. Aircraft Certification and Medical Services are also contacted by at least one in four customers during a 12 month period.
The customers most likely to contact each of these commonly contacted divisions or departments are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Licensing</th>
<th>Field Safety Advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AME</td>
<td>More than 40 years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years experience</td>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Organisations</td>
<td>Chief Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers (in general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Cert/Regn</th>
<th>Medical Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFT</td>
<td>ATPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years experience</td>
<td>Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Owner</td>
<td>Air Traffic Controllers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato/BOP/Central North Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 Roles and Responsibilities

This section examines what customers believe the roles and responsibilities of CAA currently are, what they should be, as well as how well these roles and responsibilities are being carried out. This section also presents customer attitudes to the CAA and its conduct in general.

2.1 Current Roles of CAA

Customers were asked to say what they believe are all the current roles of the CAA, as well as the one main role.

"Please indicate which of the following you believe are functions or roles of the CAA."

"Please indicate which one of the above functions or roles you personally believe is the main role of the CAA."

The following chart summarises both these questions.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the predominance of licensing and certification in customer contact with the CAA, the role most commonly associated with the CAA is “Certification and issuing licenses”. This is closely followed by “Ensuring compliance with rules and standards”.
However, when asked to choose just one role as the CAA’s main responsibility the greatest number choose the all-encompassing “Managing the whole aviation environment”. Clearly it is difficult for these customers to select just one role.

However, the second most frequently selected main responsibility of the CAA is “Maintaining or ensuring safety standards”. One in four customers (23%) see the CAA’s main role as being related directly to safety, though a further six in ten (62%) believe it is simply another role. Few (15%) do not place safety as a role or responsibility of the CAA.

Customers with less than 5 years in the industry are the only group more likely to believe “Maintaining or ensuring safety standards” is the main role of the CAA.

2.2 Delivery of Roles and Responsibilities

Customers were then asked about how well they thought the CAA delivered on specific roles and responsibilities. An overall score for delivery of key functions and roles was also obtained following the rating of more specific issues.

“Now think about the CAA as it is today, that is, the current CAA. Listed below are a series of attributes relating to the delivery of the CAA’s key functions and roles. Please indicate how well you personally believe the CAA performs on each one using a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is extremely poor and 10 is excellent.”

“And using the same scale, please indicate below overall how well you believe the CAA delivers on its key functions and roles.”

Much of the survey that followed this point sought to measure customer perceptions of the CAA and therefore followed a similar format to the above line of questioning. It was consistent with the 1998 study in terms of question wording and attributes measured allowing direct comparisons to be made.

For all the sections such as this, reporting will follow a consistent format. Firstly, the actual 2003 results will be summarised and compared to 1998. This will give an overall picture of CAA performance as well as progress in the last five years. Secondly, a Performance Importance Matrix will be completed for each of these sections, as well as an overall one at the end. These matrices provide a great deal of feedback in terms of which individual attributes are most influential in terms of driving overall satisfaction, and also in terms of which ones are of greatest priority for the CAA to address.
Overall Results and Comparison to 1998

The charts below summarise customer perceptions of CAA delivery of its roles and responsibilities, and compares them to the 1998 results. The attributes are ordered in descending order of the average rating given in 2003. Therefore those at the top of the first chart indicate attributes where the CAA is perceived to perform better than those at the bottom of the second chart.

Delivery of Roles and Responsibilities

Having a high profile in industry - 1998
2003

The service Field Safety Advisors provide - 1998
2003

Maintaining safety - 1998
2003

Having international credibility - 1998
2003

Making the industry responsible & accountable - 1998
2003

Providing ongoing education/training for the industry - 1998
2003

Being reliable - 1998
2003

Enforcing its rules effectively in the aviation industry - 1998
2003

Consulting with clients - 1998
2003

Having adequate resources to do job effectively/efficiently - 1998
2003

Having a clear costing structure - 1998
2003

Units which communicate with each other when appropriate - 1998
2003

Org. structure that allows staff to do job effectively/efficiently - 1998
2003

Being conveniently and appropriately located - 1998
2003

Providing value for money - 1998
2003

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302, N=330)
There are four roles/responsibilities which the CAA are rated most strongly as delivering on:

- Service from Field Safety Advisors
- Having a high profile in the industry
- Maintaining safety
- Having international credibility

On all four of these roles/responsibilities the CAA is currently rated at 6.6 or above out of 10.

On only one role/responsibility does the CAA receive an average rating of below 5 – “providing value for money”. Often a rating of below 5 represents rejection, although on issues relating to price such as this one, it may simply reflect customers’ natural reluctance to score a provider highly regardless of quality of service. However it is the attribute that receives the lowest score in this study. That said, the rating for value for money has improved significantly since 1998.

In comparison to 1998 all roles and responsibilities exhibit either a significant increase in the standard of provision or have remained unchanged. On no role/responsibility has the rating of the CAA’s provision of that role declined.

Ratings that show the largest improvement are:

- Maintaining safety (6.1 to 6.7)
- Having adequate resources to do job effectively/efficiently (5.1 to 5.9)
- Providing value for money (4.2 to 4.9)

(As a note for interpreting the preceding charts, and all following ones of this nature, the key analysis tool are the average ratings to the right. In the chart itself it is clear that there was a significantly higher proportion of “don’t knows” in 1998 than in 2003. This is a result of the previous telephone methodology compared to self-completion – which gives respondents more time to consider their response. This difference makes comparison between 1998 and 2003 difficult except for the average ratings because the average ratings exclude “don’t knows”.

Therefore the results in the chart itself should not be used for comparison between 1998 and 2003, but for looking at each year in isolation.

For instance one useful analysis is identifying that the bulk of ratings are in the 5-7 range rather than having a more polarised result.)
Overall Ratings

After rating the CAA on each individual aspect of the delivery of the roles and responsibilities, customers were asked to give an overall rating. This is summarised below.

![Overall Ratings Graph](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor (1-4)</th>
<th>(5-7)</th>
<th>Excellent (8-10)</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)

In balancing the wide range of scores given individual aspects of delivery of roles/responsibilities, the average rating of CAA performance sits at 6.2 out of 10, with the vast majority rating the CAA between 5 and 7.

The following tables summarise which groups of customers are more likely to be either dissatisfied (1-4 out of 10) or satisfied (8-10 out of 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years experience</td>
<td>6 to 10 years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPL</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>102 contacts per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more contacts per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance/Importance Matrix

A Performance Importance Matrix is an analytical tool that not only summarises how well an organisation is performing on a series of attributes but also how important each attribute is in determining overall satisfaction or overall performance in that area. In this way decisions about prioritisation can be made so that for instance, attention isn’t focussed on an area of poor performance that actually has little importance or impact on customers’ overall perceptions.

For instance from earlier analysis we know that the CAA is rated most highly in its delivery of roles and responsibilities for its profile and Field Safety Advisors service. But are these the most important aspects of delivery of roles and responsibilities? The Performance Importance Matrix will answer this question.

The matrix is developed through statistical regression and identifies what attributes are most closely linked with the overall rating. At a very basic level it identifies what attributes are generally scored highly when an high overall score is also given.
The matrix itself consists of four quadrants formed by two dynamics. The horizontal dynamic places each attribute on the matrix in accordance with the average performance rating given by customers. These results have been presented and discussed earlier.

The vertical dynamic places each attribute on the matrix in terms of its (derived) importance to driving the rating of overall satisfaction or performance. It is “derived” because we have deliberately not asked customers to rate the importance of each attribute. Historically such a question has not differentiated attributes, with customers typically rating all attributes as important.

The interaction of these two dynamics generates four quadrants into one of which each attribute falls. The top right quadrant contains those service attributes for which the organisation is rated highly and which also have high importance in determining overall satisfaction. It is vital to Maintain the organisation’s delivery of these attributes.

The top left quadrant contains those service attributes for which the organisation receives lower ratings but which also impact greatly on overall satisfaction. These attributes are of First Priority to focus attention on.

The bottom left quadrant contains attributes for which lower performance ratings are given and which are of lower importance in driving overall satisfaction. These are the attributes of Second Importance.

The bottom right quadrant contains attributes for which an organisation receives higher performance ratings but have lesser impact on overall perceptions. These attributes are of Third Priority for attention.

Detailed below is the Performance Importance Matrix constructed based on the ratings given the CAA’s delivery of roles and responsibilities.

**Customer Performance Importance Matrix**

---

**First priority**

- High derived importance

- Organisational structure
  - * Being reliable
  - * Communication between units

- Value for money
  - * Enforcing rules effectively
  - * Consulting clients
  - * Making industry responsible

- Low performance

**Second priority**

- Low derived importance

**Third priority**

- High performance

- Field Advisor service

---

colmar brunton
The two most important attributes are “maintaining safety” and “being reliable”, and on these two attributes the CAA is rated highly. It is therefore important to maintain current performance on these attributes. The improvement on “maintaining safety” since 1998 has therefore been a critical shift.

However on the next two to three most important attributes there is clearly room for improvement and it is on these attributes that attention must be focussed to impact most effectively on customer ratings of CAA delivery of roles/responsibilities. These are:

- Having units which communicate with each other when appropriate
- Having an organisational structure that allows staff to do their job effectively and efficiently
- Enforcing its rules effectively in the aviation industry.

However there is one more attribute that is clearly worthy of attention even though its impact on overall rating is less than the previously mentioned three, and this is “value for money”. This attribute receives the lowest score of any attribute in the survey, and despite its increase since 1998 should still be given priority by the CAA.

Three of these four attributes are as much about customer perceptions as they are about the reality of delivery of roles and responsibilities. It is therefore a matter of communicating to customers the role of different departments of the CAA, and the level of communication that occurs between these departments. The employee part of the survey demonstrates high levels of satisfaction with these aspects – it remains for this to be communicated to customers. Certainly in the qualitative study there was little awareness of organisation structural change since 1998.

Likewise, value for money is more about perception rather than simply being a cost issue. Customers will be willing to pay for CAA services if they perceive the value of doing so. This will also improve rating of this attribute.
2.3 Enforcement Versus Education

Customers were asked to say firstly whether the current role of the CAA is more to “enforce rules to ensure unsafe practices are not followed” or to “educate and guide operators so as not to undertake unsafe practices”. They were then asked which one of these the CAA should focus on to improve its operation. These two philosophies were identified in the qualitative study as polarising customers. It was therefore important to measure where the bulk of customers fit on a continuum between these two positions in the quantitative part of the study. A great deal more information on the nature of these two positions is contained in the qualitative findings contained in the Appendix.

The following chart summarises the results of these two questions.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Role</th>
<th>Preferred Future Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforce Rules</td>
<td>Educate and Guide Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
```

Currently similar numbers of customers believe the CAA’s role is to enforce rules as believe their role is to educate and guide. However, there is a clear desire for the CAA’s emphasis to be placed more on education than on enforcement.

To a large extent such a focus is likely to be as much about a manipulation of customer perceptions as it is about any actual change in emphasis. CAA communications are therefore the ideal vehicle to achieve these aims.

However, there will always need to be an element of enforcement required in the CAA’s role, and it is actions relating to this aspect of the CAA’s role that are likely to be more noticed and remembered by customers and their associates. Achieving customers’ desired level of education and guidance may therefore always be a constantly moving target that can never quite be attained, since they will always remember enforcement more vividly.

There are no particular groups of CAA customers who show a greater or lesser likelihood to prefer enforcement over education – the level of support for each focus is constant throughout all customers.
2.4 Attitudes Towards the CAA

All customers were asked about some specific attitudes towards the CAA overall. These were identified in the qualitative research as being perceptions held by customers and in this stage we are endeavouring to understand how prevalent and important each is for the CAA.

"Listed below are some things people have said about the CAA in general. Please indicate below how much you agree or disagree with each one."

The following charts summarise overall attitudes on these issues.

### Attitudes Towards The CAA

#### The CAA works more in consultation with customers than it has in the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CAA processes are too paper driven and slow moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bureaucracy means that there is a lack of accountability at the CAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The CAA does not have enough industry experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The CAA is fairer and more consistent now than in the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### You would prefer the CAA to allow more self-regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
On none of the above issues is there a strong feeling in either a positive or negative direction (i.e. few who strongly agree or disagree with each issue). There is no evidence therefore that these issues represent issues which the CAA needs to give immediate priority to, however there are also clearly some opportunities for improvement in terms of customer attitudes and perceptions.

Overall there are some more positive findings, some more negative findings and some on which opinion is equally divided.

On the more positive side:
- 80% of CAA customers agree that the CAA “works more in consultation with customers than it has in the past”. This is a clear endorsement and result of the changes the CAA has implemented in recent years.
- 61% of CAA customers do not believe that “the CAA does not have enough industry experience”.
- 71% of CAA customers believe “the CAA is fairer and more consistent now than in the past”.

On the more negative side:
- 69% of CAA customers believe “CAA processes are too paper driven and slow moving”.
- 63% of CAA customers believe “bureaucracy means there is a lack of accountability at the CAA”.
  These two issues are clearly inter-related and indicate a perception, correct or not, that the CAA is a paper-dependent bureaucracy.

Other issues are more balanced with equal numbers of customers agreeing and disagreeing on each issue. Clearly then, on each of these issues there is also scope for the CAA to improve its perception and performance.

There is also a strong level of demand for more self-regulation since 61% of CAA customers do not believe there is “already too much”. This follows a finding in the qualitative section of the study which identified that customers perceive a greater emphasis from the CAA in recent years on self-regulation (see Appendix).
3.0 Service Levels

The survey then moved on to assessing consumer perceptions of specific aspects of CAA service. These followed a similar format to the rating of provision of roles and responsibilities.

3.1 Level of Service

Comparison to 1998

The first of these sections examined level of service in detail. The following chart summarises the 2003 findings and compares results to 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Aspect</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a consistent service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to find the appropriate person to deal with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on progress/outcomes of complaints/incidents</td>
<td>(not included in 1998)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is client focussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has fast turnaround times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302, N=330)

With the exception of “fast turnaround times” all aspects of service are rated at just under 6 out of 10 (5.8 or 5.9). And no measures demonstrate a significant increase from 1998.

Further, while for every aspect the bulk of customers rate CAA on the middle of the scale of 1 to 10 (i.e. between 5 and 7), at least one in four express a high level of dissatisfaction on each aspect. In fact on the lowest performing aspect, “turnaround times”, more than one in three (36%) say they are dissatisfied with CAA turnaround times.

To balance these more negative customers, there are also between 1 in 4 and 1 in 5 who exhibit high satisfaction, however the fact remains that significant numbers of CAA customers are dissatisfied with the level of service they receive from the CAA.
Overall Rating
The overall rating of service levels is summarised below.

Consistent with the individual ratings given for this section, the average overall rating sits at 6 out of 10, with the bulk of customers rating the CAA between 5 and 7, and equal numbers being dissatisfied and satisfied.

CAA customers who are more likely to be dissatisfied and satisfied are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATPL</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers who contact CAA 1 or 2 times per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance/Importance Matrix

Customer Performance Importance Matrix
- Level of Service

- First priority
  - High derived importance
    - Maintain
    - Consistent service
- Second priority
  - Low performance
    - Fast turnaround
  - Feedback on complaints/incidents
- Third priority
  - High performance
    - Easy to find person
  - Client focused

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
Consistency is the most important aspect of service delivery, and while there is room for improvement on this attribute, the CAA does currently perform well.

Turnaround time is the area worthy of the most attention currently since it receives the lowest performance rating but has a significant impact on overall satisfaction.

Focus on clients is perhaps of third priority since its influence is relatively high but there remains room for improvement in performance. Regardless of this level of performance, client focus will always be important for any service organisation, and a high score on this attribute will result in positive overall perceptions. It is intrinsic to any positive overall rating.

There remains significant scope for improvement in these areas of priority since there has been no noticeable change since 1998.

### 3.2 Knowledge and Performance of Staff

Customers were then asked about their perceptions of the knowledge and performance of CAA staff.

#### Comparison of 1998 to 2003

**Knowledge and Performance of CAA Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having useful aviation knowledge</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having useful industry knowledge</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being responsive to your queries</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being accessible</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having management knowledge</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with each other</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving consistent responses to the same issue</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing solutions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings of knowledge and performance of staff are significantly higher than the ratings given to levels of service from the CAA itself. In particular, three aspects stand out for which over one third of customers exhibit a high level of satisfaction:

- Having useful aviation knowledge
- Having useful industry knowledge
- Being responsive to your queries
Furthermore, almost all aspects demonstrate significant improvements since 1998. The only aspect to not show such an improvement is being accessible. However, it should be said that ratings on this attribute are not low (6.3 out of 10).

**Overall Rating**

In terms of the overall rating for knowledge and performance, the following chart summarises the results of this question in 2003.

Reflecting the positive ratings given each individual aspect of staff knowledge and performance in the overall rating, nearly 3 in 10 exhibit a high level of overall satisfaction, with few being dissatisfied.

Those more likely to be dissatisfied and satisfied are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years experience</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years experience</td>
<td>Chief Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPL</td>
<td>Operations Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more contacts per year</td>
<td>1 to 2 contacts per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not surprising that more experienced customers rate the CAA less highly for knowledge and experience since it is likely this group will include some very wise heads who possess a great deal of knowledge.
As with previous sections, the attributes of greatest importance are also those in which the CAA performs best. In particular staff aviation knowledge is both vital and rated highly. However, their industry knowledge is also important and receives excellent ratings.

The area for priority in terms of improvement are in “providing solutions” and “communicating with each other”. This latter attribute again demonstrates negative customer perception about the ability of the CAA to perform well due to detrimental internal structure or poor communication.

Of second priority is “management knowledge” and “giving consistent responses”. This latter issue is consistent with the attribute rated as most important in terms of overall service delivery and clearly indicates a customer need for consistency of outcomes.

Combined with “providing solutions”, it is clear that customers are looking for consistent solutions to issues and incidents. This is another finding that is backed up in the qualitative part of the study where participants talked about their perceptions that there were differences in treatment and solutions of enquiries made by industry heads versus the public, or employees versus employers.
4.0 Communications and Information

The CAA produce a wide range of publications to inform, educate and communicate with customers. As well as measuring customer attitudes to these publications the CAA need to understand which are used more or less widely.

In addition, the CAA run seminars and workshops as part of their role in promoting safety in the aviation industry.

This section examines customer usage of and attitudes to these initiatives, and aims to determine what, if any, opportunities exist to provide additional information.

4.1 Usage of CAA Publications

Customers were asked,

"Listed below are a range of publications released on a regular basis by the CAA. For each one, please indicate how much of each one, if anything, you personally tend to read."

The following chart summarises the results of this question.
Clearly the most popular CAA publication is the combined Vector and CAA News with 9 in 10 and 7 in 10 CAA customers respectively reading each issue. Interestingly, the Vector part of the publication is more widely read than the CAA News part.

Safety videos and the CAA website are less commonly used, however at least one third of customers also do not receive the “how to” booklets, GAP booklets, and safety posters.

### 4.2 Format of CAA News and Vector

As the most popular CAA publication, the CAA need to assess customer opinion prior to making substantial changes to either CAA News or Vector. Therefore, the study also addressed customer opinion about a proposed change in format of the combined publication.

"The Vector and CAA News magazines are currently printed back to back and inverted. An alternative would be to print the pages of both parts sequentially the same way up but still as one publication. Please indicate below whether you prefer the current layout, this proposed new layout, or have no preference."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference for Vector/CAA News Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer current layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)

Opinion is relatively evenly divided on this issue, however more customers prefer the current layout than the proposed new one, with a large group of customers not having any preference.

More frequent readers of each publication do not differ significantly from this overall finding.

The recommendation must therefore be to keep the current layout, however if there are significant reasons or savings to warrant a change then only a maximum of 37% of customers will view the change negatively.
4.3 Content and Usefulness of Publications

As in previous sections, customers were asked to rate their satisfaction with the CAA’s publications on a range on attributes as well as overall. In 1998 several of these attributes were also measured.

Comparison to 1998

Content and Usefulness of Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing useful information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing accurate information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing credible information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing interesting information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing open and honest communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing relevant information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting publications to right people/places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating rules so that they are easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Rules &amp; Advisory Circulars which are clear/concise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications which encourage change in own/organisation’s behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing forms which are user-friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302, N=330)
Clearly, all aspects of CAA publications have improved since 1998 with all attributes measured showing signs of improvement over time. Two attributes in particular have shown enormous improvement:

- Providing open and honest communication
- Communicating rules so that they are easy to understand.

However, the attributes on which CAA publications perform most strongly are:

- Providing useful information
- Providing credible information
- Providing accurate information
- Providing interesting information

These ratings are likely to be driven in large part by the widely read CAA News/Vector publication, however with such positive ratings overall all publications play a role in conveying this perception of excellence.

**Overall Rating**

Customers were then asked to rate the CAA publications’ content and usefulness overall.

Reflecting the very high scores given each aspect of CAA’s publications, overall rating is also high with six in ten customers rating it between 8 and 10.

Those more likely to be very satisfied and those more likely to be less satisfied are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-readers of CAA News or Vector ATPL</td>
<td>Avid readers of CAA News or Vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those in more frequent contact with the CAA</td>
<td>Customers with up to 5 years experience PPL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two aspects of communications or publications require immediate focus – “providing relevant information” and “providing interesting information”. These two attributes are of greatest influence in driving overall perceptions of CAA communications and perceptions.

However two others are almost equally important and on these the CAA is rated extremely highly – “providing credible information” and “providing useful information”.

Overall however, the results have demonstrated the high regard with which CAA communications and publications are held. It is likely therefore that attention could be safely focussed on other areas of the CAA’s operation prior to communications and publications.
4.4 Attendance At and Usefulness Of CAA Forums, Workshops and Seminars

Prior to rating the usefulness and content of CAA workshops and seminars customers were asked to say which, if any, they had attended in the last 12 months.

The following table summarises the results of this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>percent attended last 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV Kiwi Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA Safety Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident and Incident Reporting Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Safety Coordinator Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Authorisation Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASE: All CAA Customers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AV Kiwi Seminars and CAA Safety Seminars are the most popular CAA workshops or seminars, and are the only ones with sufficient attendance to allow robust analysis of the usefulness of these sessions.

Those customers more likely to attend these sessions are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV Kiwi Seminars</th>
<th>CAA Safety Seminars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPL Owners</td>
<td>More than 10 years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those with frequent face to face contact</td>
<td>Those with frequent face to face contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAA customers most likely to **not** have attended any CAA workshops or seminars in the last 12 months are:

- Those with 40 years experience or more
- ATPL, CPL
- Those with no face to face contact in last 12 months
In terms of the perceived usefulness of the two most widely used workshops, the results are summarised below.

![Bar chart showing the perceived usefulness of AV Kiwi Seminars and CAA Safety Seminars.]

**AV Kiwi Seminars (N=24)**
- Not at all useful (1-4): 8%
- Poor: 11%
- Not very useful (5-7): 81%
- Excellent: 0%

**CAA Safety Seminars (N=33)**
- Not at all useful (1-4): 15%
- Poor: 17%
- Not very useful (5-7): 68%
- Excellent: 8%

Mean
- AV Kiwi Seminars: 8.0
- CAA Safety Seminars: 7.3

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)

Clearly, for those who attended each of these seminars, almost all found them extremely useful, with the AV Kiwi Seminars disappointing very few people.

### 4.5 Content of Forums, Workshops and Seminars

As per previous sections, customers were asked to rate the content of CAA forums, workshops and seminars overall. Note that this section does not analyse perceptions of specific initiatives.

#### Comparison to 1998

The following chart summarises feedback on specific issues relating to forums, workshops and seminars in 1998 and 2003.

**Content of CAA Forums, Workshops & Seminars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing accurate information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poor (1-4)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (8-10)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing open and honest communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poor (1-4)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (8-10)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing useful information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poor (1-4)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (8-10)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing credible information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poor (1-4)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (8-10)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating rules so that they are easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Poor (1-4)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5-7)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent (8-10)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 1998 - All CAA Customers (N=330); 2003 – All attended at least one (N=95)
In 1998 all customers were asked this question regardless of whether they had attended a forum, workshop or seminar – hence the high proportion of “don't knows” which makes comparison difficult. However, in comparison of the average ratings (which excludes "don't knows”), it is apparent that customer perceptions of these CAA sessions have improved enormously across all aspects. In particular, the performance of the CAA in terms of “communicating rules so that they are easy to understand” has improved by a significant margin.

Across all aspects however in 2003 at least six in ten, and in most cases seven in ten, attendees rate their satisfaction very highly (8 to 10 out of 10).

**Overall Rating**

In 2003 attendees were asked to rate CAA forums, workshops and seminars overall for content and usefulness.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of ratings: 21% Poor, 75% Average, 1% Excellent, Mean 8.1.](chart)

Base: All attended at least one (N=95)

Three quarters of attendees of CAA forums, workshops and seminars rate the content and usefulness of the sessions very highly (8 to 10 out of 10). Customers who are more likely to be very satisfied and less satisfied are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower North Island (excluding Wellington)</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following on from the extremely high ratings given to CAA forums, seminars and workshops, the Performance Importance Matrix further highlights the strength of the CAA in this area.

The CAA performs strongly on four of the five attributes and performs best on the two that impact most on overall rating of this area – "providing accurate information” and “providing useful information”.

The only aspect where attention could be focussed is on “communicating rules so that they are easy to understand”.

However it may be that there are other areas of the CAA’s operation that warrant more immediate attention, and that also impact more on overall performance. The next section will answer this question.
4.6 Demand for Further Information

To understand customer needs, the next question aimed to identify what areas customers would like more information on.

"Please indicate which of the following areas, if any, you would like to receive further information from the CAA in either a publication or forum such as a seminar or workshop."

The following chart summarises the areas identified by customers for which they would like additional information.

**Demand for Additional Information**

Safety education 52%
Safety systems and practice 47%
Rules and legislation 45%
Best practices 44%
Industry developments 43%
Advisory circulars 33%
Safety statistics and risk assessments 32%
Enforcement action summaries 26%
Consultation outcomes 23%
Nothing at all 15%

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)

Safety education and systems are customers’ first priority, with rules and legislation, and best practice slightly behind this. There is clearly demand for the CAA increasing its involvement in communicating safety and with that, best practice. Pilots and private pilots in particular exhibit a significantly stronger demand for safety and best practice information.

There is less overall demand for feedback from the CAA on enforcement actions, consultations and risk assessments. However, it is extremely likely that customers involved in these processes will have a very high demand for this type of feedback.

Just one in seven customers (15%) feel they do not need additional information from the CAA on any area.
5.0 Overall Satisfaction

After considering each of these aspects of the CAA’s operation in detail, customers were lastly asked to rate the performance of the CAA overall. A similar overall question was asked in 1998.

"Please think about all aspects of the CAA including its fulfilment of roles and responsibilities, its service levels, its communications, and its staff.

Using a slightly different scale where 1 is extremely dissatisfied and 10 is extremely satisfied, please indicate below how satisfied you personally are with the performance of the CAA overall."

Comparison to 1998
The following chart summarises both the 2003 and 1998 results.

Following on from previous findings, 2003 results exhibit an improvement over 1998 findings.

Customers who are more likely to exhibit higher or lower overall satisfaction are as follows. These largely reflect previous findings identified in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Satisfaction</th>
<th>Higher Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATPL</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Christchurch/Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more contacts per year</td>
<td>1-2 contacts per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance/Importance Matrix**

In preceding sections, the Performance Importance Matrix has been used to identify where the CAA needs to focus attention to improve customer ratings of that area of operation alone. However we have not yet identified which area or areas are most important overall – which ones impacts most on overall customer perceptions of the CAA itself.

The following Performance Importance Matrix does so.

**Customer Performance Importance Matrix**

---

**First priority**

- Delivery of Roles/Responsibilities
- Level of service
- High derived importance
- Maintain

**Second priority**

- Staff knowledge and performance

**Third priority**

- Forums/seminars/workshops
- Communications and publications

**Low performance**

- Low derived importance

---

Clearly, while the CAA’s forums/seminars/workshops and communications/publications are their key strength, they have less impact on customer perceptions than other areas of the CAA’s operation. This is not unexpected.

And when comparing the CAA’s performance in these two areas, the scale of the opportunity and need for improvement in these other areas can be clearly seen.

In particular, improving customer perceptions of the CAA’s delivery of its roles and responsibilities, and of the level of service provided overall, will impact most effectively on overall perceptions of the CAA.

Second to those two areas, is improving customer perceptions of the knowledge and performance of staff. However as we have seen significant improvements in this area since 1998 it may be that this issue is being addressed already.
There is therefore the greatest scope for improvement in customer perception of the CAA by focussing on the attributes that impact most on the delivery of roles and responsibilities, and overall levels of service. To be more specific, and recap on the recommendations for these areas, the attributes of greatest impact in these areas are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery of Roles/Responsibilities</th>
<th>Service Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintain:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain safety</td>
<td>Providing a consistent service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being reliable</td>
<td>Being client focussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus on:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having units which communicate with each other when appropriate</td>
<td>Fast turnaround time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an organisational structure that allows staff to do their job effectively and efficiently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing its rules effectively in the aviation industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AND:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing value for money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Influence of CAA on Behaviour

Identifying what actual impact the CAA has had on organisations is difficult to measure since even if customers were willing to admit to change, often they might be unaware of how or if the CAA has influenced that change. For this reason, part of this section of the survey centred on a series of attitudinal statements regarding their organisation, its practices and the possible role of the CAA.

"Listed below are a series of statements that some people have made about the influence the CAA has had on the way they and their organisation operates.

For each one please indicate how much you agree or disagree that statement applies to you and your organisation."

**Influence of CAA on Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAA safety products mean you do things differently &amp; better</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your company has instituted double sign-off procedures on all maintenance work</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA has helped change the culture of your organisation so it is more safety conscious</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organisation has a NZ &quot;No. 8 wire&quot; culture</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organisation used to have a NZ &quot;No. 8 wire&quot; culture but has now changed</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organisation always adopts recommendations made by the CAA</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organisation listens to what the CAA recommends but only adopts things that are practical</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CAA should make more recommendations as to how to change the way you do things</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)

In some respects the responses given to the above issues reflect a desire to say/do the correct thing – as will always be the case in questions such as this. For instance, few are willing to admit that their organisation has or has had a "No. 8 wire" culture – this is not too surprising.

However, it is clear that most customers are aware of and recognise the input of the CAA on their way of doing business to some extent. Three quarters agree that CAA safety products mean they do things differently and better. Two thirds agree that the CAA has helped change the culture of their organisation so that it is more safety conscious. Two thirds agree that their organisation always adopts recommendations made by the CAA.
One thing to note about these findings however is that of the people who agree with each of these statements, few agree strongly. That is they are either unwilling to fully acknowledge the CAA’s influence, or there are genuine reservations as to how much influence the CAA does and should have.

And perhaps the most enlightening finding on this issue is that two thirds of customers agree that their organisation listens to what the CAA recommends but only adopts things that are practical. This would tend to suggest that while the CAA influences behaviour to some extent, other considerations are taken into account before action is taken.

Following on from this, opinion is relatively evenly divided in terms of whether customers would like to see the CAA make more recommendations as to how to change the way organisations do things. In fact, slightly more are against this proposal than for it.

On one issue, “double sign-off procedures”, there is a significant proportion (31%) who answered “don’t know” as to whether they have instituted this procedure on all maintenance work. This means that either the respondent was not in a position to know whether this has happened or not, or there is a need for more communication by the CAA on this issue.

Following these attitudinal statements, customers were asked about which interactions had resulted in changes to the way their organisation did business.

"Please indicate which of the following types of interactions with the CAA, if any, have resulted in changes to the way you or your organisation operates in the last 12 month."

---

**Interactions That Have Resulted in Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vector</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Process</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Aviation Practice Booklet</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA News</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Circulars</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification/Licensing Process</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Contact (FSOs)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Investigation</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA Seminar</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Videos/Posters</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Leaflets</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Process</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
The above chart again demonstrates the power and importance of the Vector publication. Not only is it widely read and used, it impacts greatly on influencing behaviour with nearly one in two customers saying Vector has resulted in changes to the way their organisation operates.

Perhaps not too surprisingly, Audits and Rules also have a strong impact on change.

Below this, CAA News and the GAP Booklets are also influential for three in ten customers.

Few CAA customers (14%) cannot point to a particular interaction with the CAA and say it has resulted in change to their organisation.
7.0 Best Practice

The previous section highlighted a dynamic among customers which recognised the influence of the CAA on operations but grounded recommendations in realities such as the practicalities of their operation.

Customer perceptions of best practice may be another influence on whether or not organisations change or introduce behaviour recommended by the CAA.

This section aims to measure perceptions of the CAA in terms of recognising and recommending best practice in an attempt to understand potential barriers to behaviour change.

7.1 Overall Perceptions of Best Practice

Customers were first asked,

"Please indicate which of the following best describes the proportion of CAA recommendations you personally believe represents global best practice."

![Perception Chart]

While few customers believe all CAA recommendations represent global best practice, six in ten believe most in fact do represent global best practice. However, one in three believe no more than some recommendations are best practice and it is likely from this group that those who selectively implement CAA recommendations are likely to come.

Therefore, the customers who are more likely to say "most" or "some" are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Some” Recommendations</th>
<th>“Most” Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 years or more in industry</td>
<td>No more than 10 years in industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFT</td>
<td>Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again the impact of experience and perceived knowledge is apparent in these results and in how customers perceive the CAA.

Based on the qualitative part of the study best practice ideals are drawn from the United States (F.A.A.) and Europe.

As an overall question, customers were then asked about the New Zealand aviation industry implementing best practice as a whole.

"Overall do you believe that the New Zealand aviation industry generally reflects global best practice."

The vast majority of CAA customers believe the New Zealand aviation industry reflects global best practice. Just one in five are prepared to say that it does not do so. Customers more likely to agree or disagree with this are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No – Does Not Reflect Best Practice</th>
<th>Yes – Does Reflect Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly those customers who believe that only “some” or “none” of CAA recommendations represent global best practice are just as likely to say they believe the New Zealand industry as a whole represents best practice. This again indicates the group’s willingness to ignore CAA recommendations on the basis that they perceive they know a better way.

The qualitative highlighted customer perceptions of “cowboys” still operating in the industry who were more likely to ignore CAA recommendations. These were characterised as either “dead wood” lacking in experience and expertise, or “empire builders” perceived to operate autonomously or have personal agendas. However, most also acknowledge the need to take commercial realities into account whenever considering the implementation of CAA recommendations. Other reasons given for ignoring CAA recommendations were perceptions of accountability and processes being too slow and dominated by paperwork.
7.2 Strengths and Weakness of CAA

Given that there is a group of customers who are prepared to ignore CAA recommendations and proceed with their own way of doing things, this section should be particularly enlightening as to which areas the CAA is perceived to be weak in. Customers were asked to say firstly which areas they believed the CAA are strongest in, and secondly which areas they believe the CAA are weakest.

"Please indicate which areas, if any, you believe the CAA is strongest/weakest in, in terms of having the knowledge and expertise to recommend best practice."

The following charts summarise both these questions, ordering the areas in descending order of which areas customers believe the CAA is strongest in.

![Strengths and Weaknesses Chart]

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
As is often the case in questions such as this, customers have been more willing to be complimentary than be critical. Therefore larger proportions have nominated strengths than weaknesses.

The three key outputs from the above charts are to highlight the areas most frequently mentioned as strengths, those most frequently mentioned as weaknesses, and those where more customers have highlighted that area as a weakness rather than a strength.
On this basis, accident and incident investigation is clearly the CAA’s strength in terms of representing best practice. However the following are also seen by at least four in ten customers as strengths representing best practice:

- Aviation law
- Advisory circular development (again recognising the strength of CAA publications)
- Aircraft certification
- Rule development
- Audit and monitoring

Conversely the areas which the largest number of customers perceive are a weakness are:

- Aviation medical
- Public and industry relations
- Aircraft design

However perhaps the areas of greatest concern in the short term for the CAA are those areas which larger numbers of customers nominate as weaknesses rather than as a strength. These are:

- Aviation medical
- Sport and recreational sector
- Public and industry relations
- Research and development
- Engineering (electronic)
- Business management
- Aircraft design
- Engineering (software)
- Finance

It is in these latter areas where operators who are more likely to believe only some or none of CAA recommendations represent best practice, are likely to ignore the CAA and implement their own decisions.
8.0 Auditing And Certification

Customers were then asked about the auditing and certification services of the CAA and the value they placed on these services.

"Listed below are a series of statements that some people have made about the auditing and certification services provided by the CAA."

"For each one please indicate how much you agree or disagree that statement applies to you or your organisation."

The following chart summarises the responses to these statements.

On many of these issues opinion is relatively evenly divided in terms of offering both positive and negative perceptions of the CAA’s auditing and certification services.

However on two issues large majorities demonstrate positive attitudes towards the CAA. More than three quarters believe:

"The CAA is the best organisation to conduct auditing, surveillance and certification."

"The information provided by the CAA is accurate and up to date."

But on all other issues relating to auditing and certification equal numbers of CAA customers are likely to agree and disagree with each attitude statement. This means that there is a significant body of opinion that has negative perceptions of the CAA and its auditing processes.
For instance around one in two customers believe;

- The rules and restrictions are too strict,
- That CAA does not provide excellent information as to how to fix faults,
- That it is difficult to implement CAA advice,
- That achieving certification is difficult.

In combination these attitudes are dangerous to have since they will only encourage customers to ignore CAA advice or recommendations. If a customer additionally is less likely to think those recommendations do not represent best practice then implementation becomes even less likely.

There is evidence here that the CAA needs to attempt to adjust some of these perceptions of their auditing and certification services. Communications through CAA News or Vector would be the best medium to use for this objective.
9.0 Revised Medical System

Doctors, pilots and air traffic controllers were then asked about the new medical certification system. Most customers qualified to answer under this definition reducing the sample size to N=254 for this section.

9.1 Rating of Medical System Overall

First of all these customers were asked about different aspects of the new medical system.

"Thinking about the new medical certification system, and using a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is completely dissatisfied and 10 is completely satisfied, please indicate below how satisfied you personally are on each of the attributes listed."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1-4)</th>
<th>Satisfied (8-10)</th>
<th>Satisfied (5-7)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information or advice from your medical examiner about your medical status</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having ready access to a Medical Examiner</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining a medical certificate in a timely manner</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease in completing the paperwork for each examination</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information or advice from the CAA about your medical status</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the process that medical certification now follows</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being aware of the review options should you disagree with the results of your medical examination</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Pilots, Doctors, Air Traffic Controllers (N=254)

On several issues customers register a very high level of satisfaction. These key strengths of the new medical system are:

"Obtaining a medical certificate in a timely manner."
"Having ready access to a Medical Examiner."
"Obtaining information or advice from your medical examiner about your medical status."

However, in other areas customers are less satisfied. Indeed on two aspects of the system, one in three customers exhibit dissatisfaction.

"Understanding the process the medical certification now follows."
"Being aware of the review options should you disagree with the results of your medical examination."
So while the new system has recognised benefits in terms of access, turnaround and information, there is a level of dissatisfaction caused by ignorance or uncertainty over the processes and customers’ review options. Perhaps this is another aspect that could be included in future CAA News/Vector issues.

There is also a significant difference in rating given to the information customers receive from their medical examiner, compared to the similar rating of CAA information.

### 9.2 Overall Ratings

A series of overall questions were then asked. Doctors, and pilots/air traffic controllers were asked separate questions before a combined overall one.

**Doctors:**

"Using the same scale of 1 to 10, please indicate how satisfied you are with the information you receive from the CAA in terms of it being relevant and useful."

**Pilots/Air Traffic Controllers:**

"Using the same scale of 1 to 10, please indicate how satisfied you are with the information you receive from the CAA’s medical staff under the new medical system in terms of being relevant and useful."

**Overall:**

"And using the same scale, please indicate below how you rate the new medical system overall."

Most customers sit on the fence between 5 and 7, with equal numbers being satisfied and dissatisfied. This ambivalence may well be caused by customers simply feeling uncertain about processes and systems as identified in the specific ratings. Such uncertainty would cause them to give responses around the middle of the scale.
Customers more likely to be satisfied and dissatisfied with the system are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years experience</td>
<td>PPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFT</td>
<td>Wellington/Palmerston North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATPL</td>
<td>Christchurch/Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland/Northland</td>
<td>Other South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato/BOP/Central North Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally respondents were asked to compare the new system to the old one.

"And overall do you believe the new medical system is better than the old system, about the same, or not as good as the old system?"

![Pie chart showing the responses]

- 24% New system better
- 59% About the same
- 18% Old system better

Base: All Pilots, Doctors, Air Traffic Controllers (N=254)

As with the overall measures, opinion is relatively evenly divided over the new system in comparison to the old. Slightly more customers prefer the new system than prefer the old system, but the majority see no real difference.

Again this highlights the need for communication of the benefits, systems and processes of the new system to correct these perceptions.
The Performance Importance Matrix has highlighted the importance of addressing those issues which the CAA’s medical system is currently rated less well on; improving understanding of the process, and making customers aware of their review options. These two attributes are among those that impact the most on overall perceptions of the medical system.

Secondary to this is to focus attention on the information supplied to customers from the CAA itself about customers’ medical status.

Interestingly two of the three attributes on which the CAA medical system performs most strongly are among those that impact the least on overall rating of the system.
10.0 Current and Desired Image Of The CAA

Finally, customers were asked to select from a list of words and phrases, the ones that best described their perceptions of the current CAA.

"Listed below are a series of words and phrases which some people have used to describe the current CAA."

"Please indicate the three or four words and phrases that best describe the current CAA."

Following this, customers were asked to say how they would like the CAA to change.

"Please indicate up to three or four words and phrases which you believe the CAA should improve on in order to improve both its image and the services it provides."

The following chart summarises these two questions, ranking the image attributes in descending order of how the CAA is currently perceived.

Base: All CAA Customers (N=302)
Key strengths of the CAA currently are that it is widely perceived as authoritative, professional and approachable.

However one in two customers perceive it to be bureaucratic, and one in four believe it is pedantic. This reinforces earlier findings that suggested such a perception of the CAA.

Furthermore, few customers rate the CAA positively in terms of:
- Providing feedback
- Transparency
- Reliability
- Practicality
- Responsiveness.

It is in these areas also where the largest proportions of customers would like to see improvements.

However at least one in four would also like to see the CAA become more approachable, helpful, friendly, and experienced and less bureaucratic.

Fewer than one in ten could suggest no improvements to the CAA.
11.0 Profile of Customers

This section aims to describe the profile of CAA customers, however it is limited by sampling considerations and should only be considered indicative. This is because we have no way of guaranteeing that all types of customers have an equal likelihood of participating in this research. This may mean that some types are over-represented while others are under-represented. For instance customers who are more time poor are less likely to take part than those who have more time at their disposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length Of Time In Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 40 years</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland/Northland</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato/BOP/Central North Island</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower North Island</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington/Palmerston North</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch/Canterbury</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson/Marlborough</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other South Island</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Operator</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Owner</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot/Instructor</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer/Engineering Manager</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/General Manager/Managing Director</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Pilot</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Traffic Controller</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>