



SmartGate
Final Report
2005



SmartGate 2 Study, January 2005

Final Report

Prepared for: Australian Customs Service (ACS)
Client Contact: Ellen Brophy (02 6275 8053)
Prepared by: ACNielsen
ACNielsen Contact: Bill Allen (0414 564 117) / Sharon Savage (02) 8873 7841
Date: 4 March 2005
Ref No.: NG1146

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Summary of Findings.....	4
Introduction.....	9
Methodology	10
Survey of Qantas Crew	11
Survey of Qantas Passengers	13
Survey Analysis	15
Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew	17
Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers.....	35

Statement of Professional Commitment

ACNielsen certifies that the information contained in this report has been compiled in accordance with sound market research methodologies developed by, or for, ACNielsen. ACNielsen believes that this report represents a fair, accurate and comprehensive analysis of the information collected, with all sampled information subject to normal statistical variance.

Executive Summary

In December 2004 the Australian Customs Service commissioned ACNielsen to conduct a survey of Qantas crew and selected Qantas passengers to get their views on SmartGate, the automated border processing system using face recognition technology. This extended from a previous study conducted in 2003 to evaluate the SmartGate system. The aim of the current survey was to measure the effectiveness of the SmartGate system for each user group, across both Sydney and Melbourne airports, and identify areas where processes can be improved.

The results of the current study show that enrolled users have a clear preference for SmartGate over the standard manual clearance process. This view was expressed by both key user groups – Qantas crew and passengers.

Few concerns were expressed by either group regarding security or privacy, and a majority of users regard the system as easy and always use SmartGate when entering Australia through Sydney or Melbourne airports. For the minority of users who did experience problems with SmartGate, the main issue for Qantas crew involved the system not being operational at the time of transaction. For enrolled passengers, some difficulties were experienced with the reliability of SmartGate.

Improvements offered by users most commonly included expanding the system to make it more widely available (by increasing the number of kiosks, airports involved, and/or extending the system to outbound flights). Other suggestions involved improving:

- the signage both to direct users towards the SmartGate kiosk when arriving at the airport and to clarify instructions at the kiosk, and
- the reliability to ensure that the kiosk efficiently clears all people who should be cleared.

While learning to use SmartGate is relatively simple, current users recommended that some form of a demonstration is helpful for new users.

Overall, the results of the current study suggest that SmartGate has proved to be an effective system for both current user groups.

Summary of Findings

Methodology There were two components of the study:

1. Qantas Crew: A random sample of Sydney and Melbourne-based Qantas international crew was interviewed face to face at the respective Qantas Centres, over the period 10-21 January 2005. After excluding domestic crew, the overall response rate was high at 71%.

The findings in this report are based on the information supplied by 1,218 Qantas international crew.

2. Selected Qantas Passengers: An online survey invitation was sent to all enrolled Qantas Platinum Frequent Flyer members and those qualifying to enrol but who have not yet done so. The online survey was available to complete from 20 January to 8 February 2005. The overall response rate was 6%. The response rate was higher for enrolled users (57%) than for non-enrolled passengers (4%).

The findings in this report are based on the interim information supplied by 1,478 Qantas passengers.

Continued on next page

Summary of Findings, Continued

Survey Results

Qantas Crew

Enrolment

Nearly nine-tenths (88%) of Sydney-based Qantas international crew have enrolled in SmartGate, and just over half (56%) of Melbourne-based international crew. This varies by gender and age - males were more likely to enrol than females and enrolment increases with age.

The main reasons given by Qantas crew for not enrolling in SmartGate related more to time (not got round to it) than any concerns about SmartGate itself such as perceived advantage, privacy or security.

Most (83%) of those enrolled have been so for 12 months or longer, with the main driver for enrolment being the prospect of faster clearance.

ePassport use

Few Qantas international crew had been issued with an ePassport (11%). Of those holding an ePassport, 33% said that they usually use this service rather than the other kiosk

Frequency of use

Eighty-five percent of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate always use it when entering Australia through Sydney airport.

The main reason for not always using SmartGate related to its reliability – either SmartGate was not working at the time (58%), or previous difficulties with SmartGate had been experienced (31%).

Ease of use

Nine in every ten (90%) of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time rated it as easy to use, 5% rated it as neither easy nor difficult and 5% rated it as difficult.

The main reason for rating it as difficult was due to it not being operational at the time of transaction ('not reliable/not working' - 84%).

Summary of Findings, Continued

Preferred clearance method

On the assumption that SmartGate is reliable, then it is the preferred method of clearance:

- 98% of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that they would prefer to use SmartGate than manual processing when entering or leaving an Australian airport*.
- 88% of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that they would prefer to use SmartGate rather than some other automated processing system or manual processing when entering or leaving an overseas airport*.

Recommended teaching method

Two-thirds (67%) of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that the best way to teach someone how to use SmartGate was a practical demonstration.

Privacy concerns

Only 5% of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate had any privacy concerns with using SmartGate

Suggested improvements

Over half (58%) of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate had suggestions for improving SmartGate. The main suggestions were:

- Improve reliability (54%); and
- Install more gates for peaks (27%).

Awareness of feedback mechanisms

Awareness of any feedback mechanisms to Customs on SmartGate was fairly low with only 8% of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate aware of any such mechanisms.

Continued on next page

* Please note that automated processing (SmartGate) is only presently available for inward processing at Sydney and Melbourne international airports at this time. This type of processing is not currently available for outward processing in Australian international airports.

Summary of Findings, Continued

Survey Results

Qantas Passengers

Enrolment

One in twenty, or 5%, of Frequent Flyer members and those who qualify for enrolment have enrolled in SmartGate.

The main reasons given for not enrolling in SmartGate related to:

- lack of awareness of the system (29%),
- not traveling during the enrolment period (27%), and
- insufficient time (28% not got round to it).

Few respondents indicated any concerns about SmartGate itself such as perceived advantage (1%), privacy (2%) or security (1%).

The majority (63%) of those enrolled have been so for two months or more, with the prospect of faster clearance being the main reason for participating.

Frequency of use

Three-quarters (75%) of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate always use it when entering Australia through Sydney or Melbourne airports.

The main reasons for not always using SmartGate related to the length of queues at the kiosk and the reliability of the service (it was not working at the time). The main reason for never using SmartGate, was one of time – in not having got around to it yet.

Ease of use

Almost nine-tenths (89%) of passengers who use SmartGate at least some of the time rated it as easy to use, 8% rated it as neither easy nor difficult and 4% rated it as difficult.

In the small number of respondents who had experienced difficulty with the SmartGate system, the main reason related to technical problems (“it didn’t work” or their passport was not recognized).

Continued on next page

Summary of Findings, Continued

Preferred clearance method

For those passengers who use SmartGate at least some of the time, 99% said they would prefer to use SmartGate than manual processing when entering or leaving an Australian airport*.

When given the option of manual processing, SmartGate, or some other automated system, 93% of these passengers would prefer SmartGate when entering or leaving an overseas airport.

Recommended teaching method

Nearly half of the passengers currently using SmartGate first learnt to use the system from a Customs officer (49%), with a third of users (32%) reading the “how to use” card.

The majority (56%) of passengers using SmartGate said that the best way to teach someone how to use the system involved some form of demonstration - 39% supported using a practical demonstration and 17% for a video demonstration. A quarter of users (26%) also supported the use of “How to use” cards or brochures.

Privacy concerns

Only 3% of passengers enrolled in SmartGate had any privacy concerns with using SmartGate.

Suggested improvements

A third (33%) of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate had suggestions for improving SmartGate. Commonly reported suggestions included improvements to signage and instructions, and requests to widen the availability of the service to other airports and to outbound flights.

Awareness of feedback mechanisms

Awareness of any feedback mechanisms to Customs on SmartGate was low - only 10% of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate were aware of any such mechanisms.

* Please note that automated processing (SmartGate) is only presently available for inward processing at Sydney and Melbourne international airports at this time. This type of processing is not currently available for outward processing in Australian international airports.

Introduction

In December 2004 the Australian Customs Service commissioned ACNielsen to conduct a survey evaluating the SmartGate system, an automated border processing system which uses face recognition technology.

The SmartGate system involves a process requiring less than ten seconds to perform all necessary image verification and customs/immigration checks, allowing enrolled travellers to pass through Customs quickly, while maintaining a high level of security. The system uses face recognition technology to undertake the face-to-passport check usually undertaken by a Customs officer, and compares a live image taken at the Customs control point against one or more stored images of that same person.

An initial trial of SmartGate was run in November 2002 for enrolled Qantas aircrew operating on international flights arriving at Sydney International Airport. Enrolment for SmartGate was entirely voluntary. An evaluation of the system was then conducted by ACNielsen in June 2003, involving Qantas crew in Sydney airport. The study concluded that SmartGate was an effective system, preferred by the vast majority of Qantas international crew surveyed. Few concerns were expressed regarding privacy or security, with suggested improvements focused on increasing the reliability of the system and refining the gate mechanism.

Since the July 2003 evaluation, several developments with SmartGate have occurred including the expansion of the system to Melbourne airport, inclusion of specific types of passengers in a trial, and the introduction of a prototype Australian ePassport.

Following these changes, the current study aimed to measure how effective SmartGate is now operating, and in particular identify areas, from a user's perspective, where the process can be improved.

This report details the findings from the SmartGate Survey conducted at the Qantas Centres at Sydney and Melbourne airports, over the period 10-21 January 2005; and the online survey results of selected Qantas passengers over the period 20 January to 8 February 2005.

Methodology

Target Groups

The scope of the survey included

- all Qantas international crew based in Sydney and Melbourne; and
- certain groups of Qantas passengers
 - o Qantas Platinum Frequent Flyers,
 - o Chairman’s Club members,
 - o Qantas First Class passengers.

The total population included 6,304 crew (4,224 cabin crew and 2,080 flight crew) and 23,964 passengers.

Given the two separate groups to be surveyed, the study was divided into two sections: a survey of Qantas crew using a face to face intercept methodology, and a survey of certain Qantas passenger groups using an online survey.

Qantas Crew:	Face to face interviews at Sydney and Melbourne airport
Qantas Passengers:	Online survey sent to all eligible Frequent Flyer members

Each of these survey components are described in separate sections below.

Survey of Qantas Crew

Sample Design

The sample design was a random sample of Qantas crew stratified by

1. type of crew – cabin or flight operations, and
2. geographic location – Sydney or Melbourne.

Although the design initially also sought to distinguish between type of SmartGate user (i.e MRZ SmartGate or ePassport), this was not feasible given the low proportion of ePassport users.

A total of 1,218 interviews were completed. A breakdown of these by crew type and location is provided below. This design was considered to be the most efficient to ensure analysis could be conducted at the location level and the type of crew level while not significantly reducing the accuracy of estimates for the total population.

	Sydney airport	Melbourne airport	Total
Cabin crew	397	354	751
Flight crew	352	115	467
Total	749	469	1,218

Questionnaire Design

The survey instrument was a modified version of the questionnaire used in the 2003 ACNielsen study. Draft questionnaires were provided to Customs for comments prior to being finalised.

The broad content of the questionnaire is:

- Crew characteristics – type of crew, frequency of entry to Australia, age, education and sex.
- Crew not enrolled in SmartGate – why not enrolled.
- Crew enrolled in SmartGate – duration of enrolment, main reason enrolled, frequency of use, ease of use, suggested improvements and awareness of feedback mechanisms.

Continued on next page

Survey of Qantas Crew, Continued

Fieldwork	Interviewing commenced on Monday 10 January 2005 and was completed on Friday 21 January 2005. A total of 1,218 interviews were completed and the average interview length was less than 5 minutes. The findings in this report are based on the information supplied by these 1,218 respondents.
Response Rates	The overall response rate was high at 71%. The response rate is the number of completed interviews divided by the number of in scope crew. The overall refusal rate was 29%. The refusal rate is the number of refusals divided by the number of in scope crew. Note however, that several crew were recorded as refusals in Melbourne when they had completed the survey in Sydney. As a result the true response rate is higher. Other reasons for refusing related to time limitations.
Interviewers and Training	All ACNielsen interviewers are trained in basic interviewing procedures. In addition, all interviewers used for the SmartGate survey were specially trained on how to administer the questionnaire for this study.
Weighting	The survey data was weighted by type of crew member (cabin or flight) and location (Sydney or Melbourne) to the total population of each group. The population counts were supplied by Qantas. The weight was the population count for the relevant cell divided by the responding sample size for that cell.

Survey of Qantas Passengers

Sample Design

Rather than a sample, all Qantas Platinum Frequent Flyers, Chairman's Club members and Qantas First Class passengers as of 24 December 2004 were invited to participate.

A total of 1,478 questionnaires were completed, with a further 414 surveys partially completed.

Questionnaire Design

The survey instrument was developed in consultation with Customs, and included similar questions to the Qantas Crew questionnaire. Draft questionnaires were provided to Customs for comments prior to being finalised.

The broad content of the questionnaire is:

- Passenger characteristics – type of passenger, age, education and sex.
- Passengers not enrolled in SmartGate – why not enrolled.
- Passengers enrolled in SmartGate – frequency of entry to Australia, duration of enrolment, main reason enrolled, frequency of use, ease of use, suggested improvements and awareness of feedback mechanisms.

Fieldwork

The online survey commenced on Thursday 20 January 2005 and was completed on Tuesday 8 February 2005.

Email invitations for the survey were arranged and sent to all eligible Frequent Flyer members by Qantas. For those passengers identified as current "users" of the system, Qantas issued an "enrolled" version of the email invitation. The remaining passengers who qualified to enrol for SmartGate but who have not yet done so, received a "non-enrolled" version of the email invitation. Both users and non-users completed the same questionnaire.

A total of 1,478 surveys were completed and the average duration to complete the survey was 4 minutes.

The findings in this report are based on the information supplied by these 1,478 respondents.

Continued on next page

Survey of Qantas Passengers, Continued

Response Rates

The overall response rate was low at 6%. The **response rate** is the number of completed questionnaires divided by the number of passengers who received the email invitation to participate. However, the response rate was higher for enrolled users (57%) than for non-enrolled passengers (4%).

A further 2% of respondents partially completing the survey. No response was received from the remaining 92% of emailed members.

Weighting

The survey data was weighted to the total population of Qantas Platinum Frequent Flyers, Chairman's Club members and Qantas First Class passengers who were sent an invitation via email. The population counts were supplied by Qantas.

The weight was the population count for the relevant cell divided by the responding sample size for that cell.

Survey Analysis

Standard Errors

Significance limits for this survey are defined as twice the relative standard error, which corresponds to a 95% confidence interval for the results. This means that, if the survey were repeated, the results found would fall within a certain band either side of the original results, depending on the sample size.

Set out in the table below are the estimates of significance. We have used the Simple Random Sample (SRS) formulae for the calculation of variances, ie. $p(1-p)/n$, where p is an estimate from the survey expressed as a proportion and n is the sample size that p is based on (see example below). Note that the significance limits relate to the sample size on which an estimated proportion is based.

As an example of the use of this table, the proportion of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate who said that overall it was easy to use was estimated to be 90% and was based on a sample of 868 respondents. The corresponding proportion in the table is 0.9 and the closest sample size is 800. Where 0.9 and 800 intersect gives a significance limit of 2%. That is, we are 95% sure that the true value is 90% +/- 2% or between 88% and 92%.

SIGNIFICANCE LIMITS

Proportion of sample	Sample size (n)							
	1,000	800	500	400	300	200	100	50
0.9	2	2	3%	3%	3%	4%	6%	8%
0.8	2	3	4%	4%	5%	6%	8%	11%
0.7	3	3	4%	5%	5%	6%	9%	13%
0.6	3	3	4%	5%	6%	7%	10%	14%
0.5	3	3	4	5%	6%	7%	10%	14%
0.4	3	3	4	5%	6%	7%	10%	14%
0.3	3	3	4	5%	5%	6%	9%	13%
0.2	2	3	4	4%	5%	6%	8%	11%
0.1	2	2	3	3%	3%	4%	6%	8%

Continued on next page

Survey Analysis, Continued

If you wish to compare two estimates in the survey then the difference between two estimates (say, p_1 and p_2) is significantly different if:

$$p_2 - p_1 > 2 [\text{square root } (p_2(1-p_2)/n_2 + p_1(1-p_1)/n_1)]$$

As an example, the proportion of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate was estimated to be 88% for Sydney crew (p_1) and was based on a sample of 749 (n_1). The proportion of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate was estimated to be 56% for Melbourne crew (p_2) and was based on a sample of 469 (n_2). The difference ($p_2 - p_1 = 22\%$) is significantly different if:

$$22\% > 2[\text{square root}(0.88 \times 0.12/469 + 0.56 \times 0.44/749)] = 0.047 \text{ or } 5\%$$

Therefore the difference is significantly different.

Note that such tests of significance have to be done on a case by case basis as it depends on the estimates and the corresponding sample sizes that each estimate is based on. In this report differences are noted where they are statistically significant.

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew

Profile of Qantas Crew

A range of background details was collected from Qantas crew in order to better understand their characteristics and to assist in data analysis.

In January 2005, there were 5,287 Qantas crew on international flights and based in Sydney and 1,017 Qantas crew on international flights based in Melbourne. Key characteristics of the crew were:

- 67% were cabin crew and 33% were flight operations crew;
- 65% were male;
- 30% were under 35 years of age, 37% were 35-44 years and 34% were 45 years or more;
- 71% had a post school qualification; and
- 61% were being cleared by Customs at Sydney airport 3 or more times a month (Table 1.1A).

The main differences between cabin crew and flight operations crew are that cabin crew are more likely to be:

- Female (51% compared with 2%); and
- Cleared by Customs at Sydney or Melbourne airport 3 or more times per month (68% compared with 47%).

The main differences between Sydney and Melbourne crew are that Sydney crew are more likely to:

- Have a greater proportion of older crew (36% aged 45 years or more compared with 24%);
- be cleared by Customs at Sydney or Melbourne airport 3 or more times per month (63% compared with 45%) (Table 1.1B).

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

TABLE 1.1A. QANTAS CREW (a): SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF CREW, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Characteristics of crew</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=1218)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=751)	<i>Flight</i> (n=467)	
Sex			
Male	49	98	65
Female	51	2	35
Age group (years)			
Under 25	2	4	3
25-34	29	22	27
35-44	38	33	37
45-54	25	24	24
55 and over	6	16	10
Education			
Degree	37	37	37
Diploma	19	29	19
Certificate/trade	14	16	15
Highest level secondary school	27	27	27
Did not complete secondary school	1	<1	1
Frequency of entry to Australia per month			
2 times or less	32	53	39
3-5 times	58	42	53
6 or more times	10	5	8
Total	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

TABLE 1.1B. QANTAS CREW (a): SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BY LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Characteristics of crew</i>	<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=1218)
	<i>Sydney</i> (n=749)	<i>Melb</i> (n=469)	
Sex			
Male	86	80	84
Female	14	20	16
Age group (years)			
Under 25	3	3	3
25-34	27	27	27
35-44	35	46	37
45-54	25	19	24
55 and over	11	5	10
Education			
Degree	38	34	37
Diploma	19	17	19
Certificate/trade	15	14	15
Highest level secondary school	26	32	27
Did not complete secondary school	1	3	1
Frequency of entry to Australia per month			
2 times or less	37	52	39
3-5 times	55	38	53
6 or more times	8	10	8
Total	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Enrolment in SmartGate Nearly nine-tenths (88%) of Sydney-based Qantas international crew have enrolled in SmartGate, and just over half (56%) of Melbourne-based international crew. Cabin and flight crew were equally likely to have enrolled (Table 1.2).

Enrolment varies by location, age and sex:

- Sydney crew were more likely to enrol than Melbourne crew – 88% compared with 56%.
- Enrolment increases with respondent age from 76% for those aged under 35 years to 85% for those aged 45 years or more.
- Males were more likely to enrol than females -84% compared with 79%.

TABLE 1.2 QANTAS CREW (a): SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005
(Per cent)

<i>Enrolment status</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=1218)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=751)	<i>Flight</i> (n=467)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=749)	<i>Melb</i> (n=469)	
Enrolled	83	82	88	56	83
Not enrolled	17	18	12	44	17
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Crew not enrolled

The main reasons given by Qantas crew for not enrolling in SmartGate was that they had not got round to it (reported by 42% of crew). A further 10% of crew indicated they were not aware of the SmartGate system (Table 1.3).

Few concerns were raised regarding SmartGate:

- 5% indicated privacy concerns;
- 2% indicated concerns with security.

However 7% reported having experienced problems in the enrolling process.

A third (35%) of crew provided other verbatim reasons for not enrolling

Reasons for not enrolling were generally similar between cabin and flight crew although cabin crew were more likely than flight crew to say they were unaware of the system (13% compared with 4%). Flight crew were more likely than cabin crew to travel as domestic crew (15% compared with 4%), and also more likely not to perceive an advantage with the system (12% compared with 1%).

Reasons for not enrolling were also generally similar between Sydney and Melbourne based crew, although Melbourne crew were more likely to say they were unaware of the system (18% compared with 5%), and to travel mostly as domestic crew (13% compared with 5%). Sydney crew were more likely than Melbourne crew to report flying through other airports as a reason for not enrolling (16% compared with 1%).

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

TABLE 1.3 QANTAS CREW NOT ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): MAIN REASONS NOT ENROLLED BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 05 (Per cent)

<i>Reasons not enrolled</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total (n=309)</i>
	<i>Cabin (n=218)</i>	<i>Flight (n=91)</i>	<i>Sydney (n=96)</i>	<i>Melb (n=213)</i>	
Not got round to it	39	47	45	38	42
Didn't know about the system	13	4	5	18	10
Usually fly through another airport	9	12	16	1	10
Mostly travel as domestic crew	4	15	5	13	8
Problem with enrolment process	7	8	5	10	7
Privacy concerns	7	2	7	2	5
No perceived advantage	1	12	3	6	4
Did not know could still enrol	4	1	2	5	3
Security concerns	2	0	3	0	2
Waiting to see if it works	0	4	2	0	1
Prefer to deal with a person	<1	0	0	<1	<1
Other	34	37	39	29	35
Don't know	<1	5	3	<1	2

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Duration of enrolment

Most (83%) Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate have been enrolled for 12 months or more (Table 1.4).

Duration of enrolment was higher for Sydney based crew than for Melbourne crew (with 88% of Sydney crew having enrolled for 12 months or more, compared with 40% of Melbourne crew).

Duration of enrolment also varied by:

- gender (males more likely to report having enrolled for over 6 months - 93% compared with 88%).
- age (enrolment periods of 12 months and over were indicated by 72% of those aged under 35 years to 84% for those aged 35-44 years, to 91% for those 45 years or more).

TABLE 1.4 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): DURATION OF ENROLMENT BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Duration of enrolment</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=909)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=533)	<i>Flight</i> (n=376)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=653)	<i>Melb</i> (n=256)	
Less than one month	2	2	1	9	2
1 month	2	1	1	7	1
2-3 months	3	2	1	24	3
4-5 months	3	1	2	10	2
6-11 months	9	5	8	10	8
12 months or more	81	88	88	40	83
Not sure	<1	1	<1	0	<1
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Main reasons enrolled Most (89%) Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate because they thought that Customs clearance would be quicker than manual processing (Table 1.5).

TABLE 1.5 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): MAIN REASONS FOR ENROLMENT BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Main reasons for enrolment</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=909)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=533)	<i>Flight</i> (n=376)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=653)	<i>Melb</i> (n=256)	
Quicker clearance	88	92	89	94	89
Interested in technology	5	4	5	5	5
Thought it was compulsory	6	2	5	4	5
Ease of enrolment	3	5	4	<1	4
Way of the future	3	2	3	4	3
Better security	1	1	1	2	1
Other	8	6	7	8	7

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

ePassport user

Only 11% of crew enrolled in SmartGate have currently been issued with an ePassport (Table 1.6)¹. ePassport holders are more likely to be:

- based in Sydney than in Melbourne (12% compared with 2%), and
- cabin crew rather than flight crew (14% compared with 6%).

Of those crew issued with an ePassport, one third (33%) said that they usually use the ePassport kiosk in preference to the other kiosk.

TABLE 1.6 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO HAVE AN EPASSPORT(a): BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Issued with an ePassport</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=909)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=533)	<i>Flight</i> (n=376)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=653)	<i>Melb</i> (n=256)	
Yes	14	6	12	2	11
No	86	94	88	98	89
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

¹ Note that ePassports were being issued during the period of interviewing (according to advice provided by Qantas). As a result, increases in the number of ePassport holders are likely to have occurred since interviews were conducted.

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Frequency of use

Eighty-five percent of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate always use it when entering Australia through Sydney or Melbourne airports (Table 1.7).

A small proportion (4%) indicated they never use it. Reasons provided for never using SmartGate included difficulties with the system (“doesn’t work/won’t clear me – 52%) and crew not having got around to using it yet (10%).

Of those crew who said that they used SmartGate sometimes but not all of the time, the main reasons for not using it all the time were:

- it was not working at the time (58%);
- previous difficulties (31%); and
- there were longer queues at the kiosk (15%).

An additional 29% of these crew provided verbatim responses

TABLE 1.7 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): HOW OFTEN USE SMARTGATE BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Frequency of use</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=909)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=533)	<i>Flight</i> (n=376)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=653)	<i>Melb</i> (n=256)	
Always	88	81	85	88	85
Most of the time	3	10	6	4	5
Half of the time	1	1	1	<1	1
Sometimes	<1	1	1	0	1
Rarely	4	3	4	0	3
Never	4	4	4	8	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Ease of use When asked how easy SmartGate was to use, 90% of Qantas crew who use the system at least some of the time rated it as easy, 5% rated it as neither easy nor difficult and 5% rated it as difficult (Table 1.8).

The main reason for rating it as difficult was due to it not being operational at the time of transaction ('not reliable/not working' - 84%). A further 6% indicated that there were not enough gates/kiosks.

TABLE 1.8 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): EASE OF USE BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Ease of use</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=510)	<i>Flight</i> (n=358)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=631)	<i>Melb</i> (n=237)	
Easy	89	91	91	83	90
Neither easy nor difficult	5	6	5	11	5
Difficult	5	4	5	6	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Preferred method of clearance

Assuming that SmartGate was reliable, then almost all (98%) Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that they would prefer to use SmartGate than manual processing when entering or leaving an Australian airport* (Table 1.9).

TABLE 1.9 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): PREFERRED METHOD OF CLEARANCE IN AUSTRALIA BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Preferred method of clearance in Australia</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=868)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=510)	<i>Flight</i> (n=358)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=631)	<i>Melb</i> (n=237)	
SmartGate	98	98	98	95	98
Manual processing	2	1	1	3	1
Depends on airport	<1	<1	<1	1	<1
Depends on whether inwards or outwards	<1	0	0	1	<1
Not sure	<1	<1	<1	1	<1
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

* Please note that automated processing (SmartGate) is only presently available for inward processing at Sydney and Melbourne international airports at this time. This type of processing is not currently available for outward processing in Australian international airports.

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

The majority (88%) of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that they would prefer to use SmartGate rather than some other automated processing system or a manual processing when entering or leaving an overseas airport* (Table 1.10).

TABLE 1.10 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): PREFERRED METHOD OF CLEARANCE OVERSEAS BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Preferred method of clearance overseas</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=510)	<i>Flight</i> (n=358)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=631)	<i>Melb</i> (n=237)	
SmartGate	87	90	88	88	88
Other automated processing	5	6	6	5	6
Manual processing	1	1	1	2	1
Depends on airport	1	1	1	2	1
Not sure	5	2	4	2	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Learning to use SmartGate

Half (50%) of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said they first learned how to use SmartGate from a demonstration by a Customs officer. A further 21% said they worked it out themselves from instructions provided at the kiosk, and 20% said another Qantas crew member showed them (Table 1.11).

Cabin crew were more likely than flight crew to have first learned to use SmartGate from a Customs officer (53% compared with 43%) and less likely to have learned by working it out themselves (19% compared with 26%).

Sydney based crew were more likely to have learned the system themselves, using the instructions at the kiosk than Melbourne based crew (22% compared with 9%)

TABLE 1.11 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): HOW FIRST LEARNED TO USE SMARTGATE BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005
(Per cent)

<i>How first learned to use SmartGate</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=510)	<i>Flight</i> (n=358)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=631)	<i>Melb</i> (n=237)	
Customs officer demonstrated	53	43	50	53	50
Worked it out themselves/ instructions on kiosk	19	26	22	9	21
Other crew showed me	21	19	21	18	20
Read the "how to use" card	5	8	6	8	6
Brochure in mailbox	4	10	5	15	6
Watched the video	3	1	3	1	2
Other	3	1	2	5	2

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Recommended Teaching Method The majority (67%) of Qantas crew who use SmartGate at least some of the time said that the best way to teach someone how to use SmartGate was via a practical demonstration (Table 1.12).

TABLE 1.12 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): BEST TEACHING METHOD FOR SMARTGATE BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Best way to learn how to use SmartGate</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=868)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=510)	<i>Flight</i> (n=358)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=631)	<i>Melb</i> (n=237)	
Practical demonstration	65	70	66	74	67
Follow instructions on kiosk	15	12	15	9	14
How to use card/brochure	7	10	8	9	8
Watch a video demonstration	9	5	8	6	8
Other	3	3	3	2	3
	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights. (b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Privacy concerns

Only 5% of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate had any privacy concerns with using SmartGate (Table 1.13).

TABLE 1.13 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): PRIVACY CONCERNS BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005
(Per cent)

<i>Privacy concerns</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=909)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=533)	<i>Flight</i> (n=376)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=653)	<i>Melb</i> (n=256)	
Yes	5	5	5	4	5
No	95	95	95	96	95
Total	100	100	100	100	100

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Suggestions for improvement

Just over half (58%) of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate had suggestions for improving SmartGate. The main suggestions were:

- Improve reliability (54%); and
- Install more gates for peaks (27%) (Table 1.14).

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

TABLE 1.14. QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO HAD SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING SMARTGATE(a): SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Suggestions for improvement</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total</i> (n=522)
	<i>Cabin</i> (n=310)	<i>Flight</i> (n=212)	<i>Sydney</i> (n=387)	<i>Melb</i> (n=135)	
Improve reliability	60	42	54	50	54
Install more gates for peaks	24	34	28	19	27
Widen gate	10	16	12	9	12
Slow down gate closing time	6	11	8	4	7
Expand to other airports	4	3	4	2	4
Other	22	27	22	33	23

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 1 Qantas Crew, Continued

Awareness of feedback mechanisms Only 8% of Qantas crew enrolled in SmartGate were aware of any mechanisms by which they could provide feedback to Customs on SmartGate (Table 1.15).

TABLE 1.15 QANTAS CREW ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): AWARENESS OF FEEDBACK MECHANISMS BY TYPE OF CREW AND LOCATION, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Feedback mechanisms aware of</i>	<i>Type of crew</i>		<i>Location</i>		<i>Total (n=909)</i>
	<i>Cabin (n=533)</i>	<i>Flight (n=376)</i>	<i>Sydney (n=653)</i>	<i>Melb (n=256)</i>	
Customs officer at manual line	5	8	5	11	6
Customs Complaints and Compliments service	1	1	1	3	1
SmartGate email address	1	2	1	1	1
Customers officer at enrolment	1	1	<1	4	1
Other	1	1	1	2	1
None	92	91	93	81	92

(a) Sydney and Melbourne based crew on international flights.

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers

Profile of selected Qantas Passengers

A range of background details were collected from Frequent Flyer Qantas passengers partaking in the online survey in order to better understand their characteristics and to assist in data analysis.

In January 2005, there were 23,964 Qantas passengers eligible for enrolment in the SmartGate system. At this time, 1,137 passengers were identified as 'users', with the remaining not currently enrolled.

Of those passengers who responded, key characteristics were:

- 83% were male;
- 8% were under 35 years of age, 24% were 35-44 years and 68% were 45 years or more; and
- 89% had a post school qualification (Table 2.1).

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

TABLE 2.1 QANTAS PASSENGERS (a): SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PASSENGERS, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Characteristics of crew</i>	Total (n=1218)
Sex	
Male	83
Female	17
Age group (years)	
Under 25	<1
25-34	8
35-44	24
45-54	37
55 and over	31
Education	
Degree	70
Diploma	12
Certificate/trade	7
Highest level secondary school	8
Did not complete secondary school	2
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

(b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Enrolment in SmartGate

Currently one in twenty, or 5%, of Qantas Frequent Flyer passengers who qualify for enrolment have enrolled in SmartGate (Table 2.2).

TABLE 2.2 QANTAS PASSENGERS (a) ENROLMENT STATUS, JANUARY 2005
(Per cent)

<i>Enrolment status</i>	Total <i>(n=1478)</i>
Enrolled	5
Not enrolled	92
Not sure	3
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Passengers not enrolled

The main reasons given for not enrolling in SmartGate related to:

- lack of awareness of the system (29%),
- not traveling during the enrolment period (27%), and
- to time limitation (28% not got round to it).

Few respondents indicated any concerns about SmartGate itself such as perceived advantage (1%), privacy (2%) or security (1%) (Table 2.3).

TABLE 2.3 QANTAS PASSENGERS NOT ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): MAIN REASONS NOT ENROLLED, JANUARY 2005
(Per cent)

<i>Reasons not enrolled</i>	Total (n=807)
Didn't know about the system	29
Not got around to it	28
Was not travelling during the enrolment period	27
Was not available when I was flying	10
Not eligible/not an Australian citizen	4
Problem with enrolment process	2
Privacy concerns	2
No perceived advantage	1
Security concerns	1
Waiting to see if it works	1
Prefer to deal with a person	1
Other	17

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Duration of enrolment

The majority (63%) of those passengers enrolled have been so for two months or more (Table 2.4).

TABLE 2.4. QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): LENGTH OF TIME PARTICIPATING, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Length of time participating</i>	Total (n=646)
Less than one month	7
1 month	29
2 months or more	63
Not sure	1
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Main reasons for participating

Almost all (96%) Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate chose to participate in the trial for the prospect of quicker clearance through Customs (Table 2.5). Just under half (42%) also indicated that they chose to participate as they saw SmartGate as the way of the future.

TABLE 2.5. QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): MAIN REASONS FOR PARTICIPATION, JANUARY 2005 (per cent)

<i>Main reasons for participating</i>	Total (n=646)
Quicker clearance	96
Way of the future	42
Interested in technology	29
Ease of enrolment	24
Better security	15
Other	1

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Frequency of use

Three-quarters (75%) of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate always use it when entering Australia through Sydney or Melbourne airports (Table 2.6).

Only 8% of enrolled Qantas passengers indicated that they never use the SmartGate system. The main reason for never using it was time (36% said they had not got around to it yet). A high proportion (66%) of verbatim responses were also provided

A small proportion (16%) said that they used SmartGate sometimes but not all the time. The main reasons for not always using SmartGate related to the length of queues at the kiosk (18%) and the reliability of the service (18% said it was not working at the time). A further 10% had experienced difficulties with SmartGate previously. Additional verbatim responses were provided by 63% of these crew

TABLE 2.6. QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): HOW OFTEN USE SMARTGATE, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Frequency of use</i>	Total (n=646)
Always	75
Most of the time	9
Half of the time	2
Sometimes	4
Rarely	1
Never	8
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

(b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Ease of use

Qantas passengers were asked how easy it was to use the SmartGate system. Almost nine-tenths (89%) of passengers who use SmartGate at least some of the time rated it as easy to use, 8% rated it as neither easy nor difficult and 4% rated it as difficult (Table 2.7).

In the small number of respondents who had experienced difficulty with the SmartGate system, the main area of concern related to technical problems (“it didn’t work” or their passport was not recognized).

TABLE 2.7 QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): EASE OF USE, JANUARY 2005 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Ease of use</i>	Total (n=593)
Easy	89
Neither easy nor difficult	8
Difficult	4
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

(b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Preferred method of clearance

Assuming that SmartGate was reliable, virtually all (99%) of passengers who use SmartGate at least some of the time, said they would prefer to use SmartGate than manual processing when entering or leaving an Australian airport* (Table 2.8).

TABLE 2.8 QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): PREFERRED METHOD OF CLEARANCE IN AUSTRALIA, JANUARY 2005 (b) (Per cent)

<i>Preferred method of clearance in Australia</i>	Total (n=593)
SmartGate	99
Manual processing	<1
Depends on airport	<1
Depends on whether inbound or outbound	<1
Not sure	<1
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

(b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Again, almost all (93%) of these passengers, when given the option of manual processing, SmartGate, or some other automated system, would prefer SmartGate when entering or leaving an overseas airport (Table 2.9).

Continued on next page

* Please note that automated processing (SmartGate) is only presently available for inward processing at Sydney and Melbourne international airports at this time. This type of processing is not currently available for outward processing in Australian international airports.

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

TABLE 2.9 QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): PREFERRED METHOD OF CLEARANCE OVERSEAS, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Preferred method of clearance overseas</i>	Total (n=593)
SmartGate	93
Other automated processing	1
Manual processing	1
Depends on airport	4
Not sure	1
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Privacy concerns

Only 3% of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate had any privacy concerns with using SmartGate (Table 2.10).

TABLE 2.10 QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE(a): PRIVACY CONCERNS, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>Privacy concerns</i>	Total (n=646)
Yes	3
No	97
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Learning to use SmartGate

Half of the passengers (49%) currently using SmartGate first learnt to use the system from a Customs officer, with a third of users (32%) reading the “how to use” card (Table 2.11). A further 19% watched a video demonstration, while 15% learned the system by working it out themselves.

TABLE 2.11. QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): HOW FIRST LEARNED TO USE SMARTGATE, JANUARY 2005 (Per cent)

<i>How first learned to use SmartGate</i>	Total (n=593)
Customs officer demonstrated at enrolment	49
Read the “how to use” card	32
Watched the video	19
Worked it out myself/instructions on kiosk	15
Brochure in mailbox	8
Other users told/showed me	4
Customs Internet site	2
Other	19

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

Recommended teaching method

The majority (56%) of passengers using SmartGate said that the best way to teach someone how to use the system involved some form of demonstration - 39% supported using a practical demonstration and 17% for a video demonstration. A quarter of users (26%) also supported the use of “How to use” cards or brochures (Table 2.12).

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

TABLE 2.12 QANTAS PASSENGERS ENROLLED IN SMARTGATE WHO USE IT AT LEAST SOME OF THE TIME(a): BEST TEACHING METHOD FOR SMARTGATE, JANUARY 05 (b)
(Per cent)

<i>Best way to learn how to use SmartGate</i>	Total (n=593)
Practical demonstration	39
How to use card/brochure	26
Watch a video demonstration	17
Follow instructions on kiosk	16
Other	1
Total	100

(a) Frequent Flyer members eligible for enrolment in SmartGate.

(b) Table components may not add to 100 due to rounding

Continued on next page

Survey Results: 2 Qantas Passengers, Continued

Suggestions for improvement

A third (33%) of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate had suggestions for improving system. Commonly reported suggestions included:

- improvements to signage and instructions, and
- requests to widen the availability of the service to other airports and to outbound flights.

Awareness of feedback mechanisms

Awareness of any feedback mechanisms to Customs on SmartGate was low, with only 10% of Qantas passengers enrolled in SmartGate aware of any such mechanisms.
