



**14<sup>th</sup> IATA AIRMAIL PANEL MEETING**  
**28 October 2009**  
**Bern**

**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 Bern.

A special welcome was extended to the two newest members, Barbara Johnston (AC) and Martina Goergen (LH).

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. Michael Gill of 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/14 had been received from:

- Dan Conrad (5X)
- Bob Uttmark (UA)
- Stephane Bocquet (AF)

This was only the first missed meeting for Bob Uttmark (UA) and Dan Conrad (5X) as their official membership only became effective as of the CSC/31 in Bangkok. Nevertheless, the Chairman indicated that they would be contacted to provide assurance that they are still interested in fulfilling their AMP duties.

Kiminori Seto (JL) advised the group that he was not far from retirement. The members whose terms were coming to an end were reminded to ensure that their nominations were submitted to the CSC if they wished to continue as AMP members. Besides Kiminori Seto, this also included Mark Gilbert (AA) and David Thompson (QF).

The existing AMP membership and their terms of office as of October 2009 are included as **Attachment B**.

**Item 3 - AMP Scorecard**

The Secretary had provided the Panel with an updated AMP Scorecard.

This was reviewed and the group believed that it was an adequate reflection of the status of the work undertaken against our deliverables.

It was mentioned that perhaps the removal of the mail delivery bill might be included. It was understood that this could not be an AMP deliverable per se as it was really for the postal operators to deliver the removal of their delivery bill. This effort could be supported under the

AMP deliverable to “Continue to work with the UPU and the IPC to further expedite airmail handling/transport for the benefit of the customers”.

The scorecard was duly noted.

Action: IATA Secretariat to ensure that the scorecard is provided to the CSC.
---

#### **Item 4 - Approval of AMP/13 Report & follow up on AMP/13 Actions**

The report of the 13<sup>th</sup> Airmail Panel meeting as circulated to the members was reviewed.

The following actions had been taken:

- All Nippon Airways was provided with guidance and nomination forms concerning AMP membership
- The AMP scorecard was updated as appropriate
- Items were submitted to the UPU to raise awareness concerning:
  - o Weapons in the mail
  - o Dangerous goods in the mail
  - o Clarify that SAL mail does not automatically obtain a reduced rate
- The UPU was provided with the AMP/13 marked-up version of the draft Model Framework
- The UPU was provided with the marked-up version of the AHM content
- Clarification on the Chinese requirements regarding the reporting of mail information was sought however clear official responses from Chinese Customs are not forthcoming
- A conference call for the PAWB Guidelines in April was organized

A member advised that they had been to China and the reporting of mail was never requested. Another member indicated that it was also their understanding that the requirement for advance cargo reporting did not include mail.

Further action is still required for the following:

- Secretary and Lufthansa to prepare an item regarding the potential CIMP solution for interlining of the mail if the PAWB Guidelines do not cover this aspect adequately

The following points were raised in ensuing discussion:

#### Restricted Items:

- Airlines need to continually remind the Postal Operators to ensure that restricted items in the mail are within the allowable limits
- Some tenders seem to try and absolve the Postal Operator of responsibility
- Postal operators need to question senders to confirm that restricted items are not included in the mail
- Internet commerce has increased the movement of weapons in the mail
- As cargo security has become more stringent this type of traffic may be easier to accomplish in the mail
- Package & parcel business is the future for mail as letters become more redundant due to e-mail
- A member based in the EU advised the group that the EU plans to introduce 100% screening of the mail
- In other regions, e.g. Canada, USA, screening of the mail is not allowed

Action: IATA legal to review the Canada Post tender and provide guidance concerning postal operator responsibility

The report of the 13<sup>th</sup> Airmail Panel meeting as circulated to the members was approved.

#### **Item 5 - Postal Air Waybill Number Guidelines**

The Secretary informed the group that as agreed at AMP/13 IATA had convened a call and the draft guidelines had been refined as a result. These had been circulated to the AMP and the IPC FoMBA working group and feedback had been obtained from both postal operators and airlines.

The key points were:

#### Consignment definition

It will be amended a bit but not too much or there is a risk of not being able to close the gap between cargo and mail. It will indicate that mail may be handed over in multi-lot parts but the final receipt will be for the whole lot. The posts even wanted to add time definite boundaries but that was not acceptable to the AMP.

#### Editorial Amendments

The specification will be editorially amended to include some differently titled paragraphs. For example, some assumptions will be moved to a new paragraph entitled "Pre-Conditions", e.g. at this stage, CARDIT and RESDIT are pre-requisites for the use of the PAWB. Down the road this may change if Cargo systems can track at the piece level or the Posts are willing to track at the consignment level instead.

#### Initial inclusion of the PAWB number

A flexible approach will be maintained although most parties recognize that it will typically be the airline that assigns the PAWB number in a RESDIT. Some Posts may actually be able to manage their own postal air waybill numbers, e.g. Australian Post.

#### Consolidator

It was not intended to introduce a new party but only to generally identify the importance of consolidation in the future. The term "Mail Consolidator" can be changed as it did cause concern for the postal operators. It is understood that it is not a one-to-one CARDIT to PAWB. The Post would be expected to consolidate the mail as much as possible to avoid overuse of air waybill numbers. The specification will emphasize this. It is envisioned that the PAWB can be associated to several postal delivery bills, just as a Master Air Waybill (MAWB) can be associated to several house bills. And, just as part shipments can happen for a MAWB, part postal shipments could also happen for a PAWB. The MAWB does not change, nor should the PAWB.

#### Mail Unit versus Airside

It was noted that the flow diagrams should indicate the possibility of direct delivery or pick up from aircraft to postal premises, rather than going thru an airmail unit.

#### Scanning

Whenever scanning is mentioned in the textual descriptions of the flow diagrams "when possible" will also be mentioned as scanning may not be implemented everywhere at origin and destination.

The guidelines were reviewed and further refined considering this feedback.

Action: Secretary to circulate a refined Version 0.4 of the Guidelines and to organize another interim conference call in order to finalize them at the next AMP in Vancouver in March 2010

#### **Item 6 - Review of Agenda and Preparation for IATA/UPU Contact Committee**

##### Reasons for Bad Debts

The AMP was aware that the UPU had been provided with a consolidated list of reasons for bad postal debts. IATA needed to continue to follow up on this with the UPU as it continues to be an important issue.

Action: IATA to continue to follow up with the UPU concerning the remedy solution for bad debts.

##### Model Framework for a Service Agreement

The AMP was aware that the UPU had been provided with AMP/13 suggestions for amendments to the Framework in March and that the resulting refined Framework had only been provided back in October just prior to AMP/14.

The AMP reviewed the AMP/13 marked-up version and the refined version simultaneously.

Further potential refinements were noted.

Action: Secretary to provide the UPU with the proposed amendments to the draft Model Framework

A marked-up version of the draft is included as a separate document with this report.

*Secretariat Note:* The draft also includes annotations resulting from subsequent reviews by the UPU Transport Group and the IATA-UPU Contact Committee.

##### AHM Mail Handling Procedures

The Chairman informed the group that the AHM mail handling procedures had been substantially updated. These had been shared previously with the UPU who clearly understood that the AHM was a ground level operations manual not to be over burdened with regulatory text.

The Secretary had provided the AMP with the latest mailing handling procedures which had been submitted to the Airport Services Committee for review. These were approved for inclusion in the AHM which would be released in January 2010.

##### Receptacle Label

The Chairman informed the group that there have been other UPU/IPC activities regarding the receptacle label and that his airline and other AMP airlines have participated. The main issue for the AMP is that the label has to clearly indicate the next destination for the mail so that staff handling the mail put it on the right flights. This is not always the case and appropriate relabelling of bags is not always done.

Action: AMP members in attendance at Contact Committee meeting would highlight the carriers' concerns (also captured under Item 7) with the mail receptacle label

### **Item 7 - Review of IATA/UPU Group on EDI agenda**

The EDI agenda had been circulated to the AMP.

#### Status Codes

One of the issues raised was the proposal for a new Status Event Code "40" that would indicate when the mail had been received from a flight. This would be the equivalent of the "RCF" CIMP status code for when cargo is received from a flight and placed in the cargo warehouse.

The discussion highlighted other issues with the UPU codes:

- Some were truly aircraft operational and besides being very difficult for the carrier mail unit to obtain, the requirement to know such technical information was questioned
- There seemed to be some with very similar definitions that could lead to confusion as to which one applies

Action: AMP members in attendance at the Group on EDI meeting would suggest that the code list be refined by the UPU

#### S47 Label

As indicated in the minutes for item 6 the label is a major concern for the carriers. When the day comes that the CN38 is no longer generated then the label information will have to be absolutely accurate to ensure proper transportation. So far, most of the amendments to the label are to satisfy postal operator needs and not the airlines requests.

Action: AMP members in attendance at the Group on EDI meeting would highlight the carriers' concerns with the mail receptacle label

#### M39 CARDIT & RESDIT

The members were concerned that the proposed changes might change the structure of the messages and therefore require a major system change.

Action: AMP members in attendance at the Group on EDI meeting would highlight the carriers' concerns with the M39 standard.

### **Item 8 - IPC & "Future of Mail by Air" Project**

#### Mail Reporting Device (MRD)

A member reported that the device was working well in the smaller airport installations but seemed to be having some problems in larger airports, e.g. FRA, LHR.

As indicated under Item 5 the PAWB draft guidelines had been circulated to the FoMBA working group and its feedback had been obtained which would be considered and reflected as appropriate in the next version.

The IPC has also drafted a brochure for the purpose of promoting EDI and this had also been provided to the AMP seeking their input.

Action: AMP members to provide their feedback concerning the EDI brochure.

Members continue to support the project and believed in the spirit of its vision.

**Item 9 – World Cargo Symposium 2010**

The AMP had been provided with the roadmap for the event and the Mail Track Program as well as an update on the achievements against the WCS 2009 commitments for mail.

A member had received an invitation letter that indicated a promotional fee of \$500 was applicable whereas in the past AMP members received a complimentary pass. The Secretariat advised that the event had been out sourced and that some changes had been incorporated.

Action: Secretary to confirm the registration policy and procedures for industry meeting participants.
--

**Item 10 – Any Other Business**

It was mentioned that perhaps the half day schedule for the AMP in Vancouver might not be adequate. The Secretary advised that more time could be arranged if needed.

The date for AMP/15 was conformed as 8 March 2010 in Vancouver at the WCS 2010.

**Adjournment of the Meeting**

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

AMP/14  
28 October 2009  
Bern

**Attachment A**

**IATA  
Attendance Record  
Airmail Panel  
14<sup>th</sup> Meeting  
October 28, 2009  
Bern**

<b>Company</b>	<b>Person</b>	<b>e-mail address</b>
Members		
AA	Mark Gilbert	mark.gilbert@aa.com
AC	Barbara Johnston	barb.johnston@aircanada.ca
JL	Kiminori Seto	kiminori.seto@jal.com
FX	Ron Stevens	rdstevens@fedex.com
OS	Christian Kleiner	christian.kleiner@aua.com
QF	David Thompson	dthompson@qantas.com.au
SK	Michael Thomassen	michael.thomasen@sas.dk
LH	Martina Goergen	martina.goergen@dlh.de
Secretariat		
IATA	Bill Acheson	achesonb@iata.org
IATA	Michael Gill	gillm@iata.org

The AMP membership as of October 2009:

<b>No.</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Term of Office</b>			
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	Martina Goergen (LH)	2009	2010	2011	
6	Laurent Ruch (LX)	2009	2010	2011	
7	Barbara Johnston (AC)	2009	2010		
8	Christian Kleiner (OS) <b>VICE CHAIRMAN</b>	2009	2010		
9	Michael Thomasen (SK)	2009	2010		
10	Mark Gilbert (AA) <b>CHAIRMAN</b>	2009			
11	Kiminori Seto (JL)	2009			
12	David Thompson (QF)	2009			