

Appendix A – Inquiry Summary Table

Inquiry Officer’s Report into complaints that airlines did not respect communications obligations under the *Air Passenger Protection Regulations*

Canadian Transportation Agency

List of flight counts

Flight Count 1: AC143 / Toronto - Calgary / Dec. 21	7
Flight Count 2: AC261 / Toronto – Winnipeg / Dec. 19.....	8
Flight Count 3: AC1739 / Cancun - Vancouver / Jan. 5	9
Flight Count 4: AC1334 / Toronto – St. John's / Dec. 19	10
Flight Count 5: AC1240 / Montréal - Cancun / Dec. 20	11
Flight Count 6: AC1942 / Montréal - Lima / Jan. 18.....	12
Flight Count 7: AC1703 / Deer Lake – Toronto / Jan. 1.....	13
Flight Count 8: AC1822 / Montréal – Puerto Plata / Dec. 30	14
Flight Count 9: WG187 / Montréal – Toronto – Los Cabos / Dec. 26.....	15
Flight Count 10: WG374 / Sault Ste. Marie – London - Varadero / Dec. 26.....	16
Flight Count 11: WG281 / Vancouver - Cancun / Jan. 2	17
Flight Count 12: WG596 / Cancun - Calgary / Jan. 2	18
Flight Count 13: WG526 / Puerto Vallarta - Montréal / Jan. 5	19
Flight Count 14: WG055 / Miami – Québec City / Jan. 12.....	20
Flight Count 15: WG030 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 12	21
Flight Count 16: WG380 / Québec City - Varadero / Jan. 13	22
Flight Count 17: WG380 / Mont-Joli – Québec City - Varadero / Jan. 15	23
Flight Count 18: WG244 / Cancun – Montréal / Jan. 16	24
Flight Count 19: WG281 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 16.....	25
Flight Count 20: WG481 / Calgary – Vancouver– Zihuatanejo / Jan. 16.....	26
Flight Count 21: WG596 / Cancun – Calgary / Jan. 16	27
Flight Count 22: WG515 / Toronto - Cancun / Jan. 17.....	28
Flight Count 23: WG629 / Varadero – Calgary / Jan. 18.....	29
Flight Count 24: WG596 / Cancun – Calgary / Jan. 18	30

Flight Count 25: WG244 / Cancun – Montréal / Jan. 21	32
Flight Count 26: WG518 / Cancun - Montréal / Jan. 25	34
Flight Count 27: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 18	35
Flight Count 28: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 20	36
Flight Count 29: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 21	37
Flight Count 30: WO210 / Winnipeg – Hamilton / Jan. 10	38
Flight Count 31: WO651 / Cancun - Hamilton / Jan. 14.....	39
Flight Count 32: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 4	40
Flight Count 33: WS123 / Calgary – Vancouver / Jan. 9.....	41
Flight Count 34: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 12	42
Flight Count 35: WS2581 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 12.....	43
Flight Count 36: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 13	44
Flight Count 37: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 13	45
Flight Count 38: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 15	46
Flight Count 39: WS571 / Winnipeg – Edmonton / Jan. 16.....	47
Flight Count 40: WS2581 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 16.....	48
Flight Count 41: WS3327 / Kelowna- Vancouver / Jan. 19 AND WS1864/ Vancouver-Honolulu / Jan. 19	49
Flight Count 42: WS1352 / Winnipeg – Las Vegas / Jan. 23	50
Flight Count 43: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 25	51
Flight Count 44: WS3324 / Vancouver-Kelowna / Jan. 29.....	52
Flight Count 45: AC160 / Edmonton – Toronto / Jan. 10.....	53
Flight Count 46: AC1674 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 24	54
Flight Count 47: AC1847 / Puerto Vallarta - Toronto / Jan. 12.....	55
Flight Count 48: AC1986 / Montréal – Punta Cana / Jan. 19	56
Flight Count 49: AC1804 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 4.....	57

Flight Count 50: AC167 / Toronto – Edmonton / Jan. 4.....	58
Flight Count 51: AC1738 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 5.....	59
Flight Count 52: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan 6.....	60
Flight Count 53: AC101 / Toronto – Vancouver / Jan. 12.....	61
Flight Count 54: AC619 / Halifax – Toronto / Feb. 2.....	62
Flight Count 55: AC842 / Toronto – Dublin / Jan. 16	63
Flight Count 56: AC115 / Toronto – Vancouver / Jan. 18.....	64
Flight Count 57: AC828 / Montréal – Lyon / Jan. 18	65
Flight Count 58: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale - Toronto / Jan. 8.....	66
Flight Count 59: AC1812 / Toronto – Cancun / Jan. 19	67
Flight Count 60: AC1854 / Las Vegas – Toronto / Jan. 16.....	68
Flight Count 61: AC1813 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 19	70
Flight Count 62: AC966 / Toronto – Bridgetown / Jan. 13.....	71
Flight Count 63: AC7917 / Raleigh – Toronto / Dec. 30.....	72
Flight Count 64: AC338 / Vancouver – Ottawa / Jan. 13	73
Flight Count 65: AC1813 / Cancun - Toronto / Jan. 1	74
Flight Count 66: AC8508 / Toronto – Deer Lake / Jan. 24.....	75
Flight Count 67: AC1821 / Puerto Plata –Toronto / Dec. 30.....	76
Flight Count 68: AC848 / Toronto – London / Dec. 20.....	77
Flight Count 69: TS2842 / Ottawa – Puerto Plata / Jan. 31	78
Flight Count 70: TS494 / Montréal – Cayo Coco / Jan. 17.....	79
Flight Count 71: TS2960 / Montréal – Roatan / Jan. 6	80
Flight Count 72: TS2961 / Roatan – Montréal / Jan. 6	81
Flight Count 73: AC1947 / Lima – Toronto / Jan. 19.....	82
Flight Count 74: AC1577 / Toronto – Edmonton / Jan. 19.....	83

Flight Count 75: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 16.....	84
Flight Count 76: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 18.....	85
Flight Count 77: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Dec. 27	86
Flight Count 78: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan. 18.....	87
Flight Count 79: AC1738 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 17.....	89
Flight Count 80: UA1067 / Vancouver – San Francisco / Jan. 31	90
Flight Count 81: UA2268 / Houston – Edmonton / Jan. 1	91
Flight Count 82: UA2437 / Calgary – Denver / Jan. 17.....	92
Flight Count 83: UA3615 / Montréal – Chicago / Jan. 13	93
Flight Count 84: UA4954 / Toronto – Chicago / Jan. 16.....	94
Flight Count 85: AC1806 / Toronto – San Jose / Jan. 19.....	95
Flight Count 86: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 14.....	96
Flight Count 87: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 14.....	97
Flight Count 88: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 18.....	98
Flight Count 89: AC158 / Calgary – Toronto / Dec. 19.....	100
Flight Count 90: AC842 / Toronto – Dublin / Jan. 1	101
Flight Count 91: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Jan. 19	102
Flight Count 92: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 8.....	103
Flight Count 93: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Dec. 16.....	104
Flight Count 94: AC8841 / Vancouver – Yellowknife / Jan. 4.....	105
Flight Count 95: AC1559 / Montréal – Edmonton / Dec. 31	106
Flight Count 96: AC319 / Montréal – Calgary / Jan. 6.....	107
Flight Count 97: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Dec. 19.....	108
Flight Count 98: AC1605 / Fort Lauderdale – Montréal / Jan. 18	109
Flight Count 99: AC1674 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 12	110

Flight Count 100: AC1713 / Punta Cana – Toronto / Jan. 4	111
Flight Count 101: AC1713 / Punta Cana – Toronto / Jan. 16	112
Flight Count 102: AC2437 / San Jose – Montréal / Jan. 30.....	113
Flight Count 103: AC7917 / Raleigh – Durham – Toronto / Dec. 26.....	114
Flight Count 104: AC8506 / Montréal – Fredericton / Feb. 1.....	115
Flight Count 105: AC8638 / Ottawa – Halifax / Jan. 8.....	116
Flight Count 106: AC8841 / Vancouver – Yellowknife / Dec. 31	117
Flight Count 107: AC1812 / Toronto – Cancun / Jan. 4	118
Flight Count 108: AC1821 / Puerto Plata – Toronto / Feb. 1	119
Flight Count 109: AC424 / Toronto – Montréal / Jan. 19.....	120
Flight Count 110: AC619 / Halifax – Toronto / Dec. 27	121
Flight Count 111: AC788 / Los Angeles – Toronto / Dec. 20	122
Flight Count 112: AC788 / Los Angeles – Toronto / Dec. 27	123
Flight Count 113: AC1945 - Bogota –Toronto / Jan. 1.....	124
Flight Count 114: AC8234 / Yellowknife – Calgary / Jan. 8.....	125
Flight Count 115: AC319 / Montréal – Calgary / Dec. 28.....	126
Flight Count 116: AC371 / Montréal – Winnipeg / Dec. 28.....	127
Flight Count 117: AC416 / Toronto – Montréal / Jan. 16.....	128
Flight Count 118: AC1629 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan. 4.....	129
Flight Count 119: AC1747 / Varadero – Montréal / Jan. 18.....	130

Flight Count 1: AC143 / Toronto - Calgary / Dec. 21

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Odour in aircraft cabin.	E-mail: delay from "aircraft availability."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Mechanical issue – aircraft out of service.	E-mail: delay from "aircraft availability."			
Aircraft swapped.	E-mail: delay from "aircraft availability."			
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for different reasons: "scheduling issues", odour in cabin/safety, maintenance issues.	Within control, safety AND Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, flight crew may have suggested that compensation would be provided. Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.

Flight Count 2: AC261 / Toronto – Winnipeg / Dec. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Hydraulic issue in original aircraft.	SMS: "Aircraft technical issue."		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Aircraft swapped.	Website: "Late arrival of incoming aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Weather, ground handling issues.	SMS: "Flight readiness" E-mail: "Flight preparation time."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (4-hour delay)	Passengers state no standard of treatment provided.
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for "safety-related issue."	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 3: AC1739 / Cancun - Vancouver / Jan. 5

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft weather radar defect – required to travel in expected thunderstorms.	Various e-mail messages beginning 14 hours before flight departure informing passengers of delays due to "technical issue" with aircraft and weather.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Decision to send recovery aircraft to replace.				
Recovery aircraft delayed due to security check issue.				
Recovery aircraft delayed due to mechanical defect – had to return.				
Flight cancelled.	E-mail sent 3 hours before original scheduled departure stating flight cancelled due to "aircraft maintenance" issue.			
Flight replaced with flight departing the following day.	E-mail sent 1.5 hours before original scheduled departure with revised itinerary.			
A second recovery aircraft was sent and operated the following day.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	Some passengers state they were provided with an old handout of Air Canada's Compensation Policies (dated 2017-05), with no mention of obligations linked to the <i>Air Passenger Protection Regulations (APPR)</i> .
A second recovery aircraft was sent and operated the following day.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	Some passengers state they were given vouchers, others state they were not. Some passengers state that carrier refused to reimburse hotel or food costs.
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for different reasons: weather, safety risk, security check.	Within control, safety AND Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation. Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications (scheduled flight or recovery flight).

Flight Count 4: AC1334 / Toronto – St. John's / Dec. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Previous flight using aircraft delayed due to weather, and subsequent crew time out.	Various e-mail messages beginning 12 hours before original flight departure about delays due to weather.		Knock-on effect claimed	Airline sourced new aircraft, complicated by serious weather issues in Toronto December 19.
New aircraft sourced.				
New aircraft delayed due to weather.				
Damage to new aircraft on the ground in Toronto.	Various e-mail messages beginning 4 hours before original flight departure about a delay, reasons under investigation.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements but passengers claim that various reasons were provided for the delay.
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided, flight departed next day.	E-mail that flight cancelled due to aircraft maintenance.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one passenger claimed that announcement was made that overnight accommodation would not be provided as the delay due to weather.
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided, flight departed next day.	E-mail that flight cancelled due to aircraft maintenance.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (11-hour delay)	Passengers state that no vouchers provided.
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided, flight departed next day.	E-mail that flight cancelled due to aircraft maintenance.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, flight crew may have suggested that compensation would be provided.
POST-EVENT	E-mail to some passengers denying compensation due to aircraft maintenance/safety, others due to weather.	Within control, safety , Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.
POST-EVENT	E-mail to one passenger notifying \$1000 compensation.	Within control?	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	At least one passenger appears to have been compensated.

Flight Count 5: AC1240 / Montréal - Cancun / Dec. 20

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Original aircraft and two subsequent replacement aircraft all suffered mechanical issues.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Mechanical issues discovered during flight operations. Aircraft FIN931 taken out of service previous night in Montréal due to a mechanical issue (nose wheel steering fault). Next replacement aircraft, FIN936, taken out of service in London due to a cabin odour. Third replacement aircraft, FIN633, also taken out of service in Toronto due to a mechanical issue (hydraulic leak).
Original aircraft and two subsequent replacement aircraft all suffered mechanical issues.			Knock-on effect claimed	Multiple attempts by airline to source replacement aircraft, all of which suffered maintenance issues.
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided and flight departed later in the day with another aircraft.	Various e-mail messages beginning 4 hours before original flight departure stating flight cancelled due to "aircraft maintenance" issue.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complaint claimed that announcement was made that passengers would be compensated (in cash).
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided and flight departed later in the day with another aircraft.	Various e-mail messages beginning 4 hours before original flight departure stating flight cancelled due to "aircraft maintenance" issue.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (7-hour delay)	Some passengers state that they received vouchers.
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided and flight departed later in the day with another aircraft.	Various e-mail messages beginning 4 hours before original flight departure stating flight cancelled due to "aircraft maintenance" issue.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Complaints state that airline staff said that compensation (in cash) would be provided.
POST-EVENT	Different e-mail messages denying compensation as disruption due to maintenance/out of control or safety.	Within control, safety OR Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation. Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications (scheduled flight or recovery flight).

Flight Count 6: AC1942 / Montréal - Lima / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Multiple issues impacted the incoming aircraft for this flight in Toronto, resulting in a delay in Flight No. AC1942's departure from Montréal	E-mail message 4 hours before original flight departure stating flight delayed due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Knock-on effect claimed	Weather and subsequent mechanical and crew time-out impacted incoming aircraft. Heavy snowfall in Montréal and Toronto caused widespread disruption to flights and impacted availability of aircraft.
Multiple issues impacted the incoming aircraft for this flight in Toronto, resulting in a delay in Flight No. AC1942's departure from Montréal	Subsequent e-mail messages while passengers at airport, "reason for delay under investigation."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers claim many different reasons were provided for the delay.
POST-EVENT	Some passengers claim airline stated that "compensation does not apply under the APPR" and were provided a travel discount as a "gesture of goodwill."	?	Communication re Standard of Treatment (7-hour delay)	Some passengers state they were provided with \$20 meal vouchers after 6 hours.

Flight Count 7: AC1703 / Deer Lake – Toronto / Jan. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight to Deer Lake cancelled due to lack of crew.			Knock-on effect claimed	No crew available to operate aircraft due to cancellation of inbound flight to Deer Lake. Reason for lack of crew availability for inbound flight not known. What was expected of airline regarding availability of crew for inbound flight from Toronto?
Flight No. AC1703 cancelled, new itinerary provided and flight departed.	E-mail cancelling flight sent 12 hours before scheduled departure, no reason provided. Website stated "Cancelled due to crew constraints."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Reason for cancellation not provided in e-mail message.
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denying compensation for different reasons: some "out of control", some "for safety."	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation. Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications (scheduled flight or recovery flight).
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denying compensation for different reasons: some "out of control", some "for safety."	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	Are the crew issues for this flight disruption within control, required for safety, or outside control?

Flight Count 8: AC1822 / Montréal – Puerto Plata / Dec. 30

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight returned to gate and deplaned following mechanical issue.				
Attempt to repair.	Multiple e-mail messages regarding delays due to "technical issues with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers claim different reasons were provided for the delay.
Passengers reboarded, but returned to gate following same mechanical issue.	Multiple e-mail messages regarding delays due to "technical issues with aircraft systems."			
Flight cancelled, new itinerary provided and flight departed following day.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but some passengers state they were told that flight was cancelled because of crew issues.
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for different reasons: weather/out of control, security issues/out of control, passenger handling/out of control, safety/technical issues.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation. Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications (scheduled flight or recovery flight).

Flight Count 9: WG187 / Montréal – Toronto – Los Cabos / Dec. 26

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Worn tire discovered during stopover in Toronto, onboard passengers disembarked for repair.	The staff handwritten log states that the following announcements were made, beginning at about the time of the original scheduled departure: *12:32 an announcement was made about crew *12:49: meal vouchers *13:20: meal vouchers 13:31: meal vouchers.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check of Toronto-Los Cabos flight, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Worn tire discovered during stopover in Toronto, onboard passengers disembarked for repair.	The staff handwritten log states that the following announcements were made, beginning at about the time of the original scheduled departure: *12:32 an announcement was made about crew *12:49: meal vouchers *13:20: meal vouchers 13:31: meal vouchers.		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts. Passengers state they were given various different reasons for the delay: mechanical, crew time out, operational restrictions into Los Cabos, no departure slot, aircraft too heavy for takeoff.
During repair, slot restriction imposed in Los Cabos, existing crew would be timed out.	Beginning about 3 hours after the original scheduled departure, carrier posted notifications about the tire repair, the slot restriction in Los Cabos, and the need for a new crew.			
New crew dispatched (approx. 3 hours required).				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because cause of disruption was a technical defect discovered during pre-flight check, categorized as within control but required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 10: WG374 / Sault Ste. Marie – London - Varadero / Dec. 26

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Icy conditions in Sault Ste. Marie delayed positioning flight from December 25 to December 26, resulting in one-hour departure delay on December 26.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier states that flight alerts were sent to passengers who signed up, via e-mail or text message, but did not provide documentation regarding the content and timing of alerts. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts. Passengers state that they were given various reasons for the delay: weather, mechanical, new aircraft.
Icy conditions in Sault Ste. Marie delayed positioning flight from December 25 to December 26, resulting in one-hour departure delay on December 26.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	The communications did not link or explain the different reasons provided as the situation unfolded.
Continuing icy conditions in Sault Ste. Marie on December 26 delayed arrival of positioning flight.				
On landing, mechanical issue identified.				
Determination that replacing aircraft and crew more expeditious than repair.				
New aircraft and crew repositioned.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	<p>January 3rd e-mail denied compensation because disruption due to weather and out of carrier control.</p> <p>January 13th e-mail added a second reason – technical issue but safety-related – for denying compensation.</p>	<p>Not within control</p> <p>Within control, safety In addition to Not within control</p>	Categorization of flight disruption	<p>There appear to be two independent reasons for the delay – weather and mechanical – categories 3 and 2.</p> <p>How should the flight disruption be categorized?</p>

Flight Count 11: WG281 / Vancouver - Cancun / Jan. 2

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
90 minutes before departure, aircraft grounded because of electrical issue with window heating.	At least one notification sent by carrier with revised departure time, no reason provided.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
90 minutes before departure, aircraft grounded because of electrical issue with window heating.	At least one notification sent by carrier with revised departure time, no reason provided.		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Two plans implemented: new window to be delivered later in the day on another flight AND rescue aircraft dispatched from Toronto.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, flight crew may have suggested that compensation would be provided.
Assessment and decision to use rescue aircraft.				
Flight departed using rescue aircraft.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because of a technical issue with aircraft that was within control but required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 12: WG596 / Cancun - Calgary / Jan. 2

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed due to mechanical issue/grounding (see Flight No. WG281 on January 2).			Knock-on effect claimed	<p>Two plans were implemented to deal with mechanical issue on inbound aircraft (replacement window and rescue aircraft); rescue aircraft ultimately determined to be more expeditious.</p> <p>What was expected of carrier regarding sourcing alternative aircraft directly for Cancun rather than through solving the problem of the inbound aircraft?</p>
Inbound aircraft delayed due to mechanical issue/grounding (see Flight No. WG281 on January 2).	Carrier states that information posted to passengers at their resorts in Cancun.		Timeliness/content of notifications	<p>What was expected of carrier regarding notifications at resorts?</p> <p>Carrier states that information posted to passengers at their resorts in Cancun.</p> <p>At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.</p>
Rescue aircraft used for inbound flight.				
Following arrival of inbound aircraft and departure preparations, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	<p>Passenger states that e-mail from carrier says that compensation was denied because form submitted more than 14 days after the incident.</p> <p>Carrier states in their account that compensation denied because this flight disruption was a knock-on effect of delayed Flight No. WG281 on January 2, which was categorized as within control but required for safety.</p>	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passenger is under the impression that compensation was denied because form submitted more than 14 days after the incident while carrier states compensation denied because of a knock-on effect from a previous disruption classified as within control but required for safety.

Flight Count 13: WG526 / Puerto Vallarta - Montréal / Jan. 5

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
During flight from Puerto Vallarta to Montréal, mechanical issue identified which made it impossible to travel in icing conditions and required Landing in Winnipeg (given weather situation in Ontario and Quebec).	Pilot announcement regarding diversion to Winnipeg; passengers state that reason provided was "technical issue."		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Passengers disembarked in Winnipeg, cleared customs and checked into new flight.	<p>Carrier states that the crew was instructed, mid-flight, to describe the recovery plan to the passengers.</p> <p>Once in the terminal, carrier log states that each passenger was given information on next steps, which included the issuance of food voucher, exit CBSA hall, drop bag, have meals, and proceed through security no later than 01:15.</p>		Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that reasons provided for disruption included issue with ice capabilities of aircraft and weather in Montréal.
New aircraft in Winnipeg sourced and new crew assembled.				
Flight departed Winnipeg for Montréal.				
POST-EVENT	<p>Airline sent e-mail stating that compensation denied because the reason for the delay was weather and the categorization was within control but required for safety.</p> <p>In providing their account in the context of the Inquiry, airline stated that they incorrectly ascribed the delay to weather, but that the categorization of within control but required for safety was correct in their view.</p>	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Airline states it made a mistake in ascribing delay to weather.

Flight Count 14: WG055 / Miami – Québec City / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
In-bound flight (WG054) delayed 6 h 32 due to weather conditions at departure airport.	Airline states that delay notices regarding Flight No. WG055 were posted during the in-bound (WG054) delay.		Knock-on effect claimed	In-bound flight delay resulting in crew timing out. Crew sourced from Montréal and Toronto, and sent to Miami to operate flight. Bad weather resulted in delays in crew positioning to Miami. Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for crews?
In-bound flight (WG054) delayed 6 h 32 due to weather conditions at departure airport.	Airline states that delay notices regarding Flight No. WG055 were posted during the in-bound (WG054) delay.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements for this flight. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
In-bound crew timed out.	Airline states further delay notice issued regarding this aspect of the delay.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Complainants state that reasons provided for disruption were either weather or crew.
In-bound crew timed out.	Airline states further delay notice issued regarding this aspect of the delay.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (11-hour delay)	Carrier states that some passengers were provided with meal vouchers.
In-bound crew timed out.	Airline states further delay notice issued regarding this aspect of the delay.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	It appears that different reasons (weather or crew) may have been given by employees to different passengers at different times, without any connection provided between the two reasons.
New crew sourced and positioned from Montréal and Toronto to Miami, delayed due to weather in Canada, adding 4.5 h delay.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mails state compensation denied because of weather impacting in-bound flight, out of carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers that were told that crew issues were to blame may not have understood why carrier cited weather as the reason for the disruption.

Flight Count 15: WG030 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Previous night, airport authority instituted departure slot management because of weather, providing a slot for departure resulting in an initial three-hour delay in departure time.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier states that flight alerts were sent to passengers who signed up, via e-mail or text message, but did not provide documentation regarding the content and timing of alerts. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
In morning, passengers boarded, aircraft went to de-icing.				
Crew identified stiffness in flight control as issue for concern, returned to gate, passengers disembarked, aircraft sent for troubleshooting.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during taxiing, not during an identified component of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
New aircraft available in hangar, swapped. New crew required for duty time issue.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that many different reasons provided for disruption: ground conditions, departure slot management, safety/mechanical/swap, crew time out.
New aircraft available in hangar, swapped. New crew required for duty time issue.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	There appears to have been a lack of consistency or connection between the various reasons provided to different passengers at different times by different employees.
New crew sourced; in total, the day's delays added six hours of delay.				
Flight departed, almost nine hours delayed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mails denying compensation because disruption out of carrier control due to weather.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	There appear to be two independent causes of this disruption: weather (3) and mechanical/safety (2). Crew timeout was another reason, but followed from the two independent causes. How should the flight disruption be categorized?
POST-EVENT	E-mails denying compensation because disruption out of carrier control due to weather.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	The fact that weather was ultimately cited as the reason for the disruption may have caused confusion among passengers who heard many different reasons at the time of the disruption.

Flight Count 16: WG380 / Québec City - Varadero / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
January 12 delays in Québec City – Varadero rotation resulted in January 12 delay in Québec City – Holguin rotation.				
Aircraft missed curfew for departure from Holguin back to Québec City the evening of January 12.	Carrier states that a first six-hour delay to Flight No. WG380 posted 7.5 hours before scheduled departure, no reason provided.		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Aircraft departed Holguin for Québec City 10 hours later, on January 13.				
Late inbound aircraft delayed Flight No. WG380 departure on January 13 from Québec City for Varadero.			Knock-on effect claimed	What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for disruptions affecting another aircraft and crew two rotations earlier/one day earlier?
Late inbound aircraft delayed Flight No. WG380 departure on January 13 from Québec City for Varadero.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that they were not provided with enough information or updates.
Passengers boarded in Québec City.				
Delay in de-icing.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mails denied compensation to all passengers but one "due to unforeseen operational restriction at the airport which had an impact on the arrival of your incoming plane." One passenger provided \$400 compensation.	Not within control	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	Airline states it made a mistake in providing compensation to a passenger.
POST-EVENT	E-mails denied compensation to all passengers but one "due to unforeseen operational restriction at the airport which had an impact on the arrival of your incoming plane." One passenger provided \$400 compensation.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the categorization as outside carrier control (3) appears correct, but the reason in that case should probably be stated as weather, the cause of the initial knock-on effect sequence.

Flight Count 17: WG380 / Mont-Joli – Québec City - Varadero / Jan. 15

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
In previous flight, aircraft swapped because of a mechanical issue.				
Crew duty time issues and requirement for de-icing in Mont-Joli resulted in decision to travel to Québec City to pick up a new crew.			Knock-on effect claimed	Previous flight aircraft swap and potential need for de-icing resulted in crew time issues. Carrier modified itinerary to travel directly to Québec City to source a new crew, and then continue on with planned itinerary.
Crew duty time issues and requirement for de-icing in Mont-Joli resulted in decision to travel to Québec City to pick up a new crew.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier states that flight alerts were sent to passengers who signed up, via e-mail or text message, but did not provide documentation regarding the content and timing of alerts. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
New crew picked up in Québec City, ferry flight to Mont-Joli.	Airline states that 1 h 10 before scheduled departure from Mont-Joli, the departure from Mont Joli was revised to 10:40 a.m. (from 7 a.m.) and from Québec City to 12:30 p.m. (from 8:50 a.m).		Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that they were told that the flight disruption was due to crew duty time issues.
Departure from Mont-Joli.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail stating compensation denied because reasons for disruption were combination of within control, but required for safety and outside carrier control (weather).	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	The primary reason for the flight disruption appears to be a mechanical issue causing an aircraft swap on the previous flight. Operational requirements due to weather and crew duty time issues then resulted in further delays. Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the categorization as within control but required for safety (2) would appear to be the correct one rather than outside carrier control due to weather.
POST-EVENT	E-mail stating compensation denied because reasons for disruption were combination of within control, but required for safety and outside carrier control (weather).	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why there was a discrepancy between the reasons provided by staff during the flight disruption (crew duty time) and the reasons provided when compensation denied (safety, weather).

Flight Count 18: WG244 / Cancun – Montréal / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
In-bound flight (Montréal to Cancun) delayed seven hours due to major snowfall in Montréal.			Knock-on effect claimed	What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Cancun)?
In-bound flight (Montréal to Cancun) delayed seven hours due to major snowfall in Montréal.	Approximately two hours before the originally scheduled departure from Cancun, electronic notices were issued for a seven-hour delay.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that they were told that the in-bound flight was delayed by a lack of fuel and a mechanical issue. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Flight departed Cancun seven hours late.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denied compensation due to in-bound flight being impacted by weather, outside of carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why there was a discrepancy between the reasons provided by staff during the flight disruption (fuel, mechanical) and the reasons provided when compensation denied (weather impacting in-bound flight).

Flight Count 19: WG281 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight boarded, mechanical issue discovered before takeoff.	Airline states that it posted a three-hour delay. Complainant states that after all passengers boarded, it was announced that the flight would be delayed 3 hours to investigate a potential problem.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Flight boarded, mechanical issue discovered before takeoff.	Airline states that it posted a three-hour delay. Complainant states that after all passengers boarded, it was announced that the flight would be delayed 3 hours to investigate a potential problem.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier log provides the following wording for agents to announce: 12:44 - During pre-flight preparations, a technical defect was identified with your outbound aircraft causing your flight to be delayed. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Passengers disembarked during evaluation of aircraft.				
After evaluation, passengers re-embarked and aircraft pushed off from gate approximately 3 hours delayed.				
Approximately 30-minute additional delay due to congestion on tarmac before take-off.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption within control, but required for safety.	Within control, safety	Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not provide reasons for the flight disruption.

Flight Count 20: WG481 / Calgary – Vancouver– Zihuatanejo / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight delayed 40 minutes departing Calgary due to de-icing.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier states that flight alerts were sent to passengers who signed up, via e-mail or text message, but did not provide documentation regarding the content and timing of alerts. At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Flight arrived in Vancouver, new crew took over.				
Flight pushed off from gate to go to de-icing.				
Aircraft stuck in pothole during de-icing.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that they were told that flight disruption due to brake issue, pothole, crew timeout.
Aircraft tugged out of pothole, required additional fuel.				
Tarmac delay.				
Gate finally available two hours later.				
Passengers disembarked, new crew sourced.				
Passengers re-embarked, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier has not responded to request for compensation yet, but stated during inquiry that no compensation due since flight disruption was outside carrier control due to weather and airport facility issues.	Not within control		

Flight Count 21: WG596 / Cancun – Calgary / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight (WG281) experienced 3 h 25 delay due to mechanical issue discovered during pre-flight checks, followed by an additional delay due to taxiing congestion and winds.				
Passengers of Flight No. WG596 kept at hotel during delay.	One complainant submitted a carrier notification with revised departure time.		Timeliness/content of notifications	<p>Carrier states that delay notifications sent.</p> <p>Complainants state that no information provided at hotel.</p> <p>What was expected of carrier regarding notifications at resorts?</p> <p>At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.</p>
Flight No. WG596 departure delayed by 3 h 28 minutes, with arrival in Calgary delayed 2 h 56.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because arrival delay was less than 3 hours.			

Flight Count 22: WG515 / Toronto - Cancun / Jan. 17

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
On arrival from previous flight, first planned aircraft (wet leased) had windshield issues which required an aircraft swap.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered on arrival of previous flight, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
On arrival from previous flight, first planned aircraft (wet leased) had windshield issues which required an aircraft swap.			Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
A second (Sunwing) aircraft and (Sunwing) crew were sourced.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that various reasons were provided for the delays: mechanical, water damage, toilet, crew issue.
During pre-flight preparation, second aircraft was discovered to have lavatory flooding issues.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
A third aircraft was sourced.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because of technical issue within carrier control, but required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 23: WG629 / Varadero – Calgary / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
On January 17, Flight No. WG530 from Puerto Vallarta to Saskatoon was diverted to Calgary due to poor weather in Saskatoon.				
Flight No. WG628 aircraft and crew was used as rescue flight to bring Flight No. WG530 passengers to Calgary.				
This delayed Flight No. WG628 from Calgary to Varadero on January 18.				
This in turn delayed Flight No. WG629 from Varadero to Calgary. Most passengers were held at hotel, some air-only passengers went to Varadero airport and were provided with meal vouchers.	Carrier states that destination representative informed passengers of the delay the previous night and passengers were held at the hotel. Carrier states that announcement made at Varadero airport saying that the flight was delayed due to the late arrival of the inbound aircraft.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state they were not provided with reasons for the delay until later by the flight crew (verbally). At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Flight No. WG629 departed.			Knock-on effect claimed	Ultimately, Flight No. WG629 was delayed due to the carrier's attempts to avoid having the passengers of Flight No. WG530 go through a 14-hour delay. What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for disruptions affecting another aircraft and crew two rotations earlier? What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Varadero)?
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because flight disruption due to late arrival of incoming aircraft, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	This appears to be an incorrect categorization as the incoming aircraft arrived late due to a decision of the carrier to mitigate a delay on another flight. Alternatively, if it is accepted that this is a knock-on effect originating from Flight No. WG530, then the reason for the delay should be weather.

Flight Count 24: WG596 / Cancun – Calgary / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
On January 17, Flight No. WG530 from Puerto Vallarta to Saskatoon was diverted to Calgary due to poor weather in Saskatoon.	Flight alerts issued with revised departure times.		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Flight No. WG628 aircraft and crew was used as rescue flight to bring Flight No. WG530 passengers to Calgary.				
This delayed Flight No. WG628 from Calgary to Varadero on January 18.				
This in turn delayed Flight No. WG629 from Varadero to Calgary.				
This in turn delayed Flight No. WG595 from Calgary to Cancun.				
This in turn delayed Flight No. WG596 from Cancun to Calgary.			Timeliness/content of notifications	<p>Carrier states that passengers were able to check in to flight at hotel, and would have been told during that process that the flight was delayed.</p> <p>Complainants state they were not provided with reasons for the delay until later by the flight crew (verbally).</p> <p>What was expected of carrier regarding notifications at hotel?</p>
Flight No. WG596 departed.			Knock-on effect claimed	<p>Ultimately, Flight No. WG596 was delayed due to the carrier's attempts to avoid having the passengers of Flight No. WG530 go through a 14-hour delay.</p> <p>What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for disruptions affecting another aircraft and crew four rotations earlier?</p> <p>What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Cancun)?</p>

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because flight disruption due to late arrival of incoming aircraft, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	<p>This appears to be an incorrect categorization as the incoming aircraft arrived late due to a decision of the carrier to mitigate a delay on another flight.</p> <p>Alternatively, if it is accepted that this is a knock-on effect originating from Flight No. WG530, then the reason for the delay should be weather.</p>

Flight Count 25: WG244 / Cancun – Montréal / Jan. 21

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight attendant from in-bound flight experienced ear problem, pilot unwilling to travel with flight attendant on crew in that condition resulting in missing crew complement.	Complainant provided the following flight alert: 17:22 – Revised times (from 3:40 p.m. updated to 03:15 a.m.). Carrier's log states delay announcement made: "The flight is delayed because the crew planned to operate your flight can no longer be utilised for the planned departure."		Timeliness/content of notifications	At the time of the flight disruptions in this inquiry, Sunwing had no system in place to provide reasons for the flight disruption in flight alerts.
Flight attendant from in-bound flight experienced ear problem, pilot unwilling to travel with flight attendant on crew in that condition resulting in missing crew complement.	Complainant provided the following flight alert: 17:22 – Revised times (from 3:40 p.m. updated to 03:15 a.m.). Carrier's log states delay announcement made: "The flight is delayed because the crew planned to operate your flight can no longer be utilised for the planned departure."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	One passenger states that various reasons were provided by airline employees for the flight disruption – crew illness, mechanical, weather – while another states being told that there was an indefinite delay for unknown reasons.
Carrier assessment that positioning one crew member from Canada would not work given the rest of the crew would time out.				
New crew sourced and dispatched from Toronto.				
Carrier arranged hotel accommodation, passengers return to hotel for duration of delay.				
Flight departed approximately 12 hours after originally-scheduled departure.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because outside carrier control due to regulatory requirements (i.e. Cabin Safety Regulations regarding crew complement).	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	Under what conditions are crew issues within control, required for safety, or outside control?

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because outside carrier control due to regulatory requirements (i.e. Cabin Safety Regulations regarding crew complement).	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	<p>Is the carrier's characterization of the reason for the flight disruption (regulatory requirements) correct or should it be crew illness?</p> <p>The carrier's reason for the flight disruption when denying compensation would have been difficult for passengers to understand.</p>

Flight Count 26: WG518 / Cancun - Montréal / Jan. 25

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Medical emergency during flight required diversion to Charlotte, North Carolina.				
Ill passenger offloaded, delay on tarmac in Charlotte due to need to perform overweight landing check and ground handler hired on an urgent basis by carrier not being authorized to operate in that particular zone of the tarmac.				
Crew timed out.	Carrier states that information provided to passengers in Charlotte as follows: "Your flight is delayed because your aircraft had an inflight operational requirement which caused the aircraft to make an unscheduled stop subsequently the flight is delayed because the crew planned to operate your flight can no longer be utilized for the planned departure."			
Passengers disembarked, baggage unloaded, passengers sent through U.S. Customs, then to hotel.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Passengers state that they had no information/assistance from the airline while they were collecting their baggage and clearing U.S. Customs.
Carrier hired ground handler for Charlotte and sourced new crew from Toronto.				
Flight departed for Montréal the following day.				
POST-EVENT	There do not appear to be any requests for compensation. In their account during the Inquiry, carrier stated that the flight disruption was caused by a medical emergency, outside the carrier's control.	Not within control		

Flight Count 27: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft grounded the previous day due to mechanical defect detected during arrival of previous flight.	<p>Carrier states that notification of delay was provided 12 hours in advance of flight departure.</p> <p>Carrier's log states notifications sent with reason for delay and revised departure times.</p>		Clarity/accuracy of communications	A complainant stated that "Airline check-in claimed they did not have to give any compensation for delays even after I informed them that regulations were changed in December 2019."
New aircraft sourced.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier denied compensation because flight disruption due to unscheduled aircraft servicing required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 28: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 20

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft grounded the previous day due to mechanical defect discovered during previous flight.	Complaint states that carrier delayed flight by nine hours at check-in; website indicated flight on time.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	It appears that the carrier website was not up to date.
Aircraft grounded the previous day due to mechanical defect discovered during previous flight.	Complaint states that carrier delayed flight by nine hours at check-in; website indicated flight on time.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complaint states that carrier announced a one-hour delay due to late arrival of incoming aircraft., and then, upon check-in, stated that the flight was delayed by nine hours.
New aircraft sourced.	Carrier sent notification with new flight time for departure the following day, due to unplanned maintenance. Carrier erroneously sent a notification regarding a different flight, but later sent an update notification apologizing for the error.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complaint states that verbal explanation provided by staff was that flight disruption was due to a cracked windshield.
New aircraft sourced.	Carrier sent notification with new flight time for departure the following day, due to unplanned maintenance. Carrier erroneously sent a notification regarding a different flight, but later sent an update notification apologizing for the error.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Carrier erroneously sent a notification regarding a different flight, but later sent an update notification apologizing for the error.
Flight departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent notification denying compensation because flight disruption due to maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 29: WO820 / Hamilton – Fort Lauderdale / Dec. 21

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft required maintenance on previous flight (WO650) on December 20, causing that flight to be delayed resulted in Flight No. WO820 crew timing out. Decision to use the aircraft for another flight.	E-mail notification sent 16 hours before scheduled flight departure, stating that the flight would be delayed by one day due to crew time-out as a result of issue with previous flight.		Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for crews for a flight disruption in Hamilton?
Aircraft required maintenance on previous flight (WO650) on December 20, causing that flight to be delayed resulted in Flight No. WO820 crew timing out. Decision to use the aircraft for another flight.	E-mail notification sent 16 hours before scheduled flight departure, stating that the flight would be delayed by one day due to crew time-out as a result of issue with previous flight.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	One passenger states that they were asked to pay \$15 to speak to an airline representative. It appears that this is in a general recording on the carrier's phone line, but it is not applied to passengers that require carrier assistance in circumstances such as these.
The flight was then rebuilt but as this was a second flight of the day with the same flight number they had to "cancel" it and use a different flight number. The carrier said it considered this a delay rather than a cancellation.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	Rebuilt flights could cause confusion in the communication if passengers get a cancellation notification then a delayed notification. Constraints around flight numbers operating on the same day may appear misleading.
Flight departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	Complainants denied compensation because they were rebooked on flights that resulted in no ultimate delay to the passenger.			

Flight Count 30: WO210 / Winnipeg – Hamilton / Jan. 10

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Previous flight (WO312) arrived late into Winnipeg due to weather/de-icing in Abbotsford, resulting in a first delay.	Just over an hour before scheduled departure of Flight No. WO210, carrier sent e-mail message regarding a delay, with no reason provided. Carrier sent e-mail half an hour after planned departure stating delay due to weather conditions out of carrier control.		Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for aircraft and crews for a flight disruption in Winnipeg?
Previous flight (WO312) arrived late into Winnipeg due to weather/de-icing in Abbotsford, resulting in a first delay.	Just over an hour before scheduled departure of Flight No. WO210, carrier sent e-mail message regarding a delay, with no reason provided. Carrier sent e-mail half an hour after planned departure stating delay due to weather conditions out of carrier control.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Reason for cancellation not provided in first e-mail message. (Note: Carrier states that from December 15 2019 to January 10, 2020, it did not provide reasons for disruption in first e-mail, but this was changed as of January 10, 2020, with reasons being automatically provided as of the first e-mail.)
Flight departed from gate in Winnipeg, but returned to gate following overwing exit door indicator.	Carrier sent various e-mail messages with updated departure times.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that carrier employees said that a mechanical issue was to blame.
Aircraft swap.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier denied compensation because flight disruption due to weather and maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety AND Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	Two independent reasons for the flight disruption: knock-on effect from weather impacting previous flight and mechanical issue with Flight No. WO210.

Flight Count 31: WO651 / Cancun - Hamilton / Jan. 14

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Crew member injured in Cancun, prior to flight.				
Flight delayed due to incomplete crew complement.	E-mail at 3:44 p.m.: "New departure time is 5:30 p.m. The delay of your flight is due to a traveler medical incident, which is outside Swoop's control. You may be eligible for completion of your itinerary."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that various reasons provided both verbally and by e-mail, including crew medical issue, traveler medical issue, controllable operational issues, and uncontrollable operational issues.
Flight cancelled due to incomplete crew complement.	E-mail at 6:04 p.m.: "Your flight has been cancelled We are working on rebooking options and will notify you by e-mail as soon as we can. The cancellation of your flight is due to uncontrollable operational issues, which are outside Swoop's control.			
Passengers rebooked on various other Swoop flights departing between 2 and 9 days later.	E-mail to one passenger at 7:23 p.m.: "New itinerary: Departure: 25 Jan 2020 at 8:05 p.m. The change of your flight is due to controllable operational issues, which are within Swoop's control. You may be eligible for completion of your itinerary, standards of treatment and compensation."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (2-9 day delay)	It appears that accommodations and meals were provided to passengers staying at all-inclusive resorts until passengers departed two to nine days later. But this does not appear to have been the case for other passengers.
POST-EVENT	Carrier stated that flight disruption was due to injury to crew. Two complainants state they received \$250 each.	Not within control, then changed to Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	Although flight disruption began with crew issue, it lasted several days given decision by carrier to return the aircraft to Canada to operate other flights while providing no solution for passengers stranded in Cancun.

Flight Count 32: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
During overnight maintenance to deal with one repair, another mechanical issue was discovered, which grounded the aircraft.				
Flight was cancelled, rebuilt, and departed the following day.	Nine hours before the planned departure of the flight, carrier states e-mail sent saying flight cancelled and would depart the following day, reason: "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight was cancelled, rebuilt, and departed the following day.	Nine hours before the planned departure of the flight, carrier states e-mail sent saying flight cancelled and would depart the following day, reason: "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	Some passengers were offered hotel accommodations.
POST-EVENT	Passengers state e-mail messages denied compensation for different reasons: unplanned maintenance, mechanical issue, safety issue.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.

Flight Count 33: WS123 / Calgary – Vancouver / Jan. 9

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight No. WS392 delayed into Halifax due to late arrival of connecting crew caused by maintenance issue with previous flight.	Carrier notification states reason for delay into Halifax was "crew maintenance safety."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Unclear what is meant by "crew maintenance safety" as reason for delay.
This resulted in delay to Flight No. WS229 (Halifax to Calgary).				
Flight No. WS229 further delayed by need for a fuel stop in Québec City.	Five or six flight delay notifications issued. Some stated "weather" as reason, others "crew."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements. Different reasons for delay provided to different passengers.
Flight No. WS229 further delayed by need for a fuel stop in Québec City.	Five or six flight delay notifications issued. Some stated "weather" as reason, others "crew."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements. Different reasons for delay provided to different passengers.
Late arrival of Flight No. WS229 in Calgary delayed departure of Flight No. WS123.			Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for aircraft and crews for a flight disruption two flights earlier in the sequence?
POST-EVENT	E-mail to complainant stated that compensation denied because disruption due to weather and outside carrier control. Complainant states that e-mail to companion stated that disruption was within carrier control and \$400 compensation would be provided.	Within control OR Not within control	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	Two companion passengers on same itinerary appear to have obtained different responses from carrier to requests for compensation.
POST-EVENT	E-mail to complainant stated that compensation denied because disruption due to weather and outside carrier control. Complainant states that e-mail to companion stated that disruption was within carrier control and \$400 compensation would be provided.	Within control OR Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	If a knock-on effect is claimed by the carrier, the categorization of the flight disruption should be the one that should be applied to the previous flights. Alternatively, what factors should determine the categorization when there are multiple flights in a knock-on sequence: chronology, length of delay due to a specific reason?

Flight Count 34: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight delayed before boarding due to mechanical issues in wing area discovered on Aircraft after landing from inbound flight.	Carrier states that two delay notifications were sent to passengers.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Flight delayed before boarding due to mechanical issues in wing area discovered on Aircraft after landing from inbound flight.	Carrier states that two delay notifications were sent to passengers.		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements but passengers state that many different reasons provided verbally by staff for the delay: frozen water pipe, issue with left wing, emergency door hydraulics, lack of maintenance staff, need to refuel plane.
Passengers waited in terminal while carrier attempted repair over a six-hour period.				
Flight cancelled.	E-mail sent cancelling flight, new departure for following day provided. Carrier states that reason provided was "unscheduled maintenance."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers state that different reasons provided verbally by staff for cancellation: lack of replacement part, crew timeout.
Flight cancelled.	E-mail sent cancelling flight, new departure for following day provided. Carrier states that reason provided was "unscheduled maintenance."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	It appears that passengers were offered meal vouchers and hotel accommodations.
Flight rebuilt as Flight No. WS4310 on January 13 (same aircraft).				
Flight No. WS4310 left gate on January 13, but delayed on tarmac for 3.5 hours for further repairs for the same issues as the previous day.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mails sent denying compensation because flight disruption due to unplanned maintenance required for safety reasons.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Some passengers state that airline staff said that compensation would be provided, including specifying the amount of \$1000.

Flight Count 35: WS2581 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Incoming aircraft delayed in Calgary due to mechanical issue (door).	About seven hours before planned departure of Flight No. WS2581, e-mail sent to passengers stating flight delayed by 5.5 hours due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Carrier states that mechanical issue with door was discovered during operations, when the aircraft arrived from Punta Cana with an open step panel.
Incoming aircraft delayed in Calgary due to mechanical issue (door).	About seven hours before planned departure of Flight No. WS2581, e-mail sent to passengers stating flight delayed by 5.5 hours due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for aircraft and crews for a flight disruption in Calgary and abroad (Cancun)?
Incoming aircraft delayed in Calgary due to mechanical issue (door).	About seven hours before planned departure of Flight No. WS2581, e-mail sent to passengers stating flight delayed by 5.5 hours due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Reason provided for cancellation ("unexpected event") does not match reason given for delay ("unplanned aircraft maintenance").
Incoming aircraft delayed in Calgary due to mechanical issue (door).	About seven hours before planned departure of Flight No. WS2581, e-mail sent to passengers stating flight delayed by 5.5 hours due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Timeliness/content of notifications	What is expectation regarding communications to passengers when carrier has not yet ascertained the reason for a flight disruption?
Attempts to repair aircraft in Calgary.				
Flight cancelled and rebuilt as Flight No. WS4381, departing January 13.	About six hours before revised departure time, flight cancelled due to "an unexpected event" and new flight scheduled for departure the following day.			
January 13 departure delayed three times (total delay of 2.5 hours).	Three e-mail messages saying flight delayed due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
January 13 departure delayed three times (total delay of 2.5 hours).	Three e-mail messages saying flight delayed due to "unplanned aircraft maintenance."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passenger states that pilot announced that passengers should fill out claims for compensation, which may have created the impression that compensation would be provided.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mails sent by carrier denying compensation because of unplanned maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 36: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delay due to weather and crew duty time issues in Toronto previous day.			Knock-on effect claimed	Airline states that weather conditions in Toronto led to departure metering out of Toronto, delaying the Toronto-Cancun flight of the aircraft for Flight No. WS2310 due to crew rest time requirements.
Delayed departure of Flight No. WS2310.	E-mail sent to at least one complainant, stating that flight disruption due to "flight crew member delays."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that airline representatives identified crew scheduling issues as the cause for the delay and said that weather was not the cause.
POST-EVENT	Passengers state that e-mails from carrier denied compensation for two different reasons.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	Assuming that the knock-on effect claim is accepted, then it appears that the disruption to Flight No. WS2310 can be attributed to the weather, which resulted in a delay to the inbound flight due to crew rest requirements.
POST-EVENT	Passengers state that e-mails from carrier denied compensation for two different reasons.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Complainants state that different reasons were given to different passengers for the delay. Both weather and the resulting crew rest requirements appear to be legitimate reasons for the flight disruption, but passengers would have been confused if they were given different reasons with no explanation of how weather led to the crew rest issue.

Flight Count 37: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight No. WS2766 delayed into Toronto due to weather conditions.				
Crew timed out and required to rest before departure of Flight No. WS2702.	Passenger states that approximately five hours before departure, e-mail message sent from carrier advised of a delay of 3 hours due to crew constraints.		Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for aircraft and crews for a flight disruption in Toronto?
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from carrier denying compensation due to flight crew member constraints the previous day that were outside the carrier's control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers were not provided with information regarding the connection between weather and the crew constraint issue, and why a crew constraint would be outside the carrier's control.

Flight Count 38: WS2702 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 15

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Crew member booked off, replaced by another crew member, who required rest before being able to travel, resulting in 120-minute delay to flight.	Passenger states that e-mail notification provided the previous night regarding a two-hour delay to the flight departure.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Airline did not provide reasons for the flight disruption in the first e-mail message.
After boarding, lavatory maintenance issue discovered, which required disembarking of passengers for repair, resulting in a further 124-minute delay.	Two e-mail messages sent by carrier stating length of delay, giving reason as unplanned aircraft maintenance, and stating "you may be entitled to standards of treatment for this disruption to your travel plans."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was due to unplanned aircraft maintenance required for safety purposes.	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	<p>There appear to be two independent reasons for the delays – crew and maintenance – resulting in delays of 120 minutes and 124 minutes, respectively.</p> <p>How should the flight disruption be categorized?</p> <p>Should both reasons be communicated to passengers?</p> <p>With respect to the first delay, under what conditions are crew issues within control, required for safety, or outside control?</p>

Flight Count 39: WS571 / Winnipeg – Edmonton / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Incoming flight delayed due to maintenance issue (GPS failure) discovered during operations (de-icing).			Knock-on effect claimed	Expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for aircraft and crews for a flight disruption in Winnipeg?
Incoming flight delayed due to maintenance issue (GPS failure) discovered during operations (de-icing).			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Resulted in requirement for crew rest.	Carrier states three notifications provided on the delay, stating reason as flight crew member availability.			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denied compensation because flight disruption due to flight crew member delays from previous day events outside of carrier's control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	If the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then the correct categorization should follow from the categorization of the delay of the previous flight, i.e. either within carrier's control or within control but required for safety.

Flight Count 40: WS2581 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight No. WS2310 delayed inbound aircraft and crew because of requirement for de-icing in Calgary due to weather conditions.				
Flight No. WS2581 departed Cancun late, resulting in arrival in Toronto delayed by 1 h 21.				
Complainant missed connection to Ottawa, was rebooked, and arrived in Ottawa approximately nine hours after originally expected.			Communication re Standard of Treatment	<p>Complainant states that no airline employees were available upon arrival in Toronto to assist and that they could not reach airline via telephone after multiple attempts.</p> <p>Complainant states that airline employees said that hotel and meals would not be provided since the airline has now adopted much stricter compensatory policies and only pays for mechanical issues that are within their control.</p>
POST-EVENT	Complainant states that they were denied compensation for the following reason: delay outside carrier control (weather).	Not within control		

Flight Count 41: WS3327 / Kelowna- Vancouver / Jan. 19 AND WS1864/ Vancouver-Honolulu / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
During a pre-flight check of Flight No. WS3327, mechanical issue discovered by crew.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Aircraft swapped.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements but passengers state that they were provided with different reasons for the delay verbally by airline employees: crew issues, unplanned maintenance, crew had insufficient time to make the connection.
Flight No. WS3327 departed 1 h 21 late, complainants missed Flight No. WS1864 connection to Honolulu, were rebooked, and arrived in Honolulu approximately 21 hours after originally expected.	Carrier states three messages were sent about the disruption being due to unplanned maintenance and one was sent about the disruption being due to crew delay due to weather. Carrier states that latter was an error.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, an erroneous message may have been sent ascribing the disruption to crew delay due to weather.
Flight No. WS3327 departed 1 h 21 late, complainants missed Flight No. WS1864 connection to Honolulu, were rebooked, and arrived in Honolulu approximately 21 hours after originally expected.	Carrier states three messages were sent about the disruption being due to unplanned maintenance and one was sent about the disruption being due to crew delay due to weather. Carrier states that latter was an error.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, flight crew may have suggested that compensation would be provided.
POST-EVENT	E-mail from carrier denied compensation due to inability of crew to make connecting flight, which was outside the carrier's control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	The flight disruption was ultimately due to a mechanical issue with Flight No. WS3327, so the correct categorization would appear to be within control, but required for safety.
POST-EVENT	E-mail from carrier denied compensation due to inability of crew to make connecting flight, which was outside the carrier's control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disruption, flight crew may have suggested that the disruption was within carrier control and compensation would be provided.

Flight Count 42: WS1352 / Winnipeg – Las Vegas / Jan. 23

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft grounded due to mechanical issue.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements but passengers state that they were provided with various reasons for the delay verbally by airline employees: unplanned aircraft maintenance, an aircraft swap, "an unexpected event."
Aircraft swapped.				
Passengers cleared through U.S. preclearance in Winnipeg.			Communication re Standard of Treatment	Carrier states meal vouchers provided.
Carrier decided to use aircraft and some crew as a recovery flight for a flight departing for Orlando.	Fifteen minutes before scheduled departure, carrier sent e-mail message stating flight delayed by four hours due to unplanned aircraft maintenance.			
New aircraft and crew sourced for Flight No. WS1352.				
Crew arrived after U.S. preclearance in Winnipeg was closed for the day, which meant flight would have to be operated as a non-precleared flight into the U.S.				
This required the carrier to "cancel" the flight and create a new one with a different number, and passengers to collect their baggage from the preclearance zone and move to the regular departure zone.	Two hours before new departure time, carrier sent e-mail message cancelling Flight No. WS1352 and creating a new flight. An hour later, carrier sent e-mail message saying flight delayed another half hour due to unplanned aircraft maintenance.			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because disruption was caused by unplanned aircraft maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	Is the correct reason/categorization unplanned aircraft maintenance required for safety or is it more related to the decision of the carrier to mitigate a flight disruption elsewhere on its network and therefore within the carrier's control?

Flight Count 43: WS2310 / Calgary – Cancun / Jan. 25

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft struck another aircraft on the tarmac.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that pilot said that aircraft had struck another aircraft and that aircraft needed to be replaced.
Carrier decided to replace aircraft.			Communication re Standard of Treatment	Carrier states meal vouchers provided.
Passengers disembarked.	Carrier states two e-mail messages sent regarding delay, saying it was due to safety.			
New aircraft and crew sourced.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation as disruption due to unplanned aircraft maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	Is the proper categorization "within control" (human error causing damage to aircraft) or "within control, but required for safety" (necessary replacement of aircraft for safety reasons)?

Flight Count 44: WS3324 / Vancouver-Kelowna / Jan. 29

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
First flight on the complainant's itinerary (WS657 Toronto-Calgary) cancelled due to maintenance issue.				
Complainant rerouted to final destination of Kelowna via Flight No. WS3324 (Vancouver – Kelowna).				
Complainant arrived in Kelowna 2.5 hours later than scheduled in original itinerary.				
POST-EVENT	<p>E-mail message from carrier denied compensation to complainant because disruption due to unplanned aircraft maintenance.</p> <p>E-mail message from carrier to complainant's travel companion said the disruption was due to unplanned aircraft maintenance, but providing \$400 in compensation.</p>	<p>Within control OR Within control, safety</p>	<p>Inconsistent treatment of passengers</p>	<p>Two companion passengers on same revised itinerary obtained different responses from carrier to requests for compensation.</p>

Flight Count 45: AC160 / Edmonton – Toronto / Jan. 10

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft returned to gate at 07:18 after 78 minutes on the tarmac following discovery of technical issue with aircraft (fuel leak). Passengers disembarked.	E-mail messages sent regarding delays, citing reason as "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Definition of "scheduled maintenance" Timeliness/content of notification	Issue discovered on tarmac, during operation, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule. Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Aircraft returned to gate at 07:18 after 78 minutes on the tarmac following discovery of technical issue with aircraft (fuel leak). Passengers disembarked.	E-mail messages sent regarding delays, citing reason as "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	During disembarkation, one complainant states that flight crew suggested that compensation would be provided.
Flight cancelled at approximately 12:10.	E-mail messages stating flight cancelled due to aircraft maintenance issues. Revised itineraries provided.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay over 6 hours)	Meal vouchers provided.
Passengers reprotected on other flights.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denied compensation because outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications – denial of compensation messages appear linked to the reprotected flights rather than the original flight.
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denied compensation because outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	In most cases, carriers have categorized critical mechanical problems discovered outside scheduled maintenance as "Within carrier control, but required for safety." In this case, the carrier has categorized a critical mechanical problem discovered outside scheduled maintenance as "outside carrier control."

Flight Count 46: AC1674 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 24

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight returned to gate after 30 minutes due to technical issue with air conditioning system.	Two passengers state that pilot stated that technical issue was fixed but that air carrier was concerned that the same issue would arise on the ground at destination.		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered on tarmac, during operation, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Flight returned to gate after 30 minutes due to technical issue with air conditioning system.	Two passengers state that pilot stated that technical issue was fixed but that air carrier was concerned that the same issue would arise on the ground at destination.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Some complainants state that pilot announced that the technical issue had been resolved but that the air carrier did not want the same issue to arise on the ground at destination.
Flight returned to gate after 30 minutes due to technical issue with air conditioning system.	Two passengers state that pilot stated that technical issue was fixed but that air carrier was concerned that the same issue would arise on the ground at destination.		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight returned to gate after 30 minutes due to technical issue with air conditioning system.	Two passengers state that pilot stated that technical issue was fixed but that air carrier was concerned that the same issue would arise on the ground at destination.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay of 4 hours)	Meal vouchers provided.
New aircraft sourced, food and baggage transferred to new aircraft, security sweep of new aircraft completed.				
Flight departed/arrived four hours delayed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation to some complainants because delay due to a scheduling issue and to other complainants because delay due to "unforeseen maintenance that does not include scheduled maintenance or mechanical problems identified during scheduled maintenance."	Within control, safety?	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) how the scheduling issue was categorized.

Flight Count 47: AC1847 / Puerto Vallarta - Toronto / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft mechanical issue required aircraft swap and new crew.	Beginning five hours before original scheduled departure, a series of e-mails sent by air carrier stating flight delayed due to technical issue with inbound aircraft and additional flight preparation time required. One complainant states that they were unable to reach Air Canada for many hours, but were eventually told that disruption due to freezing rain in Toronto.			
Mechanical issue with new inbound aircraft required second aircraft swap and yet another crew.	Final departure time provided in an e-mail approximately 45 minutes before original scheduled departure.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	During the flight, one complainant states that flight crew suggested that the flight disruption was within the carrier's control.
New inbound aircraft and crew arrived, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for different reasons: scheduling issues/out of carrier control, availability of aircraft/out of carrier control, bad weather/out of carrier control, safety-related issues.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.
POST-EVENT	Compensation denied to different passengers for different reasons: scheduling issues/out of carrier control, availability of aircraft/out of carrier control, bad weather/out of carrier control, safety-related issues.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 48: AC1986 / Montréal – Punta Cana / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft mechanical issue the previous day required aircraft swap, but availability of aircraft impacted by snow event.	Two e-mail messages sent two hours and one hour before original scheduled departure provided revised departure times. The messages stated reason was being investigated.		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Inbound aircraft mechanical issue the previous day required aircraft swap, but availability of aircraft impacted by snow event.	Two e-mail messages sent two hours and one hour before original scheduled departure provided revised departure times. The messages stated reason was being investigated.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Limited information provided to passengers during the flight disruption about the reasons for the delay.
Replacement aircraft sourced.				
Short, additional delay on tarmac due to de-icing.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail from carrier denied compensation because the flight disruption was caused by a mechanical issue and required for safety.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 49: AC1804 / Toronto – Montego Bay / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft had to be swapped twice due to mechanical issues with original and replacement aircraft.	Texts and e-mail messages to passengers began to be sent just over an hour before the original scheduled departure advising of revised flight times, due to aircraft technical issues and flight preparation.		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Aircraft had to be swapped twice due to mechanical issues with original and replacement aircraft.	Texts and e-mail messages to passengers began to be sent just over an hour before the original scheduled departure advising of revised flight times, due to aircraft technical issues and flight preparation.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay of 4 hours)	Some passengers state that they received \$20 meal vouchers while others state that they did not receive meal vouchers.
New aircraft sourced, maintenance performed.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages to passengers denying compensation because the carrier categorized the flight disruption as safety-related, stating reason as "scheduling issue."	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as safety-related.

Flight Count 50: AC167 / Toronto – Edmonton / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
After about 2 hours on the tarmac dealing with a refueling issue, passengers were disembarked.	A series of text messages were sent out by the air carrier, providing revised departure times, with the reason for the delay "fueling."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Limited information provided to passengers during the flight disruption about the reasons for the delay. Throughout the flight disruption, reason provided was "fueling."
The issue was identified as a serious one, requiring a new aircraft.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay of 4 hours)	One complainant states that they did not receive meal vouchers but other passengers did.
			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
A new aircraft was sourced.				
New catering had to be sourced, as previous catering had expired.				
Baggage transferred, passengers boarded, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent by air carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was outside carrier control, and caused by "scheduling issues."	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	<p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as safety-related.</p> <p>In many cases, carriers have categorized critical mechanical problems discovered outside scheduled maintenance as "Within carrier control, but required for safety." In this case, the carrier has categorized a critical mechanical problem discovered outside scheduled maintenance as "outside carrier control."</p>

Flight Count 51: AC1738 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 5

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed 1 h 16.	E-mail messages beginning about four hours before original scheduled departure stated new departure times, with reason for delay "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Thunderstorms forecast on planned route to Cancun; issue discovered with respect to onboard weather radar.				
New aircraft sourced from Greenboro, NC.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	One complainant claimed that employees stated that passengers would be compensated for the delays.
New aircraft had rudder issue on flight from Greenboro to Vancouver, returned to Greenboro.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers may have been confused by the fact that different reasons were provided for the flight disruption, with no explanatory thread connecting the different reasons.
Flight cancelled.	E-mail message stated flight cancelled due to aircraft maintenance. E-mail message providing new itinerary with departure the following day.			
New flight (ZX1998) departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages denying compensation were sent to some passengers stating that flight disruption was due to a safety-related risk and to others stating that flight disruption due to weather preventing the safe operation of the aircraft, outside carrier's control.	Within control, safety OR Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.

Flight Count 52: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan 6

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Multiple aircraft, including planned aircraft for Flight No. AC1627, were grounded for technical/maintenance issues the previous day due to multiple unscheduled maintenance issues (over wing exit door slide issue, flight control issue, etc).	Two e-mail or text messages sent approximately 9 hours before the original scheduled departure with a revised departure time, reason provided was "a technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."			
Replacement aircraft sourced and flown to Fort Lauderdale.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Replacement aircraft waited on tarmac until separate security breach handled at the gate.	Two e-mail or text messages sent while passengers at the gate with short additional delays due to "security breach on arrival."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	At least some passengers appear to have been provided with information verbally that a missing manual or lost carry-on was the cause of the additional delays.
Passengers boarded, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages to passengers denying compensation because the carrier categorized the flight disruption as safety-related, stating reason as "scheduling issue."	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as safety-related.

Flight Count 53: AC101 / Toronto – Vancouver / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed (27 minutes) due to enhanced U.S. baggage screening in Honolulu.	E-mail message sent 3 hours before scheduled departure with updated departure time, delay due to "aircraft towing." E-mail message sent just after original scheduled departure time stating that flight "delayed due to technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements. However, one complainant states that "throughout the wait, Air Canada made announcements saying that the aircraft was delayed due to its previous flight from Honolulu, the aircraft being stuck or delayed in the international terminal, aircraft towing, and aircraft technical issues."
Aircraft delayed on the tarmac on arrival in Toronto due to freezing rain and snow (25 minutes).				
Aircraft towing from international to domestic gate and bridging to domestic gate impacted by freezing rain (2 h 16).	Series of text messages sent out with revised departure times, delays due to "aircraft towing", then "aircraft technical issues."			
Passengers boarded, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages from air carrier denying compensation because disruption was due to bad weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have been able to reconcile the different reasons provided during the flight disruption with each other or with the final reason provided when compensation denied.

Flight Count 54: AC619 / Halifax – Toronto / Feb. 2

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Mechanical defect discovered on arrival of planned aircraft in Halifax.	Starting just before the original scheduled departure, two e-mail messages sent, delaying flight first to 21:00 (due to "weather affecting inbound aircraft") and then to 01:25 (due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during operation, not during aircraft's scheduled maintenance.
Mechanical defect discovered on arrival of planned aircraft in Halifax.	Starting just before the original scheduled departure, two e-mail messages sent, delaying flight first to 21:00 (due to "weather affecting inbound aircraft") and then to 01:25 (due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Replacement aircraft sourced (none available in Halifax).			Knock-on effect claimed (with respect to replacement aircraft)	What was expected of airline regarding availability of aircraft and crew for flight out of Halifax?
Incoming flight of replacement aircraft delayed due to weather and de-icing in Toronto.	E-mail messages sent, with further delays, due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."			
Passengers boarded, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption was safety-related. Reason: "Most significant contributing factor: scheduling. Airplane or flight crew not available due to direct effect of previous flight disruption outside of our control."	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Communication to passengers is unclear; It mentions a "previous flight disruption" as being outside carrier control, while compensation is being denied because the disruption was within carrier control, but required for safety. One complainant claims that employees stated that passengers would be compensated for the flight disruption.

Flight Count 55: AC842 / Toronto – Dublin / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight boarded.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight delayed at gate while baggage for absent passenger was removed.				
Bulk cargo door indicator required attention; repairs undertaken.				
Passengers disembarked and reboarded.	E-mail message sent stating new departure time, reason "minor aircraft repairs."			
As delay continued, crew duty time issue developed; flight rescheduled to following morning at 10 a.m.				
Replacement aircraft sourced.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Following day, flight delayed approximately an hour due to a maintenance issue on the replacement aircraft.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because reason for flight disruption was "scheduling", which was outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	<p>There were 2 independent reasons for the flight disruption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Baggage pull for absent passenger (1.5 hours, outside carrier control) b) Aircraft repairs (required for safety). <p>A third reason for the delay arose from the 2 independent reasons – crew time limits.</p> <p>What is the correct categorization of this flight disruption?</p> <p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.</p>

Flight Count 56: AC115 / Toronto – Vancouver / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft late due to weather.	Initial message sent by carrier stating that departure delayed due to late arrival of aircraft.		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Aircraft taken out of service just before departure due to engine issue.	A series of text messages sent out with revised departure times, stating reason as "technical issue with aircraft systems."			
Aircraft swapped.				
Departure delayed due to heavy snow affecting ground services.	Message sent by carrier stating that departure delayed due to ramp conditions.			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption caused by weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	What is the correct categorization of this flight disruption? Weather played a significant role in the flight disruption due to the delay of the inbound flight, the delay of the departure, and with respect to sourcing a replacement aircraft when the original aircraft had an engine issue.
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption caused by weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why there was a discrepancy between the communications during the flight disruption about a "technical issue" and the e-mail denying compensation, which provided the reason for the flight disruption as "weather."

Flight Count 57: AC828 / Montréal – Lyon / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft engine issue discovered 75 minutes before departure.	E-mail messages sent by carrier with revised departure times. Reason provided by e-mail messages for flight disruption: "additional flight preparation time." At least one other message sent, which provided a different reason for the flight disruption: "technical issues with aircraft systems."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why both "additional flight preparation time" and "technical issues with aircraft systems" were provided as reasons for the flight disruption.
Aircraft engine issue discovered 75 minutes before departure.	E-mail messages sent by carrier with revised departure times. Reason provided by e-mail messages for flight disruption: "additional flight preparation time." At least one other message sent, which provided a different reason for the flight disruption: "technical issues with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants claim that multiple reasons were provided for the flight disruptions through written and verbal means: additional flight preparation time, waiting for a mechanical part, waiting for another pilot and weather.
Aircraft repaired, but then heavy snow prevented proceeding to de-icing immediately.				
Cumulative delays resulted in crew duty time issue.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay of 1 day)	Some passengers received hotel vouchers for Montréal, while some incurred expenses for hotels in Montréal.
Flight cancelled.	E-mail message sent cancelling flight due to weather, and providing new itinerary.			
Passengers reprotected on flight the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption due to weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	What is the correct categorization of this flight disruption? Weather played a significant role, but the initial delay was due to an aircraft engine issue.
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption due to weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why weather was singled out as the reason for the flight disruption, when throughout the flight disruption, written communications from the carrier referred to "additional flight preparation time" or "technical issue with aircraft systems."

Flight Count 58: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale - Toronto / Jan. 8

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Late arrival of the inbound aircraft due to unplanned maintenance in Montréal (Montréal – Fort Lauderdale).	Two e-mail messages sent by air carrier about 8 hours before departure, providing revised departure times, stating delay due to "technical issues affecting the inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	Air carrier states that no other aircraft available in Montréal, so the carrier had to wait until the aircraft was repaired before traveling to Fort Lauderdale.
Minor delay due to slow boarding of Flight No. AC1627 in Fort Lauderdale.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	<p>E-mail messages were sent to complainants stating that compensation was denied because the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related issue, specifically a "scheduling issue."</p> <p>A follow-up e-mail was sent to one complainant who pursued the issue, denying compensation again because of a safety-related issue, but this time specifying "non-scheduled maintenance" as the reason.</p>	Within control, safety	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as safety-related.
POST-EVENT	<p>E-mail messages were sent to complainants stating that compensation was denied because the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related issue, specifically a "scheduling issue."</p> <p>A follow-up e-mail was sent to one complainant who pursued the issue, denying compensation again because of a safety-related issue, but this time specifying "non-scheduled maintenance" as the reason.</p>		Clarity/accuracy of communications	The follow-up e-mail sent to at least one complainant has a different reason for the flight disruption than was originally provided, "non-scheduled maintenance."

Flight Count 59: AC1812 / Toronto – Cancun / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Scheduled aircraft placed out of service due to a technical issue detected during a previous flight about five hours before scheduled departure time.				
Flight cancelled.	Text message sent about four hours before scheduled departure, cancelling flight and providing revised itinerary departing the following day. Reason provided: "aircraft maintenance."			
Replacement flight departed the following day, with a slight delay.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from air carrier denying compensation because flight disruption outside carrier control, due to "scheduling issues."	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from air carrier denying compensation because flight disruption outside carrier control, due to "scheduling issues."	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Lack of clarity regarding the subject of communications (scheduled flight or recovery flight). At the time of the flight disruption, passengers were provided with a different reason for the cancellation ("aircraft maintenance").

Flight Count 60: AC1854 / Las Vegas – Toronto / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight to Las Vegas had to return to Toronto due to technical issue (lavatories not functioning).			Knock-on effect claimed	What was expected of air carrier regarding availability of aircraft and crew in Toronto and Las Vegas?
Once back in Toronto, another technical issue was discovered (cargo fire extinguishing system indicator), which put the aircraft out of service.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Given the late hour, there was no time to swap the aircraft and reboard, given that U.S. Customs at Pearson Airport had closed for the day.				
Flight cancelled and passengers were reprotected on flights the following day.	E-mail and text cancelling flight, and providing revised itineraries, reason: "aircraft technical issues."			
At least one of the reprotected flights experienced a delay the following day.				
POST-EVENT	<p>E-mail messages from the air carrier sent to different complainants denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of the carrier's control.</p> <p>In some cases, reasons for the flight disruption were provided for the original flight (AC1854): "scheduling issue."</p> <p>In other cases, reasons for the flight disruption were provided for the reprotection flights: "IT issue" (ZX1999), "crew constraints" (ZX1852).</p>	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
POST-EVENT	<p>E-mail messages from the air carrier sent to different complainants denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of the carrier's control.</p> <p>In some cases, reasons for the flight disruption were provided for the original flight (AC1854): "scheduling issue."</p> <p>In other cases, reasons for the flight disruption were provided for the re-protection flights: "IT issue" (ZX1999), "crew constraints" (ZX1852).</p>	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	In some cases, reasons provided for disruption of original scheduled flight, in others for disruption of re-protection flights.

Flight Count 61: AC1813 / Cancun – Toronto / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft taken out of service in Toronto due to a mechanical issue discovered by pilot during previous flight. Flight No. AC1813 cancelled.	E-mail messages sent by carrier approximately 8 hours before the original schedule departure, stating that flight cancelled, passengers rebooked on flight the following day, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	Airline states that multiple aircraft were out of service due to weather impacts in Montréal and that no replacement aircraft was available in Toronto.
Aircraft taken out of service in Toronto due to a mechanical issue discovered by pilot during previous flight. Flight No. AC1813 cancelled.	E-mail messages sent by carrier approximately 8 hours before the original schedule departure, stating that flight cancelled, passengers rebooked on flight the following day, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but some complainants state that they were told that the flight disruption was due to crew constraints, while others state that they were told that the flight disruption was due to mechanical issues, and the carrier was awaiting a part.
Aircraft taken out of service in Toronto due to a mechanical issue discovered by pilot during previous flight. Flight No. AC1813 cancelled.	E-mail messages sent by carrier approximately 8 hours before the original schedule departure, stating that flight cancelled, passengers rebooked on flight the following day, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (delay of 1 day)	All complainants except one were provided with hotel accommodations.
Flight the following day (AC1997) delayed approximately six hours.	A series of e-mail messages were sent by carrier with revised departure times. Initially, reason "still under investigation", later reason "technical issue with aircraft systems."			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption of Flight No. AC1997 was delayed due to a maintenance issue, safety-related.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	E-mail message only referred to the replacement flight, not to the original cancelled flight.

Flight Count 62: AC966 / Toronto – Bridgetown / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight delayed due to aircraft being delayed because of bad weather impacting previous flights.	Approximately 12 hours prior to departure, airline sent e-mail message delaying flight by 2 hours due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Knock-on effect claimed	Airline states that attempt to use second aircraft failed because of required maintenance; and that aircraft availability impacted by bad weather in Toronto the previous day.
Flight delayed due to aircraft being delayed because of bad weather impacting previous flights.	Approximately 12 hours prior to departure, airline sent e-mail message delaying flight by 2 hours due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	The reason provided for the delay appears to be incorrect.
Flight delayed due to aircraft being delayed because of bad weather impacting previous flights.	Approximately 12 hours prior to departure, airline sent e-mail message delaying flight by 2 hours due to "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Additional delay due to inability to use a second aircraft due to required maintenance of that aircraft.	Airline sent text message delaying flight by an additional hour.			
Additional minor delay due to boarding.	Airline sent e-mail with a minor further delay.			
Flight departed, minor delay due to weather during flight.				
POST-EVENT	In e-mail messages denying compensation, airline stated that flight disruption due to bad weather and out of carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Passengers would not have understood why they were provided with "technical issue with aircraft systems" as the reason for the delay during the flight disruption and bad weather as the reason after a claim for compensation was submitted.
POST-EVENT	In a second e-mail to one complainant, following the initial e-mail from the carrier, airline stated that the "technical issue with aircraft systems" was the cause of the minor boarding delay, but that most of the delay was due to bad weather.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	"Technical issue with aircraft systems" was used as a reason for delay well before the minor delay during boarding.

Flight Count 63: AC7917 / Raleigh – Toronto / Dec. 30

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight pushed off from gate a few minutes late due to late incoming aircraft.	E-mail message sent by carrier with minor delay to flight departure time, reason: "weather affecting inbound aircraft."		Clarity/accuracy of communications AND Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but passengers state that over the course of the flight disruption, they were provided with various reasons for the disruption, including brake, fuel, crew issues.
Flight returned to gate a few minutes later due to parking brake failure.				
Passengers disembarked.				
Carrier determined that crew would have to be flown in from Toronto to repair aircraft.	E-mail message sent by carrier with revised flight departure time, reason: "aircraft maintenance requirements."			
Replacement aircraft sourced for flight – from later inbound flight from Toronto.				
Replacement aircraft delayed in Toronto due to maintenance issue.	E-mail message sent by carrier with revised flight departure time, reason: "aircraft maintenance requirements."			
On arrival of replacement aircraft in Raleigh, delay in fueling due to late hour.	E-mail message sent by carrier with revised flight departure time, reason: "additional fueling time."			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from air carrier denying compensation because reason for flight disruption was "maintenance", a "safety-related issue."	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 64: AC338 / Vancouver – Ottawa / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed 40 minutes due to required de-icing in Edmonton.	E-mail message sent to passengers stating "flight is delayed due to the late arrival of the inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	
On arrival in Vancouver, cabin odour detected and investigated.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Determination that issue could not be resolved until the next day, resulting in aircraft swap (to a smaller aircraft).				
Because the replacement aircraft had fewer seats, some passengers were rebooked on other flights.				
Further delay due to jet bridge malfunction.				
Flight departed with replacement aircraft.				
At least one other flight to which passengers had been rebooked was delayed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message denying compensation to one complainant because the reason for the flight disruption was safety-related, specifically due to an aircraft maintenance procedure. Other complainants claim that they received messages stating that the flight disruption was outside carrier control or due to "scheduling issues."	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Post-event, different reasons provided to different passengers for denying compensation.

Flight Count 65: AC1813 / Cancun - Toronto / Jan. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Shortly before boarding, a flight attendant reported sick.			Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
As no other flight attendant was available in Cancun, the carrier cancelled the flight until the following day.	E-mail sent by carrier 45 minutes before the scheduled departure time saying that the flight was cancelled due to lack of crew.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	Complainants state that hotel and ground transportation provided, but no meals.
Passengers provided overnight hotel and ground transportation, but no meals.				
Flight was delayed departing the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was required for safety.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Under what conditions are crew issues within control, required for safety, or outside control?
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was required for safety.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Communication to passengers denying compensation made no link between the reason provided during the flight disruption (crew constraints) with the reason/categorization provided after compensation was requested (safety).

Flight Count 66: AC8508 / Toronto – Deer Lake / Jan. 24

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Just over four hours before the original scheduled departure, flight delayed until crew for the flight (pilot) was fully staffed.	At least one message from carrier app stating that flight delayed due to crew availability issue.		Timeliness/content of notification	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Two hours before revised departure time, identified pilot called in sick.			Clarity/accuracy of communications	The carrier app message that the flight was delayed was posted later than the text message cancelling the flight.
Flight cancelled, rescheduled for the following day.	Text message sent by carrier cancelling flight.			
Rescheduled flight experienced flight delay.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of carrier control and due to "customer processing issues."	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption	The original flight was cancelled due to a lack of staff (pilot). What was expected of airline regarding availability of crew for flight from Toronto? Under what conditions are crew issues within control, required for safety, or outside control?
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of carrier control and due to "customer processing issues."	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	The e-mail denying compensation appears to be referring to a flight delay in the rescheduled flight rather than in the original cancelled flight. A passenger stated in their complaint that a Customer Service Agent advised passengers that the delay was due to crew availability and that passengers would be compensated \$1000.

Flight Count 67: AC1821 / Puerto Plata –Toronto / Dec. 30

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed then taken out of service in Toronto due to technical issues with aircraft discovered during operations.	Series of e-mail messages beginning over 4 hours before original scheduled departure sent by carrier, providing a series of delayed departure times, reason provided: "technical issue affecting inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	<p>What was expected of carrier regarding sourcing alternative aircraft for Puerto Plata other than through finding another inbound aircraft?</p> <p>What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Puerto Plata) or from Toronto?</p>
Replacement aircraft sourced from later inbound flight.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Two complainants submitted e-mail messages from carrier denying compensation because delay was due to "scheduling issues" outside carrier control. One passenger claims that they were informed that compensation was denied because the flight disruption was safety-related.	Not within control (or Within control, safety)	Categorization of Flight Disruption	<p>Given that the delay was the result of a knock-on effect from an aircraft taken out of service for mechanical issues discovered during operations, it would appear that the correct categorization of the flight disruption should be within control, but required for safety.</p> <p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.</p>

Flight Count 68: AC848 / Toronto – London / Dec. 20

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Aircraft repair issue discovered on arrival in Toronto, taken out of service.				
Flight cancelled.	Message sent from air carrier approximately five hours before scheduled departure, cancelling flight, reason: "aircraft maintenance."		Clarity/accuracy of communications	The phrase "aircraft maintenance" as a reason for a cancellation may lead to confusion as it may be interpreted by passengers as referring to regularly-scheduled aircraft maintenance rather than to resolving a technical issue that arose during operations.
Passengers rebooked on various flights the same night or the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent to one complainant, denying compensation because the cancellation was due to maintenance safety reasons, outside carrier control. Another complainant states that they received the same reason, but categorized as required for safety.	Not within control (or Within control, safety)	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Given that the cancellation was the result of mechanical issues discovered during operations, it would appear that the correct categorization of the flight disruption should be within control, but required for safety.

Flight Count 69: TS2842 / Ottawa – Puerto Plata / Jan. 31

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Issue with navigational database on planned aircraft on arrival in Ottawa.				
Assessment that navigational database could not be downloaded quickly enough for the aircraft to provide service for Flight No. TS2842.	On check-in and then via announcements at gate, passengers informed of delay for technical/safety issues.		Clarity/accuracy of communications	Carrier staff handed out complaint forms and said passengers could claim \$400 per person for the delay and that passengers would receive an additional compensation (later provided as \$100 travel credit).
Replacement aircraft sourced in Montréal and ferried to Ottawa.				
Crew change.				
Flight departed				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was required for safety, specifically due to "an unforeseen technical issue with the aircraft."	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Complainants may not have understood the connection between the technical issue with the original aircraft, the aircraft swap, and a "safety issue."

Flight Count 70: TS494 / Montréal – Cayo Coco / Jan. 17

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
An issue with the aircraft's Flight Management Unit while taxiing forced the aircraft to return to the gate and passengers to deplane.	Announcement made onboard by crew, citing a technical/safety issue.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (7.5-hour delay)	Some passengers received a \$15 meal voucher after the first return to gate. Not all passengers received it as carrier staff ran out of time to complete the distribution.
Aircraft swapped with a first replacement aircraft, flight pushed off from gate a second time.	Carrier provided updates to passengers using its website and its app.			
First replacement aircraft experienced an engine system control fault requiring the aircraft to return to the gate and passengers to be deplaned again.				
Flight delayed while awaiting a second replacement aircraft, inbound from Paris.	Announcement made at gate with new departure time.			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Two sets of e-mail messages denying compensation were sent to complainants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Some complainants were told the entire narrative of the flight delay, including the two aircraft swaps, with the reason for each aircraft swap providing, concluding that the flight disruption was outside carrier control. (b) Other complainants were only told that the flight disruption was due to an unexpected technical issue and required for safety. 	Not within control AND Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Given the sequence of events, the categorization of the flight disruption as outside carrier control communicated to some complainants appears to be incorrect.
POST-EVENT	Two sets of e-mail messages denying compensation were sent to complainants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Some complainants were told the entire narrative of the flight delay, including the two aircraft swaps, with the reason for each aircraft swap providing, concluding that the flight disruption was outside carrier control. (b) Other complainants were only told that the flight disruption was due to an unexpected technical issue and required for safety. 	Not within control AND Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communications	The complainants provided the terser explanation rather than the whole narrative would not have been able to connect the reason ultimately provided for the flight disruption (unexpected technical issue) with the different reasons provided during the flight disruption.

Flight Count 71: TS2960 / Montréal – Roatan / Jan. 6

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
After pushing off from gate in Montréal, technical issue with GPS-related system detected, requiring return to gate and deplaning of passengers.	Announcement about return to gate made by crew, reason: technical/safety issue.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (first delay)	\$15 meal vouchers provided.
Flight delayed 5 h 35 while repairs conducted.	Series of notifications via app with revised departure times.			
Flight departed.				
En route to Roatan, bad weather in Roatan resulted in diversion to Varadero.	Announcement made during flight, reason: weather in Roatan.			
Passengers deplaned in Varadero.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (second delay)	Overnight accommodations provided in all-inclusive hotel in Varadero.
Decision to overnight in Varadero, with departure to Roatan the following day. Hotel accommodations provided.				
Flight departed to Roatan the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail denying compensation because flight disruption was due to an unexpected technical issue and required for safety.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	There appear to be two independent reasons for the delay – technical and weather.- categories 3 and 2. How should the flight disruption be categorized?

Flight Count 72: TS2961 / Roatan – Montréal / Jan. 6

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Incoming flight diverted to Varadero due to bad weather conditions in Roatan.	Beginning about two hours before the original scheduled departure, the carrier issued a series of notifications with new departure times; reason provided was the late arrival of the aircraft. For all-inclusive package passengers, notifications were provided at the hotels; for air-only passengers, announcements were made at the airport.		Knock-on effect claimed	What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Roatan)?
Flight postponed to following day; passengers provided overnight accommodations.	Carrier provided notification that flight postponed to following day, overnight accommodations to be provided, reason: weather.			
Flight departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent denying compensation due to weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control		

Flight Count 73: AC1947 / Lima – Toronto / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed multiple times starting from the previous day, due to separate technical issues with the aircraft, and ultimately the requirement to swap aircraft (twice) and crew.	Beginning about 14 hours before the original scheduled departure, series of e-mail messages from carrier progressively delaying departure time, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that there were no other options than to wait for an inbound aircraft and crew to Lima, given that Lima is not an aircraft or crew base for the carrier. Carrier states that replacement aircraft and crew were constrained due to weather event in Canada that caused multiple cancellations on the previous day.
Inbound aircraft delayed multiple times starting from the previous day, due to separate technical issues with the aircraft, and ultimately the requirement to swap aircraft (twice) and crew.	Beginning about 14 hours before the original scheduled departure, series of e-mail messages from carrier progressively delaying departure time, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (11-hour delay)	Passengers state no standard of treatment provided.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail from carrier denying compensation because flight disruption due to "scheduling issues" outside of carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Given that the delay was the result of a knock-on effect of mechanical issues with the inbound aircraft, it would appear that the correct categorization of the flight disruption should be within control, but required for safety. For those passengers denied compensation due to "scheduling issues", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 74: AC1577 / Toronto – Edmonton / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Issue with flaps of aircraft discovered on the previous flight, approximately 6 hours before the original scheduled departure.	Two e-mail messages sent by carrier with revised departure times, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainant claims that announcements were not made every 30 minutes.
Aircraft swapped.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was due to "scheduling issues" outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to "scheduling issues", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 75: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Delay in Flight No. AC2414 (Vancouver-Phoenix) due to weather in Vancouver, gating constraints and requirement for de-icing, resulted in delay to inbound flight for Flight No. AC2411 (Phoenix-Vancouver, AC2415).	Two hours before original scheduled departure of Flight No. AC2411, e-mail message sent by carrier providing revised departure time (just over 2-hour delay), reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Knock-on effect claimed	What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for disruptions affecting an aircraft and crew two rotations earlier?
Delay in Flight No. AC2414 (Vancouver-Phoenix) due to weather in Vancouver, gating constraints and requirement for de-icing, resulted in delay to inbound flight for Flight No. AC2411 (Phoenix-Vancouver, AC2415).	Two hours before original scheduled departure of Flight No. AC2411, e-mail message sent by carrier providing revised departure time (just over 2-hour delay), reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed.	Just before revised departure time, carrier app revised departure time slightly, reason: "later arrival of the inbound aircraft."			
POST-EVENT	A complaint states that the carrier denied compensation because the delay was caused by maintenance issues outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the categorization as outside carrier control (3) appears correct, but the reason in that case should probably be stated as weather, the cause of the initial knock-on effect sequence.

Flight Count 76: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight (AC2415, Phoenix-Vancouver) taken out of service in Phoenix due to hydraulic leak discovered during operations.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier swapped aircraft. Replacement aircraft suffered mechanical issue, which carrier repaired overnight. Carrier states that aircraft options limited due to weather event in Montréal and Toronto.
Replacement aircraft sourced.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complaints allege that, in response to passenger requests for information on their rights and options for alternative travel arrangements, carrier staff were unfamiliar with the APPR.
Replacement aircraft aileron issued identified just prior to departure from Vancouver.	Beginning about an hour after the original scheduled departure, a series of e-mail messages sent by carrier progressively delaying flight departure time, reason: "additional flight preparation time."			
Flight No. AC2411 cancelled, passengers rescheduled to Flight No. AC2421 the following day.	Four hours after the original scheduled departure, e-mail message from carrier cancelling flight, reason: "aircraft maintenance."			
Delay in Flight No. AC2421 the following day.				
Flight No. AC2421 departure.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier responded to e-mail requesting compensation for Flight No. AC2411 cancellation by denying compensation for Flight No. AC2421 because the delay of Flight No. AC2421 was due to a safety-related maintenance issue.	Within control, safety (reprotected flight)	Clarity/accuracy of communications	While referencing that the request for compensation was with respect to Flight No. AC2411, the denial message provided an explanation for the delay of Flight No. AC2421 (reprotected flight).

Flight Count 77: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Dec. 27

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound crew delayed due to inbound flight delay from passenger medical issue and return to gate.	E-mail sent by carrier to a complainant stating that flight delayed due to "crew availability" issue.		Knock-on effect claimed	What was expectation of airline in terms of reserve capacity for crews in Toronto?
Passengers boarded while awaiting crew.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Further delays to crew.				
Passengers disembarked.				
Flight cancelled.				
Passengers rebooked on flights departing the following day.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier denied compensation, stating that flight disruption due to crew availability and scheduling issues outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	If the knock-on claim is accepted, the categorization of the flight disruption appears to be correct.

Flight Count 78: AC1627 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft from Flight No. AC1602 grounded in Montréal due to hydraulic issue discovered during operation.	Series of e-mail messages sent by carrier, beginning about 6 hours before the original scheduled departure, advising passengers of progressively delayed departure times, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier attempted three aircraft swaps, all of which failed. Weather appears to have both exacerbated the flight disruption itself (e.g. de-icing delays) and also limited the options with respect to aircraft and crew available for a flight out of Fort Lauderdale.
Replacement inbound aircraft from Flight No. AC1624 returned to gate in Toronto due to wing indicator light issue.				
Aircraft swap for Flight No. AC1624, but delays due to weather and de-icing resulted in crew duty time issue.				
Another replacement inbound aircraft and crew from Flight No. AC1608 was grounded following dual engine flameout during de-icing in Montréal.			Timeliness/content of notifications and Communication re Standard of Treatment and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Airline did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complaint states that carrier representatives provided "weather" as the reason for the cancellation and stated that no overnight hotel stays would be provided. Passengers were provided with meal vouchers with the label "CONTROLLABLE", which could have led them to assume that the carrier considered the flight disruption to be within carrier control.
Flight No. AC1627 cancelled.	E-mail message from carrier cancelling the flight, reason: "weather."			
Passengers reprotected on flights departing Fort Lauderdale the following day.	Notifications from carrier provided flight number and departure time for reprotection flights.			
POST-EVENT	At least one e-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because disruption to Flight No. AC1627 caused by weather and outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the reason for the flight disruption should probably be the mechanical issue in Flight No. AC1602, within carrier control but required for safety, although weather played a significant role in the flight disruption as well.

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
POST-EVENT	<p>At least one e-mail sent by carrier denying compensation referred to a reprotected flight rather than to Flight No. AC1627.</p> <p>A follow-up e-mail to this e-mail clarified that crew constraints and maintenance issues played a role in the cancellation of the original flight (AC1627).</p>	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communications	<p>The denial message provided an explanation for the delay of the reprotected flight, rather than for the cancellation of Flight No. AC1627.</p> <p>The more detailed follow-up message from the carrier, while providing additional information, was poorly written and difficult to understand.</p>

Flight Count 79: AC1738 / Vancouver – Cancun / Jan. 17

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed due to mechanical issue (navigational light) and due to adverse ground handling situation in Toronto due to cold weather.	Series of e-mail messages sent by carrier beginning about five hours before the original scheduled departure of Flight No. AC1738, progressively delaying flight, reason: "weather affecting airport ground operations."		Knock-on effect claimed	Extended attempt to repair the malfunction, replacement aircraft and crew sourced from Toronto.
Inbound aircraft delayed due to mechanical issue (navigational light) and due to adverse ground handling situation in Toronto due to cold weather.	Series of e-mail messages sent by carrier beginning about five hours before the original scheduled departure of Flight No. AC1738, progressively delaying flight, reason: "weather affecting airport ground operations."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	The reason provided for the disruption to Flight No. AC1738 did not refer to the inbound flight being delayed for a mechanical/safety reason.
Navigational light issue arose again on inbound aircraft landing in Vancouver.				
Repairs attempted.				
Inbound continuing passengers disembarked.				
Continued attempt at repairs.				
Flight No. AC1738 cancelled.	E-mail message from carrier cancelling flight, providing Flight No. AC1998 as re-protection flight the following day.			
Passengers reprotected on Flight No. AC1998 the following day.			Clarity/accuracy of communication	The reason provided for the disruption to Flight No. AC1998 was "security check" rather than the crew rest time issue stated by the carrier during the inquiry.
Delay in Flight No. AC1998 departure due to requirement for inbound crew rest time.	Series of e-mail messages from carrier with progressive delays, reason: "security checks on the inbound aircraft."			
Flight No. AC1998 departed.				
POST-EVENT	A complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier, offering compensation of \$400 for the delay of the re-protection flight (AC1998), but in response to a follow-up request from the complainant, the carrier sent an e-mail stating that the disruption to Flight No. AC1738 was due to maintenance required for safety reasons.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 80: UA1067 / Vancouver – San Francisco / Jan. 31

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed 30 minutes due to air traffic restrictions due to weather in San Francisco.	Text message from carrier noting delay to Flight No. UA1067 due to delay of inbound aircraft as a result of air traffic restrictions in San Francisco due to weather conditions.		Knock-on effect claimed	The delay caused by the inbound flight was a relatively minor element to the overall delay for the disruption to Flight No. UA1067 (30 minutes out of 6.5 hours).
Inbound flight delayed 30 minutes due to air traffic restrictions due to weather in San Francisco.	Text message from carrier noting delay to Flight No. UA1067 due to delay of inbound aircraft as a result of air traffic restrictions in San Francisco due to weather conditions.		Timeliness/content of notification	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements or written notifications to passengers.
Just before the planned departure from Vancouver, mechanical issue (engine valve) discovered, requiring repairs.	A series of text messages sent by carrier with progressive delays in the departure time of Flight No. UA1067, reason: "we are addressing a technical issue on your plane."			
Boarding began while repairs were undertaken.				
Passengers disembarked, repairs continued.				
Passengers boarded.				
Further delay while awaiting documentation for completed repairs.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption "due to safety reasons."	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	The e-mail messages from the carrier stated that the flight disruption was due to safety reasons, but without being specific about the reasons.

Flight Count 81: UA2268 / Houston – Edmonton / Jan. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft experienced air turbulence and had to be inspected on landing in Houston, and was taken out of service shortly afterwards.			Knock-on effect claimed	What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures?
Inbound aircraft experienced air turbulence and had to be inspected on landing in Houston, and was taken out of service shortly afterwards			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements or written notifications to passengers.
A replacement aircraft was sourced via another inbound flight into Houston.				
The replacement aircraft was prepared for Flight No. UA2268, flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because disruption due to need to resolve a mechanical issue for safety reasons.	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 82: UA2437 / Calgary – Denver / Jan. 17

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Maintenance issue (frozen potable water pipes) detected while aircraft overnighing, approximately 8 hours before the original scheduled departure. Maintenance was called and claimed to have resolved issue 20 minutes later.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	The maintenance issue was discovered during routine maintenance, but was reported to be resolved.
Passengers began boarding on time.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements or written notifications to passengers, but complainants state that they were told about the frozen water pipe issue and about attempts to solve the problem, until they were finally told that the flight was cancelled.
Just before departure, same maintenance issue detected, and attempts to resolve issue began.				
Passengers disembarked.				
Attempts to resolve issue continued for over five hours.				
Flight cancelled.				
Passengers rescheduled on other flights.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation because the flight disruption was due to safety reasons.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The maintenance issue appears to have been detected during routine maintenance, but was quickly afterwards reported as resolved. However, during the departure preparations, it was discovered that the maintenance issue still existed.
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation because the flight disruption was due to safety reasons.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	The e-mail messages from the carrier stated that the flight disruption was due to safety reasons, but without being specific about the reasons.

Flight Count 83: UA3615 / Montréal – Chicago / Jan. 13

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Shortly before takeoff, a piece of rock was detected embedded in one of the aircraft's tires.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	Issue discovered during pre-flight check, which is not part of aircraft's Maintenance Schedule.
Carrier attempted to source replacement tire, first from Premier Aviation in Trois-Rivières, but assessed that this would take too long.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements or written notifications to passengers, but complainants state that they received many delay notifications and were made aware that the delay was caused by a tire replacement issue.
Carrier instead sourced a complete set of pre-assembled wheels and tires from SkyRegional in Montréal.				
As the sourced wheels and tires were not pre-approved for the flight operator (Republic Airways), engineering approval was required for their use.				
Following approval, carrier had to wait for maintenance crew rotation to be completed before installation.				
Installation completed.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent an e-mail to one complainant denying compensation because flight disruption due to "extraordinary circumstances that could not be reasonably avoided" and "because the primary reason was beyond our control."	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The issue was discovered during operations (pre-flight check) rather than during routine maintenance. Elements of issue handling were within carrier control (location of spare tire, recourse to non-approved wheel set from Montréal). The issue had to be resolved for safety reasons.
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent an e-mail to another complainant denying compensation because flight disruption due to a "mechanical issue for safety reasons."	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The issue was discovered during operations (pre-flight check) rather than during routine maintenance. Elements of issue handling were within carrier control (location of spare tire, recourse to non-approved wheel set from Montréal). The issue had to be resolved for safety reasons.

Flight Count 84: UA4954 / Toronto – Chicago / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
The flight operator (CommutAir) experienced a network outage approximately two hours before the original scheduled departure time of the flight.	Carrier sent a series of e-mail messages progressively delaying flight, reason: "we are working to resolve an issue affecting our computer systems."		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements or written notifications to passengers, but complainants state they were told that there were various reasons for the delay: computer issues, safety issues, pilots being late, "crew in customs."
All operations of CommutAir, including flights, were halted while the issue was being resolved.				
Operations resumed approximately 4 hours after the original scheduled departure.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Complaints do not raise the issue of compensation. During the inquiry, carrier stated that the network outage was out of carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	What is the correct categorization of a network outage which is not the result of a cyber-attack?

Flight Count 85: AC1806 / Toronto – San Jose / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed due to maintenance, required aircraft swap.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that multiple aircraft out of service that day.
Further delay due to de-icing delay and adverse ramp conditions in Toronto.	Complainants state that carrier sent numerous e-mail messages with progressive delays, reasons: additional aircraft preparation time and technical issues affecting the inbound aircraft.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	At least one complainant received e-mail message from carrier denying compensation because the delay was due to "scheduling issues" outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) how the scheduling issue was categorized. Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the reason for the flight disruption should probably be the maintenance issue with the inbound aircraft, within carrier control but required for safety, although weather played a significant role in the flight disruption as well.
POST-EVENT	One complainant received e-mail message from carrier denying compensation because the delay was due to bad weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) how the scheduling issue was categorized. Assuming this is indeed a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the reason for the flight disruption should probably be the maintenance issue with the inbound aircraft, within carrier control but required for safety, although weather played a significant role in the flight disruption as well.

Flight Count 86: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 14

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound Flight No. AC2411 delayed due to mechanical issue with aircraft in Vancouver. Crew recovery time and snow event in Vancouver then resulted in cancellation of inbound flight.	Complaints state that they received e-mail messages from the carrier, progressively delaying departure time, reason: crew constraints.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that snow event in Vancouver impacted Flight No. AC2411, and that no other aircraft or crew were available in Honolulu. What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Honolulu)?
Flight No. AC2410 cancelled.	E-mail sent by carrier cancelling flight, reason: "crew constraints."			
Passengers reprotected on Flight No. AC2010 one day later.	E-mail sent by carrier with reprotection flight and itinerary.			
Flight No. AC2010 departed.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant received e-mail denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of carrier control. The other complainant received e-mail denying compensation because the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related risk.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming a proper claim of a knock-on effect, then the reason for the flight disruption should probably be the maintenance issue with the inbound aircraft, within carrier control but required for safety, but weather played a significant role in the flight disruption as well.
POST-EVENT	One complainant received e-mail denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of carrier control. The other complainant received e-mail denying compensation because the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related risk.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	One complainant states that they were denied compensation but that 4 other passengers with whom the complainant was travelling were compensated.

Flight Count 87: AC2411 / Vancouver – Honolulu / Jan. 14

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Mechanical issue (auxiliary power unit fault) discovered with aircraft prior to departure in Vancouver.				
Repairs undertaken, crew sent to hotel to rest.	E-mail messages sent by carrier progressively delaying departure time, reason: "technical issue with aircraft systems."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that they were kept updated about the repair and crew issues.
Repairs completed.				
Crew went back to airport but delayed by bad weather, and U.S. preclearance closed by the time crew arrived at the airport.				
Flight cancelled.	E-mail message sent by carrier cancelling flight due to "crew constraints."			
Passengers reprotected on Flight No. AC2011 the following day.				
Flight No. AC2011 experienced a delay due to weather conditions.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	In response to claims for compensation for the cancellation of Flight No. AC2411, carrier denied compensation but provided the reason for the delay of the recovery Flight No. AC2011 (weather).	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Although compensation was requested for the cancellation of Flight No. AC2411, the carrier responded with the reason for the delay of the recovery flight (AC2011).
POST-EVENT	In response to claims for compensation for the cancellation of Flight No. AC2411, carrier denied compensation but provided the reason for the delay of the recovery Flight No. AC2011 (weather).	Not within control	Categorization of flight disruption.	This flight disruption was caused by a mechanical issue requiring repair.

Flight Count 88: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight No. AC2415 (Phoenix-Vancouver) taken out of service in Phoenix due to hydraulic leak discovered during operations, resulting in cancellation of Flight No. AC2411 (Vancouver-Honolulu), the inbound flight for Flight No. AC2410.	E-mail messages sent by carrier beginning just over 4 hours before original scheduled departure time, progressively delay departure time, reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Knock-on effect claimed	<p>Carrier swapped aircraft. Replacement aircraft suffered mechanical issue, which carrier repaired overnight. Carrier states that aircraft options limited due to weather event in Montréal and Toronto.</p> <p>What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for disruptions affecting another aircraft and crew two rotations earlier?</p> <p>What is expectation of carrier reserve capacity of aircraft and crew to substitute for flight departures from foreign locations (e.g. Honolulu)?</p>
Flight No. AC2415 (Phoenix-Vancouver) taken out of service in Phoenix due to hydraulic leak discovered during operations, resulting in cancellation of Flight No. AC2411 (Vancouver-Honolulu), the inbound flight for Flight No. AC2410.	E-mail messages sent by carrier beginning just over 4 hours before original scheduled departure time, progressively delay departure time, reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	<p>Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that they were told various reasons for the delay: flight preparation, maintenance, crew issues.</p> <p>One complainant states that they were on hold for more than four hours with the Air Canada Customer Support line. This passenger stayed on hold for more than 4 hours and when calling again, a recording stated that no additional calls would be taken.</p>
Flight No. AC2415 (Phoenix-Vancouver) taken out of service in Phoenix due to hydraulic leak discovered during operations, resulting in cancellation of Flight No. AC2411 (Vancouver-Honolulu), the inbound flight for Flight No. AC2410.	E-mail messages sent by carrier beginning just over 4 hours before original scheduled departure time, progressively delay departure time, reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	Complainants state that they were told to obtain their own hotel accommodations, and the carrier would reimburse them for hotel and food. One complainant states that carrier employee stated that this was because the delay "was Air Canada's fault." One complainant states that they were denied their request for reimbursement.
Flight No. AC2415 (Phoenix-Vancouver) taken out of service in Phoenix due to hydraulic leak discovered during operations, resulting in cancellation of Flight No. AC2411 (Vancouver-Honolulu), the inbound flight for Flight No. AC2410.	E-mail messages sent by carrier beginning just over 4 hours before original scheduled departure time, progressively delay departure time, reason: "additional flight preparation time."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	No reason provided by carrier at the time of the cancellation. One complainant claims that carrier employee stated that flight disruption was "controllable."

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight No. AC2410 cancelled, passengers reprotected on Flight No. AC2420 the following day.	E-mail message sent by carrier cancelling flight, providing revised itinerary with Flight No. AC2420 the following day. No reason provided.			
Delay in departure of Flight No. AC2420.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages sent by carrier denied compensation (safety-related) but provided the reason for the delay of the recovery Flight No. AC2420 (maintenance issue).	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Although compensation was requested for the cancellation of Flight No. AC2410, the carrier responded with the reason for the delay of the recovery flight (AC2420).

Flight Count 89: AC158 / Calgary – Toronto / Dec. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight (AC155) delayed due to poor weather in Toronto.	Just over two hours before original scheduled departure, carrier sent message with updated (delayed) departure time, reasons: weather, additional flight preparation time.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that Calgary is not an aircraft or crew base for the carrier and therefore no other aircraft was available to avoid a delay of less than two hours.
Following delayed departure from Calgary, Flight No. AC158 experienced further delay due to gating constraints in Toronto.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail denying compensation because Flight No. AC158 was delayed due to "scheduling issues", outside carrier control.	Within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	<p>Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, the reason for the delay of Flight No. AC158 appears to be weather, which caused the delay to the inbound flight.</p> <p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.</p>

Flight Count 90: AC842 / Toronto – Dublin / Jan. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Mechanical issue (engine thrust reverser) discovered during post- pre-flight servicing.			Definition of "scheduled maintenance"	This issue was discovered between landing of the inbound flight and departure, during post- pre-flight servicing.
Mechanical issue (engine thrust reverser) discovered during post- pre-flight servicing.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainant states that reason and flight time updates were provided.
Aircraft taken out of service and repaired.	Complainant states that he was informed at the airport that the flight was delayed due to a maintenance issue and that flight time was updated multiple times.			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because flight delay due to maintenance required for safety reasons.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The mechanical issue was discovered between landing of the inbound flight and departure, during post- pre-flight servicing. Should this be considered as having been discovered during routine maintenance?
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because flight delay due to maintenance required for safety reasons.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	The word "maintenance" as a reason for a flight disruption may lead to confusion as it may be interpreted by passengers as referring to regularly-scheduled aircraft maintenance rather than to resolving a technical issue that arose during operations.

Flight Count 91: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
The previous day, snow event resulted in cancellation of a number of inbound flights, including the inbound aircraft for Flight No. AC1526.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that multiple flight cancellations resulted in lack of aircraft, and that carrier sourced the first available aircraft for the flight.
The previous day, snow event resulted in cancellation of a number of inbound flights, including the inbound aircraft for Flight No. AC1526.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complaints state that preparation of aircraft for domestic flight and baggage hold preparation were provided as reasons for the on-going delay.
Aircraft sourced from inbound international flight and prepared for domestic flight (baggage hold preparation).	Beginning about 7 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent e-mail messages with progressive delays due to "weather" and "weather affecting the inbound aircraft", and later due to "flight preparation" or "technical issue with aircraft."			
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail messages from carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was out of carrier control.	Not within control		

Flight Count 92: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Jan. 8

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight experienced a minor delay.			Timeliness/content of notifications	It does not appear that any written notifications were provided to passengers, nor did the carrier keep a record of the timing or text of verbal announcements.
Flight No. AC2410 pushed off from gate, mechanical fault (wing slat) detected on runway, and aircraft returned to gate.	There is no evidence of written notifications being provided to passengers during the flight disruption.		Communication re Standard of Treatment (1-day delay)	Although passengers were on the tarmac/runway for over 3 hours, two of the four complainants state that they were not provided with food or drink during this period.
Fault cleared, Flight No. AC2410 pushed off from gate again, takeoff again aborted, and aircraft returned to gate.				
Passengers disembarked, troubleshooting continued with aircraft.				
Flight cancelled, passengers reprotected on flight departing the following day.				
Passengers provided with taxi vouchers, meal vouchers and overnight hotel stay.				
Reprotection flight departed the following day.			Clarity/accuracy of communication	One complaint states that carrier employees stated that the flight disruption was "controllable" and would result in compensation.
POST-EVENT	One e-mail message from the carrier to a complainant denied compensation because the flight disruption was due to "non-scheduled maintenance", a safety-related issue.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	It appears that the flight disruption was mainly due to a mechanical issue discovered during operations, but required for safety.
POST-EVENT	Two complainants state that they were denied compensation because the carrier stated that the flight disruption was out of their control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	It appears that the flight disruption was mainly due to a mechanical issue discovered during operations, but required for safety.

Flight Count 93: AC2410 / Honolulu – Vancouver / Dec. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
A first delay resulted from the delay of the inbound flight.	Beginning approximately 11 hours before the original planned departure time, text messages sent by carrier stating flight progressively delayed, reason: "late inbound aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complaints state that they were provided with various reasons for the delay while on the aircraft, including missing personnel, paperwork, and troubleshooting a mechanical problem.
After passengers embarked, an engine overheating indicator required investigation.				
Determination made that aircraft could not be repaired until the following day.				
Flight cancelled, passengers disembarked and reprotected on flight the following day.	E-mail sent by carrier cancelling flight and providing new itinerary.			
Hotel and meal vouchers provided.				
Reprotection flight departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant received a response from the carrier to their request for compensation for Flight No. AC2410, which provided reasons for the delay of the reprotection flight (IT issue), denying compensation because the issue was outside the carrier's control.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Although referring to Flight No. AC2410, the first response e-mail from the carrier provided reasons for the delay of the reprotection flight.
POST-EVENT	When the complainant followed up with a second request, the carrier denied compensation because Flight No. AC2410 was delayed due to maintenance required for safety.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Although referring to Flight No. AC2410, the first response e-mail from the carrier provided reasons for the delay of the reprotection flight.
POST-EVENT	Another complainant received an e-mail message denying compensation because the delay was due to "a safety-related mechanical issue."	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Although referring to Flight No. AC2410, the first response e-mail from the carrier provided reasons for the delay of the reprotection flight.

Flight Count 94: AC8841 / Vancouver – Yellowknife / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight cancelled due to lack of a pilot.	Text message sent by carrier cancelling flight approximately five hours before original scheduled departure, reason: "crew constraints."			
Passengers reprotected on other flights.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant received an e-mail from the carrier denying compensation because "the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related risk."	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	During the inquiry, carrier stated that no other fleet types were available to be used for the flight. No other evidence was provided that suggests that this flight disruption was not entirely within the carrier's control.
POST-EVENT	Two complainants received e-mail messages from the carrier denying compensation, but referring to flights other than Flight No. AC8841.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	The carrier responded to two complainants denying compensation with reference to flights other than Flight No. AC8841.

Flight Count 95: AC1559 / Montréal – Edmonton / Dec. 31

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight cancelled due to lack of crew.	E-mail message sent by carrier cancelling flight approximately 2 hours before original scheduled departure, reason: "crew constraints."		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complaint states that staff said that the cause of the delay was weather.
Passengers booked on other flights.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant was issued \$1000 in compensation by the carrier.	Not within control	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	The denial of compensation to one complainant may be an error on the part of the carrier, as the carrier's message refers to the flight of the previous day.
POST-EVENT	The other complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier denying compensation because the cancellation was due to weather and outside carrier control. However, the message referred to Flight No. AC1559 on December 30, rather than the flight on December 31.	Not within control	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	The denial of compensation to one complainant may be an error on the part of the carrier, as the carrier's message refers to the flight of the previous day.

Flight Count 96: AC319 / Montréal – Calgary / Jan. 6

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Late arrival of the inbound aircraft due to an external IT issue and deicing in Toronto.	Beginning approximately two hours before original scheduled departure, carrier sends messages to passengers regarding a delay, reason: "additional flight preparation time."			
Upon arrival in Montréal, technical issue discovered (air conditioning pack of engine No. 2).	Series of messages sent to passengers regarding delay, stating that "flight is delayed due to the late arrival of the inbound aircraft."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Written notifications do not appear to mention the mechanical issue central to the flight disruption.
Attempt to resolve issue while passengers were boarded, then aircraft taken out of service.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complainant states that they were advised that there was an air conditioning issue.
Passengers disembarked.				
Replacement aircraft sourced.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	<p>One complainant received an e-mail from the carrier stating that the flight disruption was "due to the late arrival of the inbound equipment and maintenance issues."</p> <p>Another complainant received an e-mail from the carrier denying compensation because "the delay was caused by a safety-related risk."</p>	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 97: AC1526 / Toronto – Fredericton / Dec. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flights (Toronto-Moncton-Toronto) experienced delay due to repair of technical issue (door seal) and due to personnel constraints on tarmac in Toronto, during cold weather event.	Beginning approximately 6 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent messages to passengers regarding a delay, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft and staffing (flight attendants' time-out)."		Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complainant states that they were advised that inbound flight was delayed due to "supposed weather in Toronto."
Inbound flights (Toronto-Moncton-Toronto) experienced delay due to repair of technical issue (door seal) and due to personnel constraints on tarmac in Toronto, during cold weather event.	Beginning approximately 6 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent messages to passengers regarding a delay, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft and staffing (flight attendants' time-out)."		Communication re Standard of Treatment (4-hour delay)	No meal vouchers issued.
Inbound flights (Toronto-Moncton-Toronto) experienced delay due to repair of technical issue (door seal) and due to personnel constraints on tarmac in Toronto, during cold weather event.	Beginning approximately 6 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent messages to passengers regarding a delay, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft and staffing (flight attendants' time-out)."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier notifications refer to flight attendants' crew time, which appears to be an error.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	One e-mail message from the carrier to a complainant denied compensation because the flight disruption was due to "a safety-related issue, specifically due to scheduling issues."	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) how the scheduling issue was categorized.

Flight Count 98: AC1605 / Fort Lauderdale – Montréal / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight (Toronto-Fort Lauderdale) was delayed due to maintenance (lighting issue), then swapped, then delayed due to weather in Toronto.	Beginning about 4 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent messages regarding delay due to technical issues with the inbound aircraft.			
The delays on the inbound flight would have resulted in the crew timing out and being unable to operate Flight No. AC1605.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that weather event in Toronto resulted in lack of spare crew (or aircraft) to resolve issue more expeditiously.
Flight No. AC1605 cancelled.	Carrier sent messages cancelling flight, carrier app provided reason as "technical issue with the inbound aircraft."			
Passengers booked on other flights, including Flight No. AC1601 and Flight No. AC1609.				
AC1601 cancelled, complainant rebooked on Flight No. AC2025, more than 24 hours after the original flight (AC1605).	Just over an hour before the scheduled departure of Flight No. AC1601, carrier sent message cancelling Flight No. AC1601 because of weather.			
POST-EVENT	In response to a request for compensation for Flight No. AC1605, one complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier denying compensation because the cancellation of the re-protection flight (AC1609) was outside the carrier's control. The complainant reprotected on Flight No. AC1601 states that they were denied compensation because the reason for the flight disruption was weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming the knock-on effect claim is accepted, then the reason for the delay on the inbound flight (technical issue that had to be resolved for safety reasons) should carry on to Flight No. AC1605, although weather played a role in the flight disruption.
POST-EVENT	In response to a request for compensation for Flight No. AC1605, one complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier denying compensation because the cancellation of the re-protection flight (AC1609) was outside the carrier's control. The complainant reprotected on Flight No. AC1601 states that they were denied compensation because the reason for the flight disruption was weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not address issue of compensation for Flight No. AC1605, instead referring to the re-protection flights.

Flight Count 99: AC1674 / Toronto – Orlando / Jan. 12

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Cancellation of inbound flight due to mechanical issue (nose wheel steering issue).	Carrier began sending messages approximately 3 hours before the original scheduled departure stating that flight delayed due to weather affecting the inbound aircraft.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that no other aircraft available other than FIN692 inbound from Miami.
Cancellation of inbound flight due to mechanical issue (nose wheel steering issue).	Carrier began sending messages approximately 3 hours before the original scheduled departure stating that flight delayed due to weather affecting the inbound aircraft.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier stated that weather caused the delay to the inbound aircraft rather than a mechanical issue.
Replacement aircraft sourced.				
Replacement aircraft suffered ground delay in Toronto due to freezing rain.	E-mail message from carrier stating that flight further delayed due to additional flight preparation time.			
Departure of Flight No. AC1674.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message from carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was due to "scheduling issues", outside of carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming the knock-on effect claim is accepted, then the reason for the delay on the inbound flight (technical issue that had to be resolved for safety reasons) should carry on to Flight No. AC1674, although weather played a role in the flight disruption. For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 100: AC1713 / Punta Cana – Toronto / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft taken out of service in Toronto due to mechanical issue (exit slide wiring issue).			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that both the planned aircraft and an alternate aircraft were out of service, and that the first available replacement aircraft was sourced.
Replacement aircraft sourced and flown to Punta Cana.	Complainants state that the flight was delayed a number of times, reason: "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that they were told that the flight disruption was due to a maintenance issue with the inbound aircraft.
With maintenance delay, crew timed out in Punta Cana and flight cancelled.	Carrier sent message cancelling flight due to "crew constraints."			
Passengers reprotected on flight the following day.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant states that e-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because cancellation was due to a safety-related issue, specifically "the operating crew travelled on an inbound flight that was delayed due to mechanical issues."	Within control, safety		

Flight Count 101: AC1713 / Punta Cana – Toronto / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed due to mechanical issue (park brake pressure issue) in Toronto.	Complainants state that they were told that flight was delayed due to aircraft technical issues.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states no alternate aircraft available.
Repairs undertaken, aircraft flown to Punta Cana	Text message from carrier stated that delay due to "aircraft technical issue."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation because delay due to "scheduling issues" outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	<p>Assuming the knock-on effect claim is accepted, then the reason for the delay on the inbound flight (technical issue that had to be resolved for safety reasons) should carry on to Flight No. AC1713.</p> <p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.</p>

Flight Count 102: AC2437 / San Jose – Montréal / Jan. 30

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed slightly due to high winds.				
No gates available at San Jose airport for inbound aircraft so aircraft landed at remote parking location and buses were used to disembark inbound passengers and embark Flight No. AC2437 passengers. This resulted in a further delay.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed, minor delay during flight due to high winds.				
Complainants missed connecting flight in Montréal to Vancouver.				
Passengers rebooked on a flight the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation because delay due to "customer-processing issues", a safety-related issue.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The delay to Flight No. AC2437 appears to be due to high winds and the requirement to park the aircraft at a remote location, reasons which do not appear to be within carrier control.

Flight Count 103: AC7917 / Raleigh – Durham – Toronto / Dec. 26

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft experienced mechanical issue with stabilizer in Toronto, and taken out of service.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier states that both the planned aircraft and an alternate aircraft were out of service, and that no other aircraft were available.
Both inbound flight and Flight No. AC7917 cancelled.	No delay notifications appear to have been provided, until the flight was cancelled, reason: maintenance.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, and no written notifications appear to have been provided until the cancellation notification.
Both inbound flight and Flight No. AC7917 cancelled.	No delay notifications appear to have been provided, until the flight was cancelled, reason: maintenance.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Little information was provided by the carrier during the flight disruption about the reasons for the flight disruption.
Passengers reprotected on flight the following morning.				
Reprotection flight departure was delayed before takeoff.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation because flight disruption was due to a maintenance issue and required for safety.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	In one case, the message from the carrier references the reprotection flight rather than Flight No. AC7917.

Flight Count 104: AC8506 / Montréal – Fredericton / Feb. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Flight attendant called in sick shortly before departure. Carrier states that although Montréal is a crew base for Jazz, there was no reserve flight attendant available.	E-mail sent by carrier shortly before departure cancelling flight, reason: "crew constraints."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight cancelled, and passengers reprotected on flight the following morning.				
Complainants provided hotel overnight stay.				
Reprotection flight departed the following day.				
POST-EVENT	In response to requests for compensation for Flight No. AC8506, carrier denied compensation but for other flights in the passengers' itinerary.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	The messages from the carrier denying compensation refer to flights other than Flight No. AC8506.
POST-EVENT	In response to requests for compensation for Flight No. AC8506, carrier denied compensation but for other flights in the passengers' itinerary.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	What was expected of airline regarding availability of crew for flight from Montréal and what is the resulting categorization of this flight disruption?

Flight Count 105: AC8638 / Ottawa – Halifax / Jan. 8

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed due to freezing rain in Halifax.	Beginning about 4 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent e-mail messages delaying the flight, reason: "cabin crew availability."		Knock-on effect claimed	What was expected of airline regarding reserve crew in Halifax or Ottawa to deal with a weather-related issue?
Delay would have resulted in crew timing out; no other crews available in Halifax or Ottawa.				
Inbound flight and Flight No. AC8638 cancelled.	Carrier sent messages cancelling flight, and providing revised itinerary, reason: "crew constraints."			
Complainants reprotected on other flights the following day.				
Hotel overnight stay provided.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation, but responded with respect to flights other than Flight No. AC8638.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	The messages from the carrier denying compensation refer to flights other than Flight No. AC8638.
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation, but responded with respect to flights other than Flight No. AC8638.	Within control, safety, Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then the cancellation of Flight No. AC8638 appears to be due to freezing rain.

Flight Count 106: AC8841 / Vancouver – Yellowknife / Dec. 31

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed over 16 hours in Yellowknife, and no spare crew available in Vancouver to operate Flight No. AC8841.			Knock-on effect claimed	What was expected of airline regarding reserve crew in Vancouver?
Flight cancelled.	Carrier sent message cancelling flight, reason: "crew constraints."			
One complainant rebooked for the following day. One complainant states that they had to call back two days later to rebook the flight.				
POST-EVENT	Both complainants were compensated \$1000 each.	Within control		

Flight Count 107: AC1812 / Toronto – Cancun / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft required tire change in Barcelona, and was swapped to another aircraft undergoing repairs.	Beginning approximately 4 hours before the original scheduled departure time, revised departure times posted, reason: non-scheduled maintenance.			
As the estimate for completing repairs on the replacement inbound aircraft increased, another replacement aircraft was sourced for Flight No. AC1812.			Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier proceeded with repairs to two aircraft and attempted two aircraft swaps, the last of which succeeded.
Replacement aircraft obtained from Edmonton – Toronto flight, which had to be towed from a domestic gate to an international gate.	Series of messages sent by carrier, progressively delaying flight, reason: "aircraft technical issue."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that pilot provided them with detailed narrative of the flight disruption during the flight.
Further delay required to proceed with the removal of luggage of a no-show passenger.				
Further delay required to de-ice before take-off.				
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	One complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was caused by bad weather outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then it would appear that the flight disruption is due to safety-related maintenance, although other issues played a role as well (e.g. weather).
POST-EVENT	Another complainant received an e-mail message from the carrier denying compensation because the flight disruption was caused by a safety-related maintenance issue.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Different reasons and categories were provided to different passengers for denying compensation.

Flight Count 108: AC1821 / Puerto Plata – Toronto / Feb. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight from Toronto (AC1820) delayed by two hours due to waiting for connecting passengers from a delayed previous flight (AC847 Munich-Toronto), where a medical issue arose, and then further delayed by strong winds.	Beginning approximately 7 hours before the original scheduled departure time, revised departure times posted due to Flight No. AC847 medical issue and strong winds.		Knock-on effect claimed	For inbound flight, both the high winds and the carrier's decision to wait for 20 delayed connecting passengers each contributed about an hour to the delay of Flight No. AC1821.
During the inbound flight, passengers consumed higher than average quantity of water, requiring ordering and obtaining bottled water in Puerto Plata, resulting in a further two-hour delay to departure of Flight No. AC1821. (Issues with potable water in Puerto Plata require use of bottled water.)	Further delays posted, reason: "late arrival of the inbound aircraft." At least one delay posting stated the reason as "pilot availability."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that they were provided with various reasons for the delay: delay of inbound flight, lack of water onboard the aircraft, lack of crew/pilot.
During the inbound flight, passengers consumed higher than average quantity of water, requiring ordering and obtaining bottled water in Puerto Plata, resulting in a further two-hour delay to departure of Flight No. AC1821. (Issues with potable water in Puerto Plata require use of bottled water.)	Further delays posted, reason: "late arrival of the inbound aircraft." At least one delay posting stated the reason as "pilot availability."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	A lack of crew/pilot availability does not appear consistent with the carrier's account.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Complainants state that carrier sent e-mail message denying compensation because the delay was caused by an issue outside carrier control: "Airplane or flight crew not available due to direct effect of previous flight disruption outside of our control."	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then it would appear that the flight disruption is due to the strong winds experienced by the inbound flight and by the carrier waiting for delayed connecting passengers.
POST-EVENT	Complainants state that carrier sent e-mail message denying compensation because the delay was caused by an issue outside carrier control: "Airplane or flight crew not available due to direct effect of previous flight disruption outside of our control."	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	A lack of crew/pilot availability does not appear consistent with the carrier's account.

Flight Count 109: AC424 / Toronto – Montréal / Jan. 19

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
<p>Inbound aircraft out of service due to engine issue.</p> <p>Replacement inbound aircraft then went out of service due to flight deck door issue.</p> <p>Another replacement inbound aircraft was sourced from Flight No. AC425 from Montréal, which was already late and was further delayed due to ground operations in Toronto.</p>	<p>Beginning just over 6 hours before the original scheduled departure time, e-mail messages sent by carrier with updated departure times, reason: "technical issue with aircraft systems", then "additional flight preparation time", and "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."</p>		<p>Knock-on effect claimed</p>	<p>Carrier states that major snow and cold event impacted both Toronto and Montréal, affecting availability of aircraft.</p>
<p>Inbound aircraft out of service due to engine issue.</p> <p>Replacement inbound aircraft then went out of service due to flight deck door issue.</p> <p>Another replacement inbound aircraft was sourced from Flight No. AC425 from Montréal, which was already late and was further delayed due to ground operations in Toronto.</p>	<p>Beginning just over 6 hours before the original scheduled departure time, e-mail messages sent by carrier with updated departure times, reason: "technical issue with aircraft systems", then "additional flight preparation time", and "technical issue affecting the inbound aircraft."</p>		<p>Timeliness/content of notifications</p>	<p>Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that various reasons were provided for the delay: technical issue, waiting for the inbound flight, cockpit door issue.</p>
<p>Flight No. AC424 departed.</p>				
<p>POST-EVENT</p>	<p>Carrier sent e-mail message denying compensation due to "scheduling issues" outside carrier control.</p>	<p>Not within control</p>	<p>Categorization of Flight Disruption</p>	<p>Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then the cause of the flight disruption would appear to be safety-related mechanical, although weather also played a role.</p> <p>For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.</p>

Flight Count 110: AC619 / Halifax – Toronto / Dec. 27

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Boarding time was extended as flight was held to wait for delayed connecting passengers from Sydney; at the same time, ramp loading was slowed by weather conditions (snow).	Carrier posted notifications stating that departure was delayed to accommodate late-arriving passengers, and then due to weather.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state they were informed about the wait for late-arriving passengers.
Once pushed off from the gate, the aircraft spent over an hour waiting for the de-icing process.				
Flight departed airport about 3 hours later than originally planned, arriving 2.5 hours late in Toronto.				
Complainants missed connecting flight in Toronto.				
Complainants provided hotel and meal vouchers.			Clarity/accuracy of communication	Complainants state that the vouchers had the label "misconnect/controllable", which may have given the impression that the flight disruption was considered within carrier control by the carrier.
Complainants reprotected on flights the following day.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was due to bad weather outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	The communications about the flight disruption focused on the delay awaiting late-arriving connecting passengers, but in fact the weather was the most important contributor to the delay (ground handling and de-icing).

Flight Count 111: AC788 / Los Angeles – Toronto / Dec. 20

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight from Toronto arrived late due to failure of jet bridge power unit in Toronto.	Carrier posted delay notifications beginning about six hours before the original scheduled departure, reason: late inbound aircraft.		Knock-on effect claimed	Jet bridge power failure resulted in not being able to disengage the jet bridge from the aircraft.
Inbound flight flew to Los Angeles.				
Protest by catering workers at Los Angeles airport blocked the airport entrance and delayed crew from getting to the aircraft.	Carrier sent text messages to passengers with progressive delays, reason: crew availability.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complainant states they were told that the flight crew was late, stuck in traffic.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail message to one complainant denying compensation because the delay was due to weather, outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	It appears that both the knock-on effect from the inbound flight due to the jet bridge power failure and the protest by catering workers at Los Angeles airport contributed independently to the delay.
POST-EVENT	Another complainant states that they were denied compensation because the delay was due to customer processing issues.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	The reasons provided by the carrier do not correspond to the carrier's account of the flight disruption.

Flight Count 112: AC788 / Los Angeles – Toronto / Dec. 27

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight first delayed due to late arrival of aircraft in Toronto due to strong winds. Then on landing in Toronto, inbound aircraft struck a bird and was taken out of service.	Approximately 13 hours before the original scheduled departure, delay notifications were posted for Flight No. AC788, due to a late inbound flight.		Knock-on effect claimed	The inbound flight was delayed due to strong winds and to a bird strike that required an aircraft swap. What was the expectation for reserve aircraft and crew in Toronto?
A replacement aircraft for the inbound flight was sourced and departed Toronto for Los Angeles.			Timeliness/content of notifications and Clarity/accuracy of communication	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complainant states that they were told that the delay was due to a crew staffing issue, while another states that they were told that the delay was due to weather.
Flight arrived at and departed late from Los Angeles.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption due to safety-related maintenance.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Assuming that the claim of a knock-on effect is accepted, then the delay was due to both the bird strike and the strong winds experienced by the inbound flight.
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail message denying compensation because flight disruption due to safety-related maintenance.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Passengers were not provided enough information to have been able to understand the connection between the post-event explanation of "safety-related maintenance" and the explanation of "late inbound flight" provided during the delay.

Flight Count 113: AC1945 - Bogota –Toronto / Jan. 1

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Two flight attendants booked off.				
Flight cancelled.	Carrier posted flight cancellation six hours before the original scheduled departure, reason "crew constraints." One complainant states that at the airport, airline staff explained to the waiting passengers that the flight was cancelled due to crew constraints, specifically two crew members booking off sick.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Passengers were reprotected on flights the following day (January 2) and the day after (January 3).				
Hotel stays and meal vouchers provided.				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent an e-mail message to a complainant denying compensation because the flight disruption was the result of a safety-related risk.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	Are the crew issues for this flight disruption within control, required for safety, or outside control?
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent an e-mail message to a complainant denying compensation because the flight disruption was the result of a safety-related risk.	Within control, safety	Inconsistent treatment of passengers	One complainant alleged that she was denied compensation but that her parents and sister received compensation. After reviewing the case, the carrier provided further explanations that the companions travelling with the complainant received compensation in error and that the cancellation was due to a safety-related issue (crew).
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent an e-mail message to a complainant denying compensation for the re-protection flight for a safety-related aircraft technical issue.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Response to request for compensation for Flight No. AC1945 provided reasons for denying compensation for the re-protection flight.

Flight Count 114: AC8234 / Yellowknife – Calgary / Jan. 8

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Engine starting issues discovered just prior to departure.	Carrier posted delay notification, reason: weather.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainant states that they were told the engines would not start because of the cold and would have to be warmed up.
Passengers disembarked.				
Repairs (heating) undertaken.				
Flight departed.				
Complainants missed connecting flights, were reprotected on other flights.				
POST-EVENT	It does not appear that the complainants made a claim for compensation.			

Flight Count 115: AC319 / Montréal – Calgary / Dec. 28

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
First delay before departure due to issue with aircraft Auxiliary Power Unit (APU). Air Conditioning Pack issue also detected.	Carrier sent text messages beginning about 2.5 hours before the original scheduled departure delaying departure time, reason: "flight readiness."			
Passengers boarded.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but one complainant states that "it was very hard to get accurate information about what was happening."
Aircraft pushed off from gate, but APU issue again detected.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (9-hour delay)	A complainant states that "many passengers, including myself, did complain to the flight crew of being hot and requested updates, these requests went unanswered by the crew." Some passengers were later provided with a \$20 meal voucher.
Aircraft returned to gate, passengers disembarked, aircraft out of service.				
Flight cancelled.	Carrier sent text message cancelling flight, providing revised itinerary, reason: "aircraft maintenance."			
Aircraft ferried from Toronto for the flight.				
Flight departed (AC2067).				
POST-EVENT	Carrier sent e-mail messages denying compensation because the delay was due to safety-related "scheduling issues", but with respect to the re-protection flight.	Within control, safety	Clarity/accuracy of communication	Response to request for compensation for Flight No. AC319 provided reasons for denying compensation for the re-protection flight. For those passengers denied compensation due to a "scheduling issue", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 116: AC371 / Montréal – Winnipeg / Dec. 28

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Brake fault detected on previous flight, about four hours before original scheduled departure.	Beginning 4.5 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent messages delaying flight, reasons: "aircraft technical issue" and "additional flight preparation time."			
Aircraft taken out of service.			Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Aircraft taken out of service.			Communication re Standard of Treatment (4 h 47 delay)	Complainants state that they did not receive meal vouchers.
Replacement aircraft sourced from Inbound Flight No. AC372, arriving later in the day.	Notification issued by carrier stating that "incoming flight AC308 is delayed, which may be affecting this flight."		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Reference should have been to incoming Flight No. AC372.
Flight No. AC371 departed on replacement aircraft.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was due to "scheduling issues" related to safety.	Within control, safety	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to "scheduling issues", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as related to safety.

Flight Count 117: AC416 / Toronto – Montréal / Jan. 16

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound flight delayed due to weather (high winds) in New York City. Flight No. AC416 swapped to another inbound aircraft (from Vancouver).	About three hours before the original scheduled departure, a delay notification was posted, reason: weather.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier swapped from one inbound aircraft to another to mitigate delay to passengers.
Delay would have resulted in complainants missing connecting flight from Montréal to Lima that day, so complainants were rebooked on a direct Toronto-Lima flight the following day.	Complainants state that carrier employees stated that the delay was due to insufficient staff, resulting from bad weather in Vancouver.		Clarity/accuracy of communication	Complainants were not provided with clear information that would have allowed them to understand why Flight No. AC416 was delayed.
Complainants' new flight departed Toronto the following day, with arrival in Lima 24 hours later than on their originally-scheduled flights.				
Complainants' baggage was delayed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail sent by carrier denying compensation. Complainants state that they were told by carrier employees that the ultimate cause of the flight disruption was weather.	Not within control	Clarity/accuracy of communication	E-mail message sent to complainants denying compensation did not provide a reason for the flight disruption.

Flight Count 118: AC1629 / Fort Lauderdale – Toronto / Jan. 4

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft was operating Montréal – Orlando – Montréal, but was diverted to Miami due to weather (thunderstorms). Replacement inbound aircraft sourced, but became unserviceable in Montréal due to mechanical issue (flight deck door lock).	Beginning about 7 hours before the original scheduled departure, carrier sent e-mail messages delaying flight, stating that the reason for the flight disruption was under investigation.		Knock-on effect claimed	Carrier attempted two aircraft swaps, with the second one succeeding.
Second replacement inbound aircraft was sourced for Flight No. AC1629 and new crew assigned.	E-mail messages sent by the carrier delaying flight departure, reason: late arrival of the inbound aircraft.		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements.
Flight departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was caused by "scheduling issues" outside carrier control.	Not within control	Categorization of Flight Disruption	For those passengers denied compensation due to "scheduling issues", it is not clear and would not have been clear (a) how a "scheduling issue" caused the delay (b) why the scheduling issue was categorized as outside carrier control.

Flight Count 119: AC1747 / Varadero – Montréal / Jan. 18

Explanation provided by carrier on the cause(s) of the delay during the Inquiry	Communication provided to passengers	Categorization communicated to passengers in response to complaint or request for compensation	Issues regarding communication, reasons, or categorization	Considerations
Inbound aircraft delayed due to de-icing in Toronto.	Beginning about 5 hours before the original planned departure, carrier posted notification delaying departure, reason: "weather."		Timeliness/content of notifications	Carrier did not keep record of timing or text of announcements, but complainants state that not enough information was provided regarding the reasons for the flight disruptions.
Passengers boarded.				
Mechanical issue identified with engine (fan blade damage caused by snow/ice in Toronto).	Carrier posted notification delaying departure, reason: fan blade damage investigation.		Communication re Standard of Treatment	A complainant states that passengers were on the tarmac between 2 and 3 hours and were only offered a granola bar.
Passengers disembarked, flight cancelled.	Carrier sent message cancelling flight, reason: "maintenance."			
Hotel accommodations provided.				
Mechanics flown in to Varadero for aircraft repairs.				
Passengers reprotected the following day on Flight No. ZX1994, on the repaired aircraft.				
Flight No. ZX1994 was delayed several times the following day.				
Flight No. ZX1994 departed.				
POST-EVENT	E-mail message sent by carrier denying compensation because flight disruption was caused by "safety-related issues, specifically maintenance."	Within control, safety		