



EUROPEAN ORGANISATION
THE SAFETY OF AIR NAVIGATION

EAD Client Satisfaction Survey 2016 Report ANNEXES

Patrick.robbins@eurocontrol.int

OWNER Peter

[Sponsor]

BAIM GEN. client satisfaction survey 2016
Annex

CLASSIFICATION

Copyright Notice

Version: {_UIVersionString}
Last Approved Date: {Last Approved Date}

© 2017 European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL).
 All rights reserved.
 No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of EUROCONTROL.

Quality Review

AUTHORITY
Quality Manager P. Robbins

Approval Table

AUTHORITY
EAIM Customer Manager E. Dettwiller (author)
Head of EAIM Peter Matern (owner)
Head of NMD/NS Pascal Dias (sponsor)

Document Identification

Full Title:	EAD Client Satisfaction Survey 2016 ANNEX
Total Number of Pages:	23
Status	Active
Edition Number and approval date	Version: {_UIVersionString} Last Approved Date: {Last Approved Date}

Distribution

CopyNo/ Email	Name/Email Address	Role	Organisation
		EAIM Section	
		SQSM	

Edition History - See sharepoint

CONTENTS

1. ANNEX 1: SERVICE CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RESULTS.....	5
2. ANNEX 2: COMMENTS.....	13

1. ANNEX 1: SERVICE CATEGORIES, QUESTIONS AND RESULTS

Service		ID	Question	Results	
General		1	Please provide your details	-	
		2	What type of EAD Agreement do you currently have in place?	-	
			EAD Agreement for Data Providers (or former Data Provider Agreement)	51,2%	
			EAD Agreement for Data Users (or former Data User Agreement)	39,0%	
			EAD Developer Agreement	2,4%	
			Other (please specify)	7,3%	
		3	What best describes the activities of your organisation?		
			CAA	4,5%	
			ANSP	50,0%	
			Aircraft Operator	13,6%	
			Airport	0,0%	
			Military	4,5%	
			Commercial	21,6%	
		Other (please specify)	5,7%		
Datasets	SDO	4	Which subsystem(s) are you using mostly during your daily work?		
			SDO ~ Static Data in AIXM format	59,3%	
			INO ~ NOTAM information	65,9%	
			PAMS ~ AIP Library	58,5%	
			Briefing Facility (for ARO only)	22,0%	
			Chart Production Tool (for Data Providers only)	9,8%	
			AIP Production Tool (for Data Providers only)	16,3%	
			Not yet using any of the above systems, in the progress of connecting	1,6%	
		5	Have you used SDO Data?		
			Never	25,6%	
			Occasionally	29,1%	
		6	Frequently		45,3%
				What data format are you using when working with SDO Data?	
				AIXM 4.5	85,3%
		AIXM 5.1	14,7%		
		7	When you have used SDO Data, was the content:		
			Updated on time?	5,21	
			Correct?	4,97	
			Complete?	4,65	

Datasets	SDO	8	Did the data meet your operational requirements?	4,82
		9	How do you rate the operational and technical documentation for SDO (handbook, SIGMA etc.)?	3,69
		10	How do you overall rate SDO?	3,64
		11	Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the SDO Static Data in EAD, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments
	INO	12	Have you used INO Data?	
			Never	32,4%
			Occasionally	14,3%
			Frequently	53,3%
		13	What type of PIB do you generate usually when using INO?	
			Aerodrome PIB	26,7%
			Area PIB	18,3%
			Special Area PIB	1,7%
			Route PIB	16,7%
			Narrow Route PIB	28,3%
		14	Admin PIB	8,3%
			When you have used INO Data - looking for NOTAM, generating PIB etc.	
			Was the content of the database up to date?	5,36
			Was the information correct?	5,45
			Was the data complete?	5,27
		15	Was the generated PIB complete?	5,39
			When using dedicated PIB functions, how would you rate:	
	Profile Management		3,9	
	Schedule Management		3,89	
	16	PIB History function	3,96	
		How do you overall rate INO?	3,95	
		17	Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the NOTAM information in EAD INO, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments
	PAMS	18	Have you used PAMS information?	
Never			23,2%	
Occasionally			28,3%	
Frequently			48,5%	
19		When you have used PAMS information:		
		Did you find the publications you were looking for?	5,27	
		Was the content of the PAMS database up to date?	5,2	

Datasets	PAMS		Were the publications correct?	5,25	
		20	How was the quality / readability of the PDF files?	4,53	
		21	How was the quality of the HTML pages of the eAIP?	4,25	
		22	How do you overall rate PAMS?	4,33	
EAD Pro Applications	BF ARO	23	Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the AIP Information in EAD PAMS, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
		24	Do you use the Briefing Facility for ARO?		
			Yes	25,8%	
		No	74,2%		
		25	When using the ARO BF - managing FPL etc.		
			Was the system available?	4,48	
			Was the information correct?	5,21	
			Was the data complete?	5,11	
			Was the Status Bar up to date?	4,88	
			Was the pre-validated FPL accepted by IFPS?	5,11	
			Was the generated PIB complete?	4,95	
		26	When using dedicated ARO BF functions, how would you rate:		
			New FPL creation	4,40	
			FPL management	4,06	
			FPL follow up message handling	3,79	
			Route proposal	3,42	
			FPL Validation	4,22	
			Automatic address management	3,78	
			PIB management based on FPL	4,06	
			FPL list management	4,22	
			Automatic client notifications	3,56	
			Status Bar	3,89	
			Customisation of individual tabs	4,24	
		27	How do you overall rate the ARO Briefing Facility?	3,73	
		28	Please add any comments you might have on the ARO Briefing Facility in EAD, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
		AIP production tool	29	Do you use the EAD AIP Production Tool?	
				Yes	19,1%
				No, I use another tool	31,9%
No, I don't produce an AIP	50,0%				
30	In which format do you publish your AIP? (multiple answers possible)				

EAD Pro Applications			PDF	80,0%	
			HTML - eAIP	57,8%	
			n/a	6,7%	
		31	If you do not use the EAD AIP Production Tool, please specify below what tool you are using to produce the AIP.	See Comments	
		32	How do you overall rate the EAD AIP Production Tool?	3,61	
		33	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD AIP Production Tool, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
	CHART Production tool	34		Do you use the EAD Chart Production Tool?	
				Yes	8,5%
				No, I use another tool to produce my charts	31,9%
				No, I don't produce charts	59,6%
		35	If you do not use the EAD CHART Production Tool, please specify below what tool you are using to produce the charts.	See Comments	
		36	How do you overall rate the EAD CHART Production Tool?	3,27	
		37	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD CHART Production Tool, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
		38		Have you reported a problem or requested a service by using the EAD Service Desk?	
	Never		13,8%		
	Occasionally		44,7%		
Support Services	39		When having reported problems or requested one of more services:		
			Were you continuously informed on the progress and status of your requests?	5,38	
			Were solutions provided in time?	4,86	
			Did the provided solutions solve the problem?	4,76	
			Did the Service Desk staff provide you with an efficient and professional service?	5,23	
			Was the "Ticket Severity Classification" correct?	5,32	
	40	How do you overall rate the EAD Service Desk?	4,44		
41	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD Service Desk, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments			

Support Services	Knowledge Base	42	Have you used the EAD Knowledge Base?	
			Never	29,5%
			Occasionally	51,6%
			Frequently	18,9%
		43	When using the EAD Knowledge Base:	
			The information was easy to find?	4,41
			The information was accurate / current / valid?	4,93
44	When using the EAD Knowledge Base, did you require additional help from the EAD Service Desk staff?	4,58		
45	How do you overall rate the EAD Knowledge Base?	3,73		
46	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD Knowledge Base, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments		
EAD Pro / MyEAD Functionalities	Du or DP	47	In EAD, is your organisation a:	
	Data Provider?		56,3%	
		Data User?	43,8%	
	DP EAD Functionalities	48	What are you using to connect to which subsystem in the EAD? Multiple replies possible.	See Table 1
			EAD Pro DP via VPN (EAD Explorer)	
			EAD Pro DU via VPN (EAD Explorer)	
			EAD Pro DU via SSL (https)	
			MyEAD DP ~ using ESI (java based) technology	
			MyEAD DU ~ using ESI (java based) technology	
			MyEAD DP ~ using AIMSLS (web services based) technology	
			MyEAD DU ~ using AIMSLS (web services based) technology	
			Data Download via IFS	
	AFTN - NOTAM subscription			
	49	When using EAD Pro:		
		Overall application usability, including the programme interfaces	3,78	
		Ease of finding information	4	
		Logical workflow within the applications	3,88	
	50	When using My EAD:		
		Information sharing on API updates and EAD Releases	3,7	
		Availability and Quality of technical documentation	3,8	
51	Development support received from the Test Service Desk	3,9		
	When using Data Download service:			

EAD Pro / MyEAD Functionalities	DP EAD Functionalities		Requests are fulfilled when required	4,34	
			Downloads are complete	4,31	
			Downloads are accurate	4,24	
			Further assistance is required from the Service Desk	3,72	
			Timely indication when downloads are available.	4,1	
		52	When using AFTN:		
			NOTAM delivery is accurate	4,22	
			NOTAM delivery is timely	4	
		53	NOTAM delivered are complete and according to checklist	4,09	
			Please add any comment you might have on the different accesses to the EAD, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
	DU EAD Functionalities	54	What are you using to connect which subsystem in the EAD?	See Table 2	
			EAD Pro "ECIT" ~ software installed on a dedicated terminal		
			EAD Pro "SSL" ~ using any computer with https access		
			MyEAD ~ using ESI (java based) technology		
			MyEAD ~ using AIMSL (web services based) technology		
			Data Download		
			AFTN NOTAM subscription		
		55	When using EAD Pro:	3,68	
			Overall application usability, including the programme interfaces		
			Ease of finding information		3,78
			Logical workflow within the applications		3,75
		56	When using MyEAD:	3,92	
			Information sharing on API updates and EAD Releases		3,82
			Availability and Quality of technical documentation		3,7
		57	Development support received from the Test Service Desk	3,92	
			When using Data Download service:	3,6	
			Requests are fulfilled when required		
			Downloads are complete		4,1
			Downloads are accurate		4,02
			Further assistance is required from the Service Desk		3,98
Timely indication when downloads are available.		3,54			
58		When using AFTN:	3,61		
	NOTAM delivery is accurate				

EAD Pro / MyEAD Functionalities	DU EAD Functionalities		NOTAM delivery is timely	3,41
			NOTAM delivered are complete and according to checklist	3,44
		59	Please add any comment you might have on the different accesses to the EAD, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments
Migration	60		Since when are you an EAD Client?	
			More than 2 years	87,5%
			Less than 2 years	12,5%
	61		Please rate the following questions:	
			How was the level of information you received at your first contact to become an EAD Client?	4,5
			How were the subsequent questions handled?	4,6
			How were the discussions on the technical aspects of becoming a client?	4,4
			How do you rate the discussions on agreements and related charging?	4,5
			How did you find the provided support during the operational implementation?	4,5
	62		How did you find the prices for the different EAD Pro applications?	3
		Please add any comment you might have on the different aspects of becoming an EAD client, including proposals for improvement.	See Comments	
Overall EAD	63		How do you overall rate the EAD:	
			The extent to which the EAD meets your needs is	3,95
			The level of flexibility of the EAD to adapt to client needs is	3,6
			The level of fulfilling your feedback/user requirements is	3,92
			The level of timely implementation of system improvements is	3,46
			The overall improvements of the EAD service in the past 2 years are	3,69
		My overall perception of the EAD is	3,8	
64		Please rate your overall perception of the EAD on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 is best)	7,14	
	65	What is next for you? Please describe your further EAD requirements/expectations or any remaining comments.	See Comments	
Development				

What are you using to connect to which subsystem in the EAD? Multiple replies possible.							
Answer Options	SDO	INO	PAMS	ARO Briefing Facility	AIP Production Tool	CHART Production Tool	Workflow Management Tool
EAD Pro DP via VPN (EAD Explorer)	29	27	26	15	17	10	5
EAD Pro DU via VPN (EAD Explorer)	16	18	18	12	5	4	1
EAD Pro DU via SSL (https)	4	4	5	4	0	0	0
MyEAD DP ~ using ESI (java based) technology	8	6	5	0	2	0	0
MyEAD DU ~ using ESI (java based) technology	6	5	3	0	0	0	0
MyEAD DP ~ using AIMSL (web services based) technology	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
MyEAD DU ~ using AIMSL (web services based) technology	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Data Download via IFS	16	4	3	1	0	0	0
AFTN - NOTAM subscription	0	12	1	2	0	0	0
Numbers are actual counts of the answers received							

Table 1- Data Provider - Connections

What are you using to connect which subsystem in the EAD?			
Answer Options	SDO - Static Data	INO - NOTAM Information	PAMS - AIP Library
EAD Pro "ECIT" ~ software installed on a dedicated terminal	33	32	35
EAD Pro "SSL" ~ using any computer with https access	4	9	12
MyEAD ~ using ESI (java based) technology	19	20	15
MyEAD ~ using AIMSL (web services based) technology	5	8	6
Data Download	22	2	5
AFTN NOTAM subscription	0	14	1
Numbers are actual counts of the answers received			

Table 2 - Data Provider - Connections

2. ANNEX 2: COMMENTS

ID	Feedback	Service
Q11	Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the SDO Static Data in EAD, including proposals for improvement.	SDO
1	<p>Comment to Q7: We have two cases with receipt of empty AIXM update.</p> <p>Comment to Q8: According to statistics the number of EAD outages and unserviceabilities has been increased.</p>	
2	<p>The major concern for us in INO operations is the missing link to obstacle data.</p> <p>It is not possible to link SDO data about obstacles to a NOTAM concerning obstacles. And since this is the NOTAM where we then have most free text writing, it is also the one with highest chance of errors.</p>	
3	Documentation could be more straightforward and simpler.	
4	The States do not fill in the necessary data, therefore cannot rely on EAD data set, although the database is capable of excellent data storage and validation.	
5	We used AIXM5.1 for the airspace geometry. But a lot of general information seems to be not implemented or correctly placed (most part of interesting information is placed into "Note" instead of the correct balise).	
6	<p>- The SDO tool's window should be resizable, or at least have 1680x1050px and 1920x1080px resolution options to fit more content.</p> <p>- The entity browser tree could then be always visible to navigate more easily between the lower level elements.</p> <p>- Deleting recursively would also be nice (deleting every lower level entity, but listing them to confirm all the items)</p>	
7	<p>The quality / completeness of the data is a bit "hit and miss". There are big discrepancies from a country to another.</p> <p>There are significant technical issues with SDO export (missing frequencies currently).</p>	
8	Please make reports more clear.	
9	SIGMA had lots of INOP times.	
10	Performance is poor	
11	We're on AIXM 4.5 because 5.1 weren't working at the time (a few months ago). Would have liked to have started with 5.1 and AIXM 4.5 documentation was not as thorough.	
12	Many countries publish important static data in supplements and the information remain in the supplements for a long time. EAD does not add this data to their DB as by the policy in place leading to a gap between the EAD data and the reality.	
13	The data set is reliable for the European area only. Basic worldwide data needs to be better maintained e.g. ICAO Airports codes/locations	
14	Generate and create SDO Reports functionality is not User Friendly.	
15	Keep up the good work with DHOs, this is important	
16	<p>We are using mainly obstacle data for the time being and the data quality is so poor, that the data can't be used as a reliable source. We compared for some benchmark countries (Germany, Denmark, Czech) the EAD content to the original AIP data and there are significant - sometimes systematic! - Errors in the EAD content.</p> <p>What is not clear to us: who is responsible for the EAD content in an ADQ sense? The</p>	

	<p>national ANSPs or EAD?</p> <p>To sum it up: we stay with our "traditional" AIP-based approach and using EAD/SDO only as a backup reference, not as a reliable primary source.</p>	
17	<p>1) take too long to correct wrong data (ex of Canada route crossing the Atlantic: 6 months to correct it)</p> <p>2) PERM Notam not always loaded in SDO</p>	
18	<p>sometime very difficult to correlate between items in AIP and in SDO</p>	
19	<p>Expedite the revision/update process of SIGMA website</p>	
20	<p>This is only being completed for test purposes</p>	
21	<p>The value of static data is very limited as it only partly reflects reality. Major differences are published as AIP SUP (for example the EDDB Berlin airport with new approaches, nav aids, waypoints, etc.).</p> <p>What we need is operational data, not some well-defined but not very useful virtual data.</p> <p>With SDO you cannot create maps, you cannot plan flights, etc. I believe the product is of very limited value.</p>	SDO
22	<p>It would be helpful if the pop list values have brief explanation or sample on it.</p>	
23	<p>Question 8 rarely applies to me as I am based in a region which GroupEAD does not currently have agreements in place.</p>	
24	<p>hard to overstate the complexity of the system when compared to other complex data provision systems</p>	
25	<p>A lot of the data in SDO is absolute rubbish and cannot be relied upon. After years of using selected data from SDO, I still cannot work out what the SDO database is for. It cannot possibly be for anybody who needs a reliable database of aeronautical information as so much within it is wrong.</p>	
Q17	<p>Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the NOTAM information in EAD INO, including proposals for improvement.</p>	
1	<p>Too many bugs! Prints from the queue impossible, cursor stays in a field even if you use the tab key or click in another field,... Looks like the last release was done from an unpatched version of the previous release.</p> <p>The system is so slow and has to be restarted so many times...</p> <p>Too many confirmations are needed for a simple task. Just printing needs so many clicks...</p>	INO
2	<p>It absolutely an 'unfriendly' system with many bugs.</p>	
3	<p>Performance is poor!</p> <p>Regarding question 14.:</p> <p>In an ANS environment anything but "Allways" is not acceptable!</p> <p>Please consider reformulating this questions for the next survey.</p>	

4	<p>Performance is poor!</p> <p>Regarding question 14.:</p> <p>In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable!</p> <p>Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.</p>	INO	
5	a PIB cannot be extraordinary. Either the data are correct, either they are not.		
6	EAD offers no ready-to-use solution for 3rd party NOTAM data providers. We had to develop our own software to use the EAD system.		
7	quality and completeness very good		
8	Performance is poor		
9	The quality used be better. I have seen non-English language appear in NOTAM especially for countries like Peru.		
10	sometimes it happens that with an hourly update none valid NOTAM are shown		
11	in my function is don use INO this way, only retrieval perm NOTAMS		
12	NOTAM in respect of Domestic Aerodromes within India is scanty.		
13	<p>The flight plan parsing of INO uses SDO which does not reflect reality (static data vs operational data incorporating AIP SUPs, NOTAMs, AICs, etc.). Therefore it fails to parse a great percentage of operational flight plans and either produces no briefing at all or a faulty briefing.</p> <p>The only reliable solution is to mirror the complete INO database locally and perform the lookup on the client's end. I consider the complete PIB functionality to be largely useless...</p>		
Q23	Please add any comments you might have on the quality and completeness of the AIP Information in EAD PAMS, including proposals for improvement.		PAMS
1	<p>Performance is poor!</p> <p>Regarding question 19.:</p> <p>In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable!</p> <p>Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.</p>		
2	very good quality and completeness		
3	There are still, after so many years Countries in the Dropdown List with no content, e.g. Japan. just REMOVE them. Furthermore a reported bug is still not fixed, if you select a country e.g. Germany, you should just be able to select the languages that the AIP is written in (here German and English) however you can chose all kind of languages, giving you logically 0 finds, this is nonsense and poor coding.		
4	Allow for easier browsing rather than having to download everything.		
5	Please provide historic AMDTs for a longer time span, lets say a year. For a change analysis ("what stuff has changed in the last year?") one has to keep track of the AMDTs.		
6	Its too slow to download the pages and it's not very user friendly in searching correct page (titles are not shown by default).		
7	there is a bug in question 19 when answering the same.		
8	<p>questionnaire isn't working good:</p> <p>question 19 all often, the program doesn't allow this</p>		

9	It takes quite a lot of time to download the pdf-files. Should be much faster.	PAMS
10	Please check question n. 14 (a bug doesn't allowed the same answer for 3 different questions)	
11	There should be regular checking by EAD for adherence to guidelines, such as naming convention, categorization, etc. We have found hundreds of errors which have been corrected but they can occur again because it cannot be assumed that some 26 authorities all know the finer details of the rules.	
12	Also; as with Question 8, the Publications I search for on PAMS are usually for research and comparison purposes rather than operational.	
13	hard to overstate the complexity of the system as a factor of the requirements and output	
Q28	Please add any comments you might have on the ARO Briefing Facility in EAD, including proposals for improvement.	Briefing Facility
1	I want to have functionality for clearing the pending messages (yellow lines) at once by choosing whole messages under the heading "Message List" in order not waste time for this work.	
2	<p>The system is not stable, slow and needs too many restarts.</p> <p>Even if it looks like software for Windows, it does not behave like all software for Windows do. Windows open with the buttons under the taskbar. You have to move them to click those buttons. But, when reopening these windows, they don't reopen to their last position but again and again with the buttons under the taskbar.</p> <p>When these windows are moved, you think you can click but "no" when the pointer is on the button a flag appears to tell us just the same as written on the button! A very irritating joke.</p> <p>When sending a FPRM, sometimes the system does not allow it because it finds an error in the FPL. FPL received from IFPS!!!!!!</p> <p>When sending a diversion arrival, the system change the destination in the FPL. It should not.</p> <p>If you send at 1600 a FPL fot 1000, the system insert the DOF of the day instead of the day after.</p> <p>And once again, it's oh so slow...</p>	
3	The system is too slow, too unstable, there is too many bugs, the windows are too small. The helpdesk is very too slow(many months to resolve a bug, many years to make a improvement). See all Trouble Tickets opened by the clients to get a better idea.	
4	<p>Performance is poor!</p> <p>Regarding question 25.:</p> <p>In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable! Especially with ARO being part of ATS.</p> <p>Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.</p>	
5	<p>Performance is poor!</p> <p>Regarding question 25.:</p> <p>In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable! Especially with ARO</p>	

	being part of ATS. Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.	Briefing Facility
6	Belgocontrol has developed its own applications to compensate for the poorness of EAD BF interface. The worst shortcoming being the impossibility to switch between windows, such as the FPL window and the FPL list window, to check for already existing FPL when editing one.	
7	Performance is poor	
8	Automatic address management should also make geographical addressing. Could be complemented by addressing to e-mail addresses other than AFTN.	
Q31	If you do not use the EAD AIP Production Tool, please specify below what tool you are using to produce the AIP.	AIP Production Tool
1	Paper version	
2	Microsoft Word	
3	FrameAPS from MAIS	
4	national database for AIP production	
5	Frame Maker	
6	We used our own developed tool	
7	Manual.	
8	FrameMaker	
9	Avitech wiz@rd	
10	An inhouse software program developed by us.	
11	CADAS-EPS, previously known as GROUPEVERVE	
12	Atalis - software made by EgisAvia that were bought by Thales some years ago.	
13	we work in framemaker then PDF	
14	ids-publication manager	
15	IDS AeroPub	
16	FrameMaker	
17	IDS AeroPUB	
18	smartAIM	
19	Frequentis smartAIP which utilises Adobe FrameMaker	
Q33	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD AIP Production Tool, including proposals for improvement.	
1	We have been working with EAD AIP PT for almost 7-8 months and have not published AIP yet.	
2	Every time we have a new EAD version new problems arises	
3	we cannot comment on the production tool EAD AIP, or have suggestions for improvement yet.	

4	<p>AIP production tool is not user friendly and unreliable in terms of publication generation results. After each iteration of the generate step, different inconsistencies appear, so that too many, time consuming, corrections need to be made.</p> <p>The FrameAPS application unpredictably breaks, what may be critical if publication date is close and the user cannot predict the finalization of the work. Sometimes the publish AIP step (pdf production) takes several hours, without a feedback to the user whether the process is correct and just more time is needed, or something is not correct with the process, so it would be better for the user to stop the process and repeat the activity. Also, there is no feedback on the remaining time for the finalization of the process, which makes planning impossible.</p> <p>After patch installation, detailed quality checks of generated documents are needed as general application behaviour is different from the previous one.</p> <p>The documentation for the use of FrameAPS is inadequate, as it only reflects available functions, but in practice, some different choices and activities need to be done to get appropriate results. Adverse behaviour is not described, nor the actions necessary in such situations. Service Desk TT system is available, but not adequate for the live production of publications with strict deadlines defined. Also, after so many issues written, solutions for common problems aren't introduced into FrameAPS or some FAQ documentation, especially for the beginners.</p>	AIP Production Tool
Q35	<p>If you do not use the EAD CHART Production Tool, please specify below what tool you are using to produce the charts.</p>	
1	R.I.S.K. Company Tool	
2	We are using our own licenced Microstation software to produce the charts.	
3	AutoCad, ArcGis	
4	bespoke system	
5	Modified Adobe Illustrator	
6	ArcGIS for Aviation	
7	Geoconcept, Freehand	
8	Microstation and Avitech wiz@rd	
9	R.I.S.K. Company software	
10	Autocad and SIGMA from RISK	
11	Our system Atalis that has embedded MapInfo as the main driver for chart production	
12	ArcGIS for Aviation	
13	IDS AeroChart	
14	MicroStation Bentley	
15	We have a subcontractor who does the chart production for us. We are using EAD Chart Production Tool as a validation tool for ENR charts.	
16	IDS Charting Tool	
17	smartCharting	
18	SkyDemon	
Q37	<p>Please add any comments you might have on the EAD CHART Production Tool,</p>	

	including proposals for improvement.	Chart Production Tool
1	Comment to Q36 - We don't have such tool.	
2	Some more improvements needed. We have discuss then in the last Chart working group	
3	GIS tool should be introduced for chart production	
4	Our internet connection is too slow to generate the chart elements but overall it's helpful in charting production.	
5	I am not a procedure designer or charting specialist and we are not using the tool for chart production so it is difficult for me to evaluate the features and capabilities of the tool. We have used it for validation purposes and it seems to perform OK.	
6	I have no experience of the EAD chart production tool, so my rating of it should be ignored. I was forced to specify one.	
Q41	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD Service Desk, including proposals for improvement.	Service Desk
1	Sometimes it can seem like that the back and forward procedure between Service desk, ITP, Frequentis and so on, is a slowing link in this chain. But it's of course a challenge when having several different units, taking care of each their part of the enquiries	
2	Remote access need to be used more regularly instead of giving directions/instructions not all the AIS Offices have IT department.	
3	Some persons of the helpdesk are very good but others give regularly answers out of the question.	
4	It should be optionally possible for the ticket Reporter to make a ticket visible for all service desk users (e.g. other ANSPS). This would create transparency on issues that might be relevant for all users.	
5	It should be optionally possible for the ticket Reporter to make a ticket visible for all service desk users (e.g. other ANSPS). This would create transparency on issues that might be relevant for all users.	
6	It always seems to take a while before the right person for the problem is contacted.	
7	personnel is limited to very narrow or very specific information and difficult to get general picture if things goes behind one working position (to network or to systematic approach)	
8	Less e-mails please.	
9	highly accurate and correct	
10	Can always be relied upon.	
11	The team on the help desk are always efficient and friendly.	
12	EAD SD sometimes looks like it wants to close issues at any cost. Sometimes we need to present technical proof to argue with SD about difference of opinion. Sometimes it feels like SD tries to fool us just to close the issues. Some issues takes longer than reasonable to be solved mainly because we have to wait for future Releases and sometimes more than one Release.	
13	Sometimes it takes quite long time to solve the cases	

14	<p>Software defects that are found and reported can take many months to be fixed in an upcoming release. For smaller bugs, EAD should increase the cadence to apply fixes faster because often there is no workaround or a very inconvenient one.</p> <p>In general we find that both complexity and the rate of software defects is significantly higher with EAD than with NM/IFPS. With IFPS, the interfaces generally work as documented and we rarely ever find issues while with EAD, the software suffers from many defects and appears to be much less tested. INO PIB is one example, another is SDD which after many weeks is still not working correctly.</p> <p>It takes a lot of effort on our side to work with EAD and support because it is very complex and subject to very heavy processes. Tickets are routed among 5 or more parties and we always fear that the error is due because we did not read page 500 of manual XYZ (of which there are dozens) correctly.</p> <p>If you manage to reduce the complexity of the EAD system by applying more modern technologies and architectures, the support load should go down significantly and also the investment required by clients to make use of it.</p>	Service Desk
15	There are times that the status of requests is already resolved without our acknowledgement but the overall it provides efficient service. Just be a bit friendly and not so robotic or stern in answering queries.	
16	Distinguish between advanced users who are familiar with IT and "desktop users" who just klick icons. Please do not respond with standard phrases like: "reset you workstation", "clear your java cache". Instead publish troubleshooting guidelines and guidelines what to report in a Jira issue. Publish a terminology: what do you mean by "reset, reboot, restart, java cache, browser cache, etc."	
17	The service desk is great. Unfortunately it is the migrated states we most often need help from, as it's their data in question. They are never as good as the service desk staff in helping us.	
Q46	Please add any comments you might have on the EAD Knowledge Base, including proposals for improvement.	
1	Documents could be simplified.	Knowledge Base
2	Ead Documentation is hard to find by reference numbers. Cannot find a list of latest version for EAD documents.	
3	It happens quite frequently that information contradicts itself - older information vs. newer, one page updated where another is not. .	
4	The knowledgebase itself ist a good tool. The problem is, that not all information is in there. Some documents are in the knowledge base, some are on OneSky (e.g. FRN1L7, ESI and AIMSL info,) and some only accessible via special URL (e.g. FRN054, FRN8T2 ...). There should be only one data source.	
5	The knowledgebase itself is a good tool. The problem is, that not all information is in there. Some documents are in the knowledge base, some are on OneSky (e.g. FRN1L7, ESI and AIMSL info,) and some only accessible via special URL (e.g. FRN054, FRN8T2,). There should be only one data source.	
6	It is difficult to determine in which folder you have to search to get the information you need.	
7	Not so intuitive	
8	See prior comment about AIXM 4.5 documentation gaps.	
9	Too many documentation.	
10	I am not so familiar with this. Because finding information was not my strongest point in this.	

11	File naming is not always self-explanatory. Files allocation not always easy retrievable	Knowledge Base
12	The amount of information is very limited and usually does not apply to our use of the platform.	
13	The EAD knowledge base does not cater in detail for loading of IFP's, SID/STAR. The rest of the documents is very well defined and detailed, however not the documents that caters for IFP and SID/STARs.	
14	The format and language of the information is obviously made by people who do not use it. Whenever we used the information we had to translate it into actionable language. The result was text that was 80% shorter than the original. I think this says it all.	
Q53	DU - Please add any comment you might have on the different accesses to the EAD, including proposals for improvement.	DU - Functionalities/ Accesses
	Regarding question 44 and 45.:	
1	In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable! Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.	
2	I would like to be able to enter data into a request directly without validation. Certain functions within the admin NOTAM brief are problematic	
3	EAD Pro is technically obsolete. Drop the java HMI and replace it by contemporary solutions. Host the BF-Box (es) at EAD, instead at the customers' premises. BF-Box is an EAD application, therefor EAD shall take responsibility.	
Q59	DP - Please add any comment you might have on the different accesses to the EAD, including proposals for improvement.	DP - Functionalities/ Accesses
1	NOTAMs sent via AFTN are sometimes shown on INO with delay.	
	Regarding question 50 and 51.:	
2	In an ANS environment anything but "Always" is not acceptable! Please consider reformulating this question for the next survey.	
4	Information is too much spread out over too many manuals, hard to find what is needed. One has to invest a lot of time into EAD to be able to work with it.	
5	Support is provided by Frequentis in terms of software releases and therefore I do not believe I can accurately rate GroupEAD	
6	We have developed over 100 APIs. The EAD alone took 2x the effort than all the others combined. Take a look at FAA systems - they know how to publish information, even though they are certainly not the forefront of data distribution technology.	
Q62	Please add any comment you might have on the different aspects of becoming an EAD client, including proposals for improvement.	Migration
1	SDO is expensive (relatively to my business) considering current data completeness and technical issues	
2	Gemma was wonderful.	

Q65	What is next for you? Please describe your further EAD requirements/expectations or any remaining comments.	
1	<p>To be able to use the new input data in SDO for the production of the charts before the commit date it is our responsibility if it is correct or not but in any case we always can reload it.</p> <p>When we have a new version we have to reinstall the whole system which is not the best practice. WFM needs more improvement like the messages which are sending via email to be specific (not template). to give us the choice for the selection of the Airport or the FIR in the NOTAM proposal form, to be able to print all the forms, in the DATA origination all the steps to have a connectivity and unique ID. Each country to have access only to its own and not to all.</p>	
3	Faster bug solving cycle, data completeness improvements	
4	Worldwide coverage	
5	Why does EAD need so long time to establish AIXM 5.1? Why is software optimized for 800x640 pixel displays which are obsolete for years?	
6	<p>1) The completeness of SDO data and the use of correct xml balises</p> <p>2) The completeness of the geometries</p> <p>3) The presence of VFR data</p>	
7	<p>- A faster correction of bugs with patches. e.g. To print a notam from the incoming queue, you have to copy and paste it in WordPad and we are still waiting for the correction. Would YOU accept something like this?</p> <p>- Some parts of the software and/or DB installed locally. Loading times are insane.</p> <p>- EAD should listen to the users.</p>	Development
8	INO and Briefing Facility must be completely re-built from the start. Can EAD do that in a near future?	
9	<p>Expectation:</p> <p>Great leap on performance improvement.</p> <p>IT security improvement to current industry standards.</p> <p>Adaptation to the standards of ANS and ATS (for ARO) environment.</p>	
10	The interface on the whole looks like an application from the 80s. Interfaces are very old-fashioned. Interfaces are not user-friendly: small fonts, messages of importance to operators not sufficiently put forward, windows need to be closed before others are opened,...	
11	<p>The missing data is really breaking the camel's back.</p> <p>When using EAD we should not require dealing with individual states.</p> <p>This is not the case.</p> <p>France is my primary market and I am probably going to have to deal with both Eurocontrol AND French SIA.</p> <p>This is massively inefficient and double up the work.</p>	

12	so far we are very satisfied	Development
13	Workout the snapshot in AIXM 5.1 format information presentation	
14	Obtaining worldwide NOTAM from a single supplier	
15	<p>Please get rid of the outdated Java clients ASAP! Java on the client was questionable in 2006, a no-go in 2010 and is just ridiculous and outright unprofessional in 2016.</p> <p>Java-support is eliminated in most browsers and considered a high security risk by most professional IT department nowadays.</p> <p>Requiring outdated (!) Java versions and flagged as security risk (!) Java versions even by Oracle to access EAD data is not tolerable anymore and considered highly unprofessional in the IT industry.</p>	
16	FULL SDO Data availability	
17	Quick reaction to DHO improvement proposals	
19	We need dependable operational data, not static data.	
20	<p>Every data in the AIP has a related data/entity or field in the sdo. There are some data in our AIP which we cannot encode in the SDO like the remarks/data for PAPI.</p> <p>Expectation: Every data in AIP specifically on the AD particulars page is fully generated from SDO.</p>	
21	The full adaption with AIXM 5.x and also the introduction of the WFM Tool to fulfil the ADQ requirements. I have attended a training course related to WFM Tool and I think it should be further developed to help us as a data provider to fulfil ADQ requirements.	
22	Data User (Flight Plan Handling) does not work. INO DP seems to work, however the user interface is poor. The technical requirements for EAD user clients (ECIT) are unacceptable. ECIT should be a browser which complies to W3C Standards.	
23	The entire system is overly complicated, poorly documented, with ridiculous security systems, overall extremely costly to use and very expensive. We only use it because you have the MONOPOLY of this information.	
24	Include data from other sources such as charts, AIPs etc.	