

RESOLUTION ADVISORY PANEL (RAP) REPORT

Background

- 1 The Resolution Advisory Panel (RAP) provides recommendations to the Passenger Tariff Conferences Steering Group (PSG) for forwarding to the Composite meeting or to an area Conference, as applicable. The draft amendments to Resolutions submitted on the Agenda were developed by the RAP and have been endorsed by the PSG meeting in April 1999.

Meetings

- 2 Since the last report at the July 1998 Composite meeting, the RAP has had 2 regular meetings and one special sub-group meeting:

Montreal, 3-6 November 1998	Tenth Meeting
Washington, 10-11 February 1999	Internet/Electronic Ticketing Sub Group
Geneva, 12-15 April 1999	Eleventh Meeting

Membership and Panel Procedures

- 3 Members of the Panel are industry representatives and all discussions avoid individual carrier positions. Panel meetings are open to Observers from TC-Members and providers of automated fare pricing systems. Observers at Panel meetings are not entitled to vote. Observers from automated fare pricing systems are not present when recommendations are finalised. A list of the Panel Members/Observers is attached. Between meetings, requests for interpretation sent to the Secretariat will be answered. These interpretations will form part of the agenda for the next RAP meeting and will be reviewed to see whether clearer language is required in the Resolutions.

Major Issues

- 4 Main issues that have been addressed by the RAP since the last Composite meeting are:
 - Add-on Amounts
 - Back to Back Ticketing
 - Fare Selection
 - Global Indicators
 - Higher Intermediate Point Rule (HIP)
 - Internet/ET
 - Surface Sectors
 - Transfer Conditions

Add-on Amounts

- 5 A question was raised of the precedence rule in respect of a specified fare and a fare constructed through an add-on amount that gives a lower level. The general rule is that a specified fare always takes precedence over a constructed fare and although this text used to be reflected in Resolution 015v it was removed during a rewrite. However, the definition of Add-On Amount in Resolution 012 reads: "an amount used only to construct an unspecified through fare" and therefore the definition and use of add-on amounts is deemed sufficient. It was noted that in some instances carriers allow the use of the lower construction. This however relates to the application of carrier specific fares.

Back to Back Ticketing

- 6 The Secretariat drew attention to the problem of back-to-back ticketing and noted that with the advent of the new fare construction rules this would be possible and legitimate on one ticket. There have been developments whereby excursion fares are introduced with no minimum stay which exacerbates the problem. It was also noted that it was difficult to assess whether a passenger was a genuine passenger returning for example to attend a special function while away on business or whether he was simply using the facility to undercut fares. It was agreed however that no general rule be introduced. The attention of the Conferences is drawn to this situation, however, and where necessary this must be addressed through the end-on combination rule to prohibit, for example, combination with other than domestic fares.

Fare Selection

- 7 Since the adoption of the Fare Selection Criteria Resolutions at the last Composite meeting in July 1998, several amendments were made to the within Europe Resolution as circulated by Mail Vote 977. Additionally the RAP developed a new Resolution to show how fare selection is applied when undertaking the various fare construction checks. This was circulated by Mail Vote 978. Both of these were adopted but are awaiting implementation of the procedure itself which is still awaiting comment from the US DoT.

Global Indicators

- 8 The RAP has addressed a number of issues relating to Global Indicators. These are:
- introduction of new Global Indicators to simplify fare displays;
 - application;
 - no Fares to match travelled Global Indicator;

Introduction of new Global Indicators to simplify fare displays

Some carriers were concerned that where more than one fare level exists between two points but the same global indicator applies the information provided on the CRS screen was insufficient for an agent to immediately identify the nature of a fare. They therefore felt that in such instances new GIs should be established to provide an easier identification.

There was no support in the RAP for this approach as the present application of GIs as well as the introduction of new Global Indicators was problematic. Because of the ATPCO allocation of a separate tariff for each GI the introduction of further GIs would exacerbate the problems and would require an increase in the database to ensure that all the permutations for combination purposes were covered.

Application

The RAP was asked to clarify the validation of a ticketed itinerary against the FE Global Indicator. A fare calculation for the itinerary MOW-SIN-MEL-ADL-SIN-MOW had used EH fares as the routing of the flight on the return from SIN to MOW was via DXB. This had invalidated the use of the FE fare.

The RAP agreed that all fare construction rules are based on ticketed points only.

Tracking is only to be used for establishing Global Indicators against a coupon for which

more than one TPM/Mileage could apply e.g. a coupon SIN-NYC could be both via the Atlantic and via the Pacific.

The specific example raised was resolved through a recommended change to the language of a Note in the Preface to the TC23 Fares Tables. This will be submitted to the next TC23 meeting.

No Fares to match travelled Global Indicator

The discussion and recommendation on this issue is presented in Agenda Item COMP-28/01-49.

Higher Intermediate Point Rule (HIP)

- 9 Three issues were addressed under this Item. The first the application of the HIP check when seasonal fares are used is presented for adoption by the Composite meeting and is in Agenda Item COMP-7/02-11 and the second the flight application is in Agenda Item COMP-7/03-12. This issue was one that was unresolved at the 1998 Composite meeting and was subsequently further addressed by the RAP.
- 10 The third issue was the specific referral by the Composite meeting in 1998 to review whether the HIP check for Special Fares could be divorced from the Normal Fare and stand alone. The RAP has developed a package on this but needs more input from the Conferences to finalise it. A submission is made under Agenda Item COMP-20/01-31 which seeks this information and the RAP will then re-address the issue at its next meeting with a view to submitting a final proposal to the Conferences for adoption.

Internet/Electronic Ticketing

- 11 A separate submission has been made under Agenda Item COMP-20/02-32.

Surface Sectors

- 12 Following discussions in ATPCO Working Groups the Secretariat proposed that a separate Resolution be established relating to Surface Sectors. It was agreed that the Resolution be submitted for approval under today's rules and not be linked to the new fare construction rules. The only dissenting view was from AA who required the ability to have a fare construction surface sector at the origin of a journey/Pricing Unit. It was questioned how this would work in practice and it was established that CRSs could not handle such a situation. It was agreed that the proposal be forwarded to the Composite meeting on a majority basis recognising the AA position. The submission on this item is in Agenda Item COMP-43/01-67.

Transfer Conditions

- 13 This item had been placed on the RAP agenda by ATPCO at the suggestion of the RAP Chairman. At the ATPCO Transfers Working Group considerable discussion had taken place on problems with transfer restrictions being submitted and the resultant problems in developing a transfers facility within the ATPCO Automated Rules Product. The problems centred on the intent of the rule in its application to filed fares and the more complicated problems of combination.

- 14 On the filed tariffs the problem was simply a question of understanding the intent. Although many of the filed transfer restrictions were capable of being interpreted there were some that were so vague as to defy interpretation. In this respect reference was made to specific examples in carrier filings which left many questions unanswered. The main problem is whether the rule applies on a fare component or a pricing unit basis. This is vitally important if the fare allows combination as it is necessary to know the total number of transfers that are allowed.
- 15 Carriers present reviewed their transfer conditions and advised ATPCO of examples of simple and complicated ones together with an explanation of the intent. The IATA Secretariat undertook to do likewise with YY fares. Part of the problem relates to the method by which ATPCO allocates Tariff/carrier/rule numbers as this means that if there are two Global Indicators on a Resolution and the number of transfer limit is shown as 2 then when the rule is split the question is whether it is 2 on each fare component or for the total pricing unit. In this respect the IATA exercise was expanded to include not only those fares which are combinable but also those that show more than one GI for a Resolution, whether or not combination is permitted.
- 16 This issue has been drawn to the attention of the Conference Secretariat to ensure that each Conference is made aware of the issue and reflects the intent in the Resolutions.
- 17 It was suggested that the best default would be on a fare component basis and this was further discussed and agreed at the ATPCO Transfer Working Group in early 1999.

Resolution 012 – Glossary of Terms

- 18 A number of proposals were addressed relating to current and new definitions. These were all reviewed and where agreement was reached recommendations have been submitted under Agenda Item COMP-40/02-59.
- 19 ATPCO has been attempting to develop definitions for Outbound and Inbound but these have not yet been finalised. Once they are the Conferences will be asked to incorporate them into Resolution 012.

Resolution 100 – Standard Condition Resolution for Special Fares

- 20 The Report of the Resolution 100 Group was reviewed. The RAP is not in a position to change the report and where carriers believe changes are required they were asked to submit appropriate papers to the Composite meeting. A number of editorial amendments were developed and are proposed for expedited effectiveness (Agenda Item COMP-7/04-13 refers).

Year 2000

- 21 Carriers and CRSs advised that if the new Fare Construction rules were to be approved in the third or fourth quarter of this year, they had to defer implementation until a date in Spring 2000 at the earliest. This is due to the Y2K issue as most companies will implement a freeze from November and no major programming or reprogramming will be allowed. This issue was addressed at the Passenger Steering Group meeting held in Bangkok 26-29 April 1999. Given the procedure being applied whereby once the notice from the US DoT is received it will be reviewed by the PSG, the situation of the freeze will be taken into account when determining the implementation date of the new Fare Construction Rules.

Other Items

22 Other items addressed by the RAP and which are still under review include:

- Mixed Class
- Refunds and Reroutings

Summary of Proposals amending Composite Resolutions

23 Draft amendments to Resolutions are contained in separate documents on the Agenda as follows:

Global Indicators	COMP-28/01-49
Glossary of Terms	COMP-40/02-59
Higher Intermediate Point Check	COMP-7/02-11
	COMP-7/03-12
Resolution 100	COMP-7/04-13
Surface Sectors	COMP-43/01-67

RESOLUTION ADVISORY PANEL**Airline Members**

Company	Representative	10th RAP Nov98	11th RAP Apr99
Air Afrique	DIALLO, Amadou	X	X
Air France	CHARRIER, Bernard	X	X
Austrian	TAKACS, Manfred	X	X
British Airways	McCOOL, Martin	X	X
Delta Airlines	AUSTIN, Cheryl WRIGHT, Frank	X X	X X
Egyptair	KADRI, Salah Samir RADWAN, Soraya	X X	X X
Japan Air Lines	KAGAMIYAMA, Shinya DASILVA, Françoise ENTA, Kazue	X X X	X X X
KLM	VAN RIJNBERK, Madeleine	X	X
Lufthansa	SOCHA, Frank REDMER, Liane	X X	X X
Northwest	TOWNE, Cynthia	X	X
Qantas	FERRETT, Peter ELLIS, Beverly	X X	X X
SABENA	VAN CROMBRUGGHE, Johan	X	X
SAS	SELLSTEDT, Lars		X
South African	VAN DE VIJVER-REIMOLD, Yvonne	X	X
Swissair	DUERST, Markus	X	
United Airlines	ASHWORTH, Maggie GRECO-KLAUBA, Christine	X X	X X
VARIG	NACIF, José Luiz RIVERO, Isabel	X X	X X

Airline Observers

Company	Representative	10th RAP Nov98	11th RAP Apr99
Air Canada	PARE, Jacques		X
All Nippon	SATO, S. Alban FUKUSHIMA, Yayoi MARUYAMA, Suzie	X X	X X X
American Airlines	REILLY, Michael CHMIEL, John	X X	X X
Cathay Pacific	LEUNG, Chi Sing	X	X

Airline Observers (cont'd)

Company	Representative	10th RAP Nov98	11th RAP Apr99
Crossair	KISS, Susanne	X	X
	MUEHLBAUER, Andrea	X	X
El Al	GRINFIELD, Linda	X	
IBERIA	RUIZ de ASSIN, Mercedes		X
Korean Air	YOO, Ming Yung	X	
Meridiana	OHLY, Christoph		X

System Observers

Company	Representative	10th RAP Nov98	11th RAP Apr99
Abacus	LU, Eugene		X
	LOUI, Cyril	X	
	ROS, Nahar	X	
	ORTEGA, Christopher		X
Amadeus	BOTELLA, Sylvie	X	X
	PEDERSEN, Michael		X
	MASCARAS, Gilles	X	
ATPCO	VALTEAU, Laurette	X	X
	GREGORSON, Tom	X	X
	LOWDEN, Anne	X	X
Galileo	ATOTUBO, Eric	X	X
Microsoft	STEPICH, Mark	X	X
	CHAMPERNOWNE, Arthur	X	
	SEHGAL, Ajai		X
SABRE	HENRY, Richard	X	X
	RASCHER, S.F.	X	
	SCHILLING, Lisa		X
SITA	BLUNDELL, Les		X
	SIKORA, Arek	X	X
	FRENCH, Jim		X
Worldspan	BARBIERI, Michael	X	X
	BOYD, Vicki		X
	GRIFFIN, Dan		X
	PAYNE, Angela		X

IATA

	10th RAP Nov98	11th RAP Apr99
GILL, Rodney	X	X
FORRESTER, Ken		X
HARVEY, Tori		X
STAATS, Monique	X	X