



13th IATA AIRMAIL PANEL MEETING
2 March 2009
0900-1700
Bangkok

Report

Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

Mr. Mark Gilbert of American Airlines, the AMP Chairman, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to Bangkok. The participants introduced themselves around the table.

The attendance record for the meeting is included as **Attachment A**.

Item 1 - Anti-trust directive

As usual, the Airmail Panel was briefed on anti-trust considerations. IATA legal advised the group to be mindful of the Competition Law Guidelines For Passenger And Cargo Tariff, Agency And Service Conference Meetings that had been included in the agenda. The AMP was reminded that there could be no discussion of conditions of service or prices.

The Panel noted the anti-trust directive and members undertook to conduct proceedings accordingly.

Item 2 - AMP Membership

The Panel had been provided with the latest membership list.

Apologies for AMP/13 had been received from:

- Ron Stevens (FX)
- David Thompson (QF)
- Kiminori Seto (JL)

Although this was the 2nd consecutive absence for David Thompson, as he had also missed AMP/11 in Montreal, the Secretary and the Chairman had been in contact with David and he provided assurance that he was still very much interested in fulfilling his AMP duties. Qantas had made a corporate level decision to not attend WCS 2009 in general, not just the AMP.

The Secretariat advised the group that new members had been elected, unfortunately only officially effective as of the CSC/31 in Bangkok, and these were:

- Bob Uttmark (UA)
- Dan Conrad (5X)

There was still one vacancy to be filled. The Chairman provided the Secretary with the business card of Masashi Sato, the Director of Mail Marketing & Services Planning for All Nippon Airways who had expressed an interest in joining. Manseok Lee of Korean Air attended the meeting as an observer and also expressed interest in joining the panel.

Action:

- Secretary to provide All Nippon Airways with guidance and nomination forms

The existing AMP membership and their terms of office as of March 2008 are included as **Attachment B**.

Item 3 - AMP Scorecard

The Secretary advised the Panel that the AMP Scorecard had been provided to the CSC.

Highlights included the UPU Resolution recognizing the Postal Air Waybill number and the maintenance of limits for restricted items in the mail.

It was queried whether the BACR issue should be included. The Chairman and IATA legal advised that airline suggestions had already been provided to the UPU and there was no need to continue raising the issue. As the rate is based on 2 year 's previous statistics it may turn out that the rate actually favours the airlines in the future, even if not at present.

The scorecard was duly noted.

Action: IATA Secretariat to ensure that the scorecard is updated as appropriate.
--

Item 4 - Approval of AMP/12 Report & follow up on AMP/12 Actions

The report of the 12th Airmail Panel meeting as circulated to the members was reviewed and discussed which triggered the raising of many points.

Restricted Items:

- Limits need to be maintained - not increased
- Airlines need to re-emphasize that the Posts are to ensure that restricted items in the mail are within the allowable limits
- Posts need to be aware that certain routings may not accommodate such items
- Undeclared items will of course continue to be a problem
- An awareness campaign needs to be instigated
- Need to determine which party is actually liable when items over the limit are transported
- Limits may vary according to the mode of transport and what is allowable on a truck may exceed the limits surface air lift (SAL) mail for aircraft, e.g. dry ice
- Restrictions concerning live animals also need to be considered
 - o If within the UPU regulations then we should allow
 - o If a carrier doesn't carry live animals then they should inform the post
 - o Interline partner's restrictions also must be considered and accounted for
- No immediate need for a list of Posts that are more inclined to move special items
 - o Perhaps we should just list the brochures of regulations with a safety/security justification
 - o If that need ever arose it could not be composed in a way that could be construed to negatively affect that Post's business
 - o There would have to be clearly justified benefits
 - o This type of information is not kept on forwarders
- Weapons in the mail are another concern and need to be carefully scrutinized by the posts
- Not so much the individual transporting a sporting weapon but the commercial enterprises that are using the mail for multiple movements
- We need to ask the UPU to confirm if their members are aware of the legal implications, e.g. licenses required
- We also need to ensure that the posts are aware that SAL mail does not always get a guaranteed reduced rate

The following actions required further following up with the UPU:

Action: Chairman and Secretary to submit items to the UPU to raise awareness concerning:

- Weapons in the mail
- Dangerous goods in the mail
- Clarify that SAL mail does not automatically obtain a reduced rate

The report of the 12th Airmail Panel meeting as circulated to the members was approved.

Item 5 - Review of IATA/UPU Contact Committee Workshop items

It was noted that the agenda was received very late and that in future it needs to be received earlier in advance and that the items need to be prioritized.

Reasons for Bad Debts

The Secretary advised that the UPU had been provided with a consolidated list of reasons for bad postal debts as compiled from AMP/12. The ball was now in the UPU court and IATA was awaiting a response.

Proof of Delivery

The workshop agenda included some examples of problems with transit mail and the proof of delivery process. Many comments were made during the discussion:

- Although the regulations indicate that the delivery bill is supposed to be signed by the receiving post not all posts actually do this, e.g. USPS
- The mail registration device helps but it doesn't actually identify what was in the container
- Although Japan Post had indicated that this was a particular problem for them and their mail not all carriers had received complaints, e.g. Swiss had no problems to report concerning Japan Post mail
- The Chairman pointed out that this might be because Swiss Post is actually involved in providing the required information
- On order to accomplish this faithfully a GHA would have to actually scan each individual receptacle
- Unless the receiving Post was involved, the origin Post may still not recognize the carrier's scanning as proof of delivery
- Mail is not received into a carrier warehouse like cargo before being handed over to the Post so, although this gives the Posts better turn around, it impacts the handover & proof of delivery procedure
- It varies by country – perhaps the UPU regulations should be the default when there is no bilateral agreement in place
- Obtaining proof of delivery when the mail handling unit is being operated by the Post is complicated and not guaranteed
- There still needs to be a spirit of trust
- Perhaps a 3rd party should be engaged to identify a grand vision for going forward
- The IPC FOMBA project seems to be moving in this direction

Model Framework for a Service Agreement

IATA Legal had noted some potential amendments to the latest draft and led the AMP through a review. As a result more possible changes were identified and points were raised, e.g.:

- We need clarification on the term “Designated Operator” and whether a country could have more than one (the gut feeling was yes and New Zealand was cited as an example)
- We need a caveat that the definitions in this framework are limited to the context of the framework and do not “redefine” existing industry definitions, e.g. the definition of consignment in this framework only applies to postal consignments covered by the agreement and not consignments as defined in the Cargo Services Resolutions Manual

The draft as annotated by AMP/13 is included as a separate document with this report and would be presented for discussion at the workshop.

Action: Secretary to provide the UPU with the marked-up version of the draft Model Framework

AHM Mail Handling Procedures

The Chairman informed the group that he had once again gone over the AHM mail handling procedures and updated them as seen fit. This was done under the understanding that the AHM was ground level operations manual that would help the ground handler easily understand what was supposed to be done with the mail. It was not to over burden the operational staff with regulatory text and/or references to it.

This approach would be explained to the UPU at the workshop and the amended text would also be provided to the UPU.

Action: Chairman to provide the UPU with the marked-up version of the AHM content

Item 6 - Review of IATA/UPU Group on EDI agenda

The EDI agenda had been circulated to the AMP. There was not sufficient time to review the items in detail as priority had been given to the upcoming workshop agenda.

However, there were concerns raised regarding the item on the Chinese situation where China is implementing advance reporting requirements. Clarification was needed as to what level of information was required by Chinese Customs for the mail. There was a general feeling that it was manifest level information similar to the Air AMS requirement in the USA and not item level details.

Action: IATA and the UPU to seek clarification on the Chinese requirements regarding the reporting of mail information

Item 7 - IPC & “Future of Mail by Air” Project

There was some concern that perhaps the IPC was trying to move a bit too fast as there are too many open issues, including:

- Problems with combining multiple product rates under one PAWB
- The actual definition and understanding of a consignment

It was also mentioned that the viewpoint of the AMP and its members needed to be recognized within the project. This could be accomplished through the FOMBA participants that are also AMP members.

Members certainly supported the project and believed in the spirit of its vision.

Item 8 - Guidelines for the use of the Post Air Waybill (PAWB) number

The Secretary informed the group that as agreed at AMP/12 IATA started work on draft guidelines. These had been circulated with the agenda and were reviewed. Some editorial amendments were noted.

Some key events of late regarding the PAWB were noted:

- UPU Congress had now officially recognized the PAWB number
- IPC FOMBA project was quickly moving ahead and incorporating it in its vision
- The latest M39 CARDIT & RESDIT message specifications allowed for its inclusion and implementations were already underway

Therefore, it was generally agreed that work on the guidelines needed to be completed as a high priority. A more project-oriented approach would be used. To that end it was agreed that an initial conference call would be organized to focus on the guidelines and a work plan for their completion.

Action: Secretary and Chairman to organize a conference call for the PAWB Guidelines in April

Item 9 - Bilateral exchange of CARDIT & RESDIT messages directly between air carriers

The Chairman indicated that there might be a need for the carriers to relay these messages to each other for both planning and event reporting purposes, especially if interlining of the mail is to become more commonplace.

The other option might be to use the existing CIMP messages. These included:

Air Waybill Data (FWB) - with the MAL handling code identifying the PAWB consignment
Status Update (FSU) – to provide status updates for the PAWB consignment
Mail Label Data (MLD) - to relay mailbag label information
Mail Advisory (MAM) – a CIMP equivalent to the CARDIT

Action: Secretary and Lufthansa to prepare an item regarding the potential CIMP solution for AMP/14

Item 10 – Any Other Business

WCS2009

- The AMP was relieved that there was a Mail Track included in the program for WCS 2009 and reiterated that it needs to be part of the program every year.

No tentative date was set for AMP/14.

Adjournment of the Meeting

With no other business raised, the Chairman thanked the attendees for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

**IATA
Attendance Record
Airmail Panel
13th Meeting
March 2, 2009
Montreal**

Company	First Name	Last Name	E-mail
Members			
Air France	Stephane	Bocquet	stbocquet@airfrance.fr
American Airlines	Mark	Gilbert	mark.gilbert@aa.com
Austrian Airlines	Christian	Kleiner	christian.kleiner@austrian.com
Lufthansa Cargo	Axel	Klein	axel.klein@dlh.de
SAS Air Mail	Michael	Thomasen	michael.thomasen@sas.dk
Swiss World Cargo	Laurent	Ruch	laurent.ruch@swiss.com
Observers			
Korean Airlines	Manseok	Lee	manseoklee@koreanair.com
United Airlines	Sanjay	Sabherwal	sanjay.sabherwal@ual.com
Continental Airlines	Bill	Goorsky	bill.goorsky@coair.com
Secretariat			
IATA	Bill	Acheson	achesonb@iata.org
IATA	Robert	McGeorge	mcgeorger@iata.org
IATA	Udai	Fulena	fulenap@iata.org
IATA	Stephane	Parrenin	parrenins@iata.org

AMP/13
2 March 2009
Bangkok

Attachment B

The AMP membership as of March 2009:

No.	Member	Term of Office			
1	Stephane Bocquet (AF)	2009	2010	2011	2012
2	Bob Uttmark (UA)	2009	2010	2011	2012
3	Ron D. Stevens (FX)	2009	2010	2011	2012
4	Dan Conrad (5X)	2009	2010	2011	
5	Axel Klein (LH)	2009	2010	2011	
6	Laurent Ruch (LX)	2009	2010	2011	
7	Vacancy	2009	2010		
8	Christian Kleiner (OS) VICE CHAIRMAN	2009	2010		
9	Michael Thomasen (SK)	2009	2010		
10	Mark Gilbert (AA) CHAIRMAN	2009			
11	Kiminori Seto (JL)	2009			
12	David Thompson (QF)	2009			