June 2026

Airline Payment Framework
Companion Asset 2: Monitoring and KPI Pack

Table of contents

Purpose of this Companion Asset

Purpose of this Companion Asset

This document provides the practical monitoring layer that sits below the Management Foundation document. Its role is to turn the core monitoring logic into a usable management pack, helping airlines organize payment measurement, review performance, and support decision-making without pulling metric libraries and scorecard mechanics back into the main document.

The Management Foundation document explains why monitoring matters and how it closes the loop between strategy, policy, and execution. This document provides the practical support that helps airline payment leaders apply that logic in a disciplined and usable way.

This document is part of a three-document set comprising also the Management Foundation and the Companion Asset 1: Airline Payment Channel Policy Playbook. It is designed to be used alongside the Management Foundation document and, where relevant, alongside Companion Asset 1 when channel-level policy choices are reviewed together with enterprise monitoring.

Who this document is for

- Heads of payment/payment managers.
- Payment performance owners.
- Airline teams responsible for payment monitoring, analytics, or governance review.
- Cross-functional management teams seeking a usable payment review pack.

What this document intends to cover

It is structured to help the reader answer:

- What should we measure?
- How should those measures be organized into a manageable review pack?
- How should review cadence and ownership work in practice?
- How should monitoring signals support management response at the right level?

Scope of this document

It is not a business intelligence system design document, a raw data warehouse specification, or a full channel-by-channel metric library. It is practical, concise, and management-usable.

It covers:

- KPI definitions.
- One enterprise scorecard template.
- Review cadence and ownership.
- A decision-support matrix.

It does not cover:

- Channel-level metric libraries.
- Instrument-level diagnostic packs.
- Advanced benchmark packs.
- Detailed threshold design by channel or payment method.

Section 1
Purpose of Monitoring in the Airline Payment Framework

Monitoring gives airline payment leaders a practical way to see whether payment strategy and policy are producing the outcomes they were intended to support. Its value is not in accumulating more data. It lies in making payment performance visible enough for leadership to review trade-offs, identify emerging issues, and decide where adjustment is useful.

In airline payment, a useful monitoring approach keeps measurement tied to enterprise priorities rather than fragmented channel-level views. It helps the airline look across customer reach and conversion, cost, cash-flow quality, and risk, so that improvement in one area is not pursued without visibility on effects elsewhere. This matters because payment choices that appear attractive in one channel or for one payment method can create weaker outcomes when viewed across the wider airline payment model.

A usable monitoring pack also helps connect operating reality to management discussion. It brings together a small number of decision-useful measures, shows where results are moving in the intended direction, and highlights where local issues may call for operational response, policy review, or broader strategic reconsideration. In that sense, monitoring is less a reporting exercise than a management discipline.

This document focuses on monitoring in a practical form: a concise KPI set, one enterprise scorecard template, a workable review rhythm, and a decision-support matrix. It is not intended to replace more granular analytics or instrument-level diagnostic work. Its role is to provide a management-ready monitoring layer that helps airline payment leaders review performance consistently and keep strategy, policy, and execution aligned over time.

Airlines that establish a consistent monitoring rhythm find it easier to connect payment performance to wider management review and strategic discussion. Regular review also makes it easier to surface emerging misalignment earlier, before isolated issues become harder to correct across the broader payment model.

Section 2
KPI Design Principles

A useful airline payment KPI set is not defined by volume. It is defined by whether it helps leadership interpret performance clearly enough to review trade-offs, surface emerging issues, and take timely decisions. A concise set of decision-useful measures is more valuable than a broad set of indicators that is difficult to interpret consistently.

The first design principle is to keep KPIs linked to the outcomes the airline is trying to support. In this document, that means keeping the core monitoring view anchored to four enterprise dimensions: customer reach and conversion, cost, cash-flow quality, and risk. Measures that do not help explain performance in those areas may still be useful operationally, but they are less likely to belong in the primary management pack.

The second principle is to make trade-offs visible. Payment performance rarely improves along a single dimension only. A change that strengthens conversion may increase cost. A move that improves cash certainty may reduce reach or flexibility in some channels. A disciplined KPI set helps leadership see those interactions early, so that one improvement is not pursued without visibility on what may be weakening elsewhere.

The third principle is to keep the scorecard enterprise-readable. The primary review pack needs to support cross-functional discussion across payment, finance, treasury, commercial, distribution, and technology leadership. That means using measures that leadership across functions can discuss directly, while still being robust enough to support informed management review.

The fourth principle is to distinguish between management KPIs and deeper diagnostics. A concise monitoring pack is most effective when it shows enough to guide review and response, without trying to absorb every metric that may be useful for specialist analysis. More granular analytics remain valuable, but they are better treated as a deeper analytical layer rather than part of the primary management pack.

The fifth principle is to use KPIs in a way that supports response, not observation alone. Measures are most useful when they help the airline judge whether an issue is local and operational, whether it points to a policy question, or whether it may justify broader strategic review. In that sense, KPI design is closely connected to governance: the objective is not only to describe performance, but to make management response more timely and more consistent.

Airlines that keep these principles in view find it easier to maintain a monitoring pack that remains usable over time as the airline's payment model evolves. The discipline lies not in measuring everything, but in measuring enough of the right things to support more consistent review, better-informed decisions, and stronger alignment across the airline payment model.

Section 3
Core KPI Set

The core KPI set in this Companion is designed to give airline payment leaders a concise enterprise view of payment performance. It is not intended to capture every useful metric. Its role is to assemble a focused set of measures that give leadership a reliable read on whether payment is delivering against the airline's intended outcomes across reach and conversion, cost, cash-flow quality, and risk.

The KPI families below are best read as the primary management layer. Each family highlights what the measures are intended to illuminate and gives a small number of illustrative KPI examples that can form part of an enterprise scorecard. The aim is not to create a complete metric library, but to define a practical monitoring set that supports consistent review and informed management discussion.

For deeper operational and technical context related to the payment model, and for terminology support, see in the Annex Pack Annex A — Payment Technical Reference and Annex D — Extended Glossary.

Reach and conversion

This KPI family helps the airline understand whether its payment model is supporting customer access and successful sales completion. It is most useful when read as an indicator of whether payment support, checkout performance, and payment execution are helping the airline convert demand into completed transactions.

Illustrative KPI examples include:

- **Payment conversion rate:** the share of purchase attempts that reach successful payment completion.
- **Authorization success rate:** the share of payment attempts that are approved successfully at authorization.
- **Payment method coverage rate:** the extent to which the airline supports the payment methods that are material in its priority markets or channels.
- **Payment-related abandonment rate:** the share of purchase attempts that are not completed where payment friction is a material contributing factor.

Used together, these measures help show whether payment is widening customer access and supporting conversion, or whether friction, limited payment choice, or weaker execution may be limiting sales performance.

Cost

This KPI family helps the airline understand the financial efficiency of its payment model. It is intended to make the cost consequences of payment choices more visible, not only in direct acceptance costs, but in the broader economics of how payment supports commercial activity.

Illustrative KPI examples include:

- **Total payment cost as a share of payment value:** the overall cost of payment relative to the value processed.
- **Average payment cost per transaction:** the average cost associated with completing a payment transaction.
- **Cost by form of payment or payment category:** the relative cost profile of the main forms of payment in the airline's mix.
- **Refund processing cost:** the cost associated with reversing or refunding transactions where this is material to the airline's payment economics.

These measures help leadership understand whether payment cost is moving in the intended direction and where the airline may need to review the economics of its payment mix, channel choices, or payment model configuration.

Cash-flow quality

This KPI family helps the airline understand how quickly and reliably sales are converted into usable cash. It is intended to keep visibility on the timing, certainty, and resilience of cash realization, rather than treating payment only as a completed sale event.

Illustrative KPI examples include:

- **Average settlement time:** the average elapsed time between completed sale and receipt of funds.
- **Cash realization rate:** the share of processed payment value that converts into usable cash within the expected time frame.
- **Delayed or withheld funds exposure:** the level of payment value affected by holdbacks, delayed settlement, or similar restrictions.
- **Cash-affecting reversal rate:** the share of transactions or value later reversed in a way that weakens cash certainty.

Together, these measures help the airline see whether its payment model is supporting the quality of cash it needs, rather than only the volume of sales it records.

Risk and fraud

This KPI family helps the airline understand the extent to which its payment model is creating, containing, or shifting payment-related exposure. It is intended to support visibility on fraud, disputes, and other forms of payment loss that may weaken the value of otherwise successful sales.

Illustrative KPI examples include:

- **Fraud loss rate:** the level of loss associated with fraud write-off relative to payment value or transaction count.
- **Chargeback rate:** the share of transactions that result in chargebacks or comparable dispute events.
- **Payment default or non-remittance exposure:** the level of payment value at risk because funds are not received as expected.
- **Dispute-related loss rate:** the level of financial loss associated with payment-related disputes or reversals beyond direct fraud alone.

These measures help leadership review whether risk exposure remains within the airline’s intended risk parameters and whether payment choices that support growth or convenience are also creating weaker control outcomes elsewhere.

Taken together, these four KPI families provide a practical enterprise view of airline payment performance. The strongest value comes not from reviewing each family in isolation, but from using them together to see where stronger results in one dimension may be creating pressure in another. That is the basis on which the scorecard, review rhythm, and decision-support approach in the following sections become most useful.

Section 4
Enterprise Scorecard Template

The scorecard in this section is intended to bring the core KPI set into one concise enterprise view. Its role is not to replace detailed analysis. It helps airline payment leaders and cross-functional management teams review performance in a consistent format, see how the main KPI families are moving, and identify where discussion or action may be useful.

A practical enterprise scorecard stays simple enough to support leadership discussion. It does not need to show every supporting metric, only enough to make performance visible, make trade-offs easier to review, and indicate where results are moving in line with, or away from, the airline's intended payment outcomes.

Illustrative enterprise scorecard template

Review period: [Month/Quarter]

Prepared by: [Owner/team]

Review forum: [Payment review/cross-functional management review]

1. **Executive view**

   - **Overall payment performance reading:** [Stable/Improving/Mixed/Deteriorating]
   - **Main positive movement this period:** [Short summary]
   - **Main area of concern this period:** [Short summary]
   - **Issues requiring escalation or decision:** [Brief note, or 'None this period']

2. **Core KPI view**

   Reach and conversion

   - **Primary KPI(s):** [e.g. payment conversion rate, authorization success rate]
   - **Current reading:** [value]
   - **Direction of movement:** [Improving/Stable/Deteriorating]
   - **Management reading:** [short interpretation]
   - **Management response level:** [Operational adjustment/Policy review/Strategic reconsideration]

   Cost

   - **Primary KPI(s):** [e.g. total payment cost as a share of payment value, average payment cost per transaction]
   - **Current reading:** [value]
   - **Direction of movement:** [Improving/Stable/Deteriorating]
   - **Management reading:** [short interpretation]
   - **Management response level**: [Operational adjustment/Policy review/Strategic reconsideration]

   Cash-flow quality

   - Primary KPI(s): [e.g. average settlement time, cash realization rate, delayed or withheld funds exposure]
   - **Current reading:** [value]
   - **Direction of movement:** [Improving/Stable/Deteriorating]
   - **Management reading:** [short interpretation]
   - **Management response level:** [Operational adjustment/Policy review/Strategic reconsideration]

   Risk and fraud

   - **Primary KPI(s):** [e.g. fraud loss rate, chargeback rate, payment default or non-remittance exposure]
   - **Current reading:** [value]
   - **Direction of movement:** [Improving/Stable/Deteriorating]
   - **Management reading:** [short interpretation]
   - **Management response level:** [Operational adjustment/Policy review/Strategic reconsideration]

3. Cross-KPI reading

- **Visible trade-offs this period:** [e.g. stronger conversion with higher cost, improved cash certainty with weaker reach]
- **Areas of alignment:** [short summary]
- **Areas of tension:** [short summary]

4. Management actions and follow-up

- **Operational actions underway:** [short list]
- **Policy questions to review:** [short list]
- **Strategic questions to monitor or escalate:** [short list]
- **Owner(s):** [name/function]
- **Next review point:** [date/forum]

How to use the scorecard

This template is intended to support a consistent management discussion rather than serve as a detailed reporting pack. The strongest value comes from reading the four KPI families together, not in isolation, so that leadership can see where one improving result may be creating pressure elsewhere.

A useful scorecard reading is typically concise. The aim is to show the current position, the direction of movement, the likely management meaning, and the level at which response may be needed. This works best when the enterprise scorecard is supported by more granular analysis outside the scorecard itself, rather than placing all supporting detail inside the primary review pack.

Section 5
Review Cadence and Ownership

A monitoring pack is most useful when it sits within a clear review rhythm and visible ownership model. Without that structure, even a well-designed scorecard can become a reporting exercise rather than a management tool. The purpose of cadence and ownership is to ensure that payment performance is reviewed often enough to support timely response, while still being connected to broader management discussion.

In practice, many airlines find value in combining two levels of review. The first is a lighter operational rhythm that helps the airline observe emerging movement, surface local issues, and follow through on actions already under way. The second is a more deliberate enterprise review that brings payment performance into wider cross-functional discussion, so that leadership can assess trade-offs, review policy implications, and decide whether broader escalation may be useful.

The lighter operational rhythm is typically owned by the team responsible for payment performance, analytics, or day-to-day governance review. Keeping the monitoring pack current, identifying near-term issues, and maintaining enough continuity that changes in performance do not go unnoticed between enterprise reviews are central to that rhythm. Depending on the airline's size, complexity, and payment operating model, this rhythm may be monthly, or more frequent where payment conditions are changing quickly.

The enterprise review rhythm is typically less frequent and more decision-oriented. It may sit within an existing payment forum or within a broader cross-functional management review involving payment, finance, treasury, commercial, distribution, and technology leadership. Its purpose is not to revisit every metric in detail. It is to review the enterprise scorecard, understand the management meaning of the main movements, and judge whether operational correction is sufficient or whether policy or strategy may need closer attention.

Clear ownership matters equally. In many airlines, one function or role usefully serves as the coordinating owner of the monitoring pack, even where underlying data and interpretation come from several teams. That coordinating role typically includes consolidating the scorecard, maintaining the review rhythm, highlighting emerging issues, and ensuring that agreed actions and escalation points remain visible across review cycles.

A useful ownership model also makes participation clear. Finance and treasury teams may help interpret cost and cash-flow quality. Commercial, distribution, and digital teams may help explain movement in reach, conversion, and customer-related effects. Technology or payment operations teams may help interpret operational or control-related signals. The monitoring pack is most effective when these perspectives remain connected in one review logic rather than being discussed only in separate functional silos.

Review cadence works best when it remains proportionate. A rhythm that is too infrequent can make issues visible only after they are harder to address; one that is too frequent can reduce enterprise discussion to repetitive metric commentary without enough decision value. The more effective approach creates enough regularity to detect meaningful change, while keeping the enterprise discussion focused on implications, choices, and follow-through.

Where cadence and ownership are well organized, monitoring becomes easier to use as part of normal airline management rather than as a separate reporting exercise. A consistent review rhythm helps teams connect payment performance to policy and strategy discussions with less friction, and makes it easier for leadership to see when a local issue is beginning to signal something broader across the airline payment model.

Section 6
Decision-Support Matrix

Monitoring is most useful when it helps leadership decide not only what is happening, but what type of response may be appropriate. This section translates common monitoring signals into a practical decision-support view. Its purpose is not to prescribe one answer in every case. It helps airline payment leaders distinguish between issues that are mainly operational, issues that point to policy design or policy consistency questions, and issues that may justify broader strategic reconsideration.

The matrix below is intended to support management judgment rather than replace it. The same signal may carry different implications depending on persistence, scale, channel concentration, commercial importance, and the airline's current payment model and priorities. Even so, airlines find it useful to work from a common reading of which types of signal usually remain local, which tend to call for policy review, and which are more likely to indicate a strategic question.

Illustrative decision-support matrix

1. Signals that often point first to operational adjustment

Signal pattern: isolated deterioration in one KPI within a limited channel, market, or payment context.

- Typical reading: a local execution issue may be affecting performance without yet indicating wider design weakness.
- Management response level: operational adjustment.
- Illustrative actions: review processing performance, investigate recent operational changes, validate provider or configuration issues.
- Typical review owner/forum: payment performance owner, specialist payment team, or operational review forum.

Signal pattern: short-term decline followed by early stabilization.

- Typical reading: performance movement may reflect a temporary disruption rather than a structural issue.
- Management response level: operational adjustment with continued observation.
- Illustrative actions: monitor closely over the next review cycle, confirm whether the issue normalizes, and allow time to confirm the pattern before escalating.
- Typical review owner/forum: payment performance owner or operational review forum.

Signal pattern: one KPI weakens while the wider scorecard remains broadly stable.

- Typical reading: the issue may still be local, provided it is not linked to material exposure elsewhere
- Management response level: operational adjustment, with escalation readiness if the issue persists
- Illustrative actions: assign local corrective action, define follow-up point, check whether adjacent KPIs begin to move
- Typical review owner/forum: operational review forum with visibility to the coordinating owner

2. Signals that often justify policy review

Signal pattern: repeated deterioration in the same KPI family across more than one channel, market, or payment category.

- Typical reading: the issue may reflect a policy boundary, policy inconsistency, or recurring design weakness rather than a single local problem.
- Management response level: policy review.
- Illustrative actions: review policy assumptions, compare treatment across channels, assess whether current payment rules or preferences remain fit for purpose.
- Typical review owner/forum: cross-functional payment review or policy review forum.

Signal pattern: improvement in one KPI family is repeatedly accompanied by weakening in another.

- Typical reading: a visible trade-off may be emerging that requires more deliberate balancing in policy.
- Management response level: policy review.
- Illustrative actions: examine whether the current policy is over-weighting one objective, reassess acceptable trade-offs, test whether different policy choices would produce a more balanced outcome.
- Typical review owner/forum: cross-functional management review with payment, finance, treasury, and commercial input.

Signal pattern: similar issues recur despite earlier operational correction.

- Typical reading: repeated recurrence may indicate that execution fixes alone are not addressing the underlying cause.
- Management response level: policy review.
- Illustrative actions: revisit channel treatment, payment-method treatment, exception handling, or control boundaries.
- Typical review owner/forum: policy review forum or enterprise payment review.

3. Signals that may justify strategic reconsideration

Signal pattern: sustained movement across several KPI families at once.

- Typical reading: the airline's current payment model and priorities may no longer be fully aligned with its commercial, financial, or risk objectives.
- Management response level: strategic reconsideration.
- Illustrative actions: revisit strategic priorities, reassess the balance between reach, cost, cash-flow quality, and risk, consider whether the current payment model still supports the airline's intended direction.
- Typical review owner/forum: enterprise management review or leadership escalation forum.

Signal pattern: persistent cross-KPI tension with material financial or commercial effect.

- Typical reading: the issue may have moved beyond policy optimization and into a question of strategic choice.
- Management response level: strategic reconsideration.
- Illustrative actions: assess whether the current payment strategy remains coherent with the airline's commercial and financial objectives, and review whether capability, governance, or investment choices need to change.
- Typical review owner/forum: senior cross-functional review involving payment, finance, treasury, commercial, and technology leadership.

Signal pattern: repeated escalation from local issues into broader enterprise effects.

- Typical reading: the monitoring pattern may indicate that the current strategy is no longer providing enough direction for consistent policy and execution.
- Management response level: strategic reconsideration.
- Illustrative actions: review whether enterprise payment goals, decision principles, or organizational ownership need to be reconsidered or restructured.
- Typical review owner/forum: leadership review or strategy forum.

How to use the matrix

This matrix is most useful when read alongside the enterprise scorecard rather than on its own. A single KPI movement rarely determines the right response by itself. The stronger reading usually comes from looking at persistence, scale, cross-KPI interaction, and whether the issue remains local or begins to appear in more than one part of the payment model.

Airlines find it helpful to use the matrix as a guide to escalation discipline. It can reduce the risk that local issues are elevated too quickly, while also reducing the risk that recurring or enterprise-level signals remain treated as routine operational variance for too long. Used in that way, the matrix supports a more consistent link between monitoring, management response, and broader payment governance.

Conclusion

Monitoring is most useful when it helps the airline act with greater clarity, not when it generates reporting activity without informing management response. A disciplined monitoring approach helps leadership stay oriented: able to see where payment is performing as intended, where trade-offs are emerging, and where alignment between strategy, policy, and execution may need attention.

Used in that way, this Companion Asset supports a disciplined payment management rhythm, one in which KPIs, scorecard review, ownership, and escalation logic work together rather than as separate activities. The strongest value comes not from any single metric, but from the consistency of the review discipline built around it.

For the wider operating logic of airline payment management, return to the Management Foundation document. Where channel-policy application is needed alongside monitoring review, the Companion Asset 1: Airline Payment Channel Policy Playbook provides the practical channel-policy layer.

International Air Transport Association
SS135-800 rue du Square-Victoria
Montreal, QC, H3C 0B4
Canada

iata.org

IATA