Industry Meetings  
Doha, Qatar 19 - 20 September 2022  
AGENDA

This is the Agenda for this year’s IATA IBS OPS and SIS General Meetings. It is also published online here and on the related IATA “SSW” (Standard Setting Workspace) Online Communities.

Any revisions to the Agenda Items will be highlighted during the onsite Industry Meetings in Doha, Qatar.

IATA and Industry Financial Advisory Committee (IFAC) have decided to host this year’s IBS OPS and SIS General Meetings entirely onsite in Doha, Qatar.

8th INTERLINE BILLING AND SETTLEMENT OPERATIONS (IBS OPS) GENERAL MEETING  
19 September 2022

As you are aware, the Interline Billing and Settlement Operations is an amalgamation of the old ICH User Group and the Revenue Accounting Working Group. To be able to vote on changes to the IATA RAM (Revenue Accounting Manual), a carrier must be an IATA Member Airline. There is no proxy voting. Changes to the IATA RAM can be approved by a majority vote of IATA airline representatives voting on the proposed change, provided that the change is not opposed by 15% or more of those airline representatives voting on the proposed change. One vote per IATA airline member is permitted.

11th SIMPLIFIED INVOICING AND SETTLEMENT (SIS) GENERAL MEETING  
20 September 2022

To be eligible to vote on SIS system changes at the SIS General Meeting, participants must be signatories to the IS Participation Agreement as well as actively processing transactions in SIS. A complete list of active SIS participants with voting rights for 2022 is published on the SIS website and will be updated closer to the meeting.

Make sure you involve and bring along your Accounts Payable colleagues especially for Miscellaneous / Non-Transportation invoice types. There will be discussions about supplier invoices and how best to use the system to take advantage of the new features.

Eligible members will be able to discuss and raise questions on this year’s Industry Meetings Agenda Items in IATA’s SSW Online Communities up to ten (10) days prior to the General Meetings by Friday, 9th September 2022. Please refer to the IATA “SSW” User Guide for this year’s Industry General Meetings to help you access and navigate the IATA “SSW” Online Communities. For any assistance in using the IATA “SSW” platform, please contact us at standards@iata.org.
This year the SIS General Meeting will be hosting three (3) **Break-out Sessions**! Below are the topics for Day 2 – SIS GM:

- **BS1** - Expanding SIS to other e-Invoicing needs in the Airline Industry
- **BS2** - Miscellaneous Billings Best Practices
- **BS3** - Airlines Retailing with Offers and Orders - Impact on Financial Processes - Preview

As a reminder, please note that the **voting will be onsite only at the events for the IBS OPS and SIS General Meetings Agenda Items**. Electronic voting devices will be assigned at the time of check-in for the events to voting member delegates that registered for the onsite events. Only one device per eligible voting member will be assigned.
COMPETITION LAW GUIDELINES FOR IATA INDUSTRY MEETINGS

IATA is publishing these Competition Law Guidelines to ensure that IATA Industry Meetings are conducted in full compliance with all applicable competition laws.

Statement of Policy

IATA Industry Meetings shall be conducted in full compliance with United States antitrust laws, the competition rules of the European Union, and the competition laws of all other relevant jurisdictions.

Procedural Guidelines

IATA Industry Meetings shall be conducted pursuant to the following procedures in order to ensure compliance with all relevant competition laws:

1. All discussions or conversations among meeting participants, including during breaks and scheduled or non-scheduled social activities connected with the meetings must follow these Guidelines.

2. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with written agendas that are reviewed in advance by IATA counsel familiar with the competition laws of the United States, the European Union and all other relevant jurisdictions to assure that the agenda items are in compliance with these laws.

3. All presentations shall be reviewed and approved in advance by IATA’s competition compliance attorney.

Prohibited Agreements and Activities

1. Unless attendees of IATA Meetings are advised to the contrary by competition counsel, the following types of agreements, whether express or implied, are STRICTLY PROHIBITED:
   a. Any collective agreement concerning prices or charges for airline services;
   b. Any collective agreement allocating markets, territories, customers, suppliers or agents;
   c. Any collective agreement relating to prices or charges to be paid to suppliers, and any other agreement that is intended to, or that in operation is likely to, harm non-participants, including without limitation any agreement that is intended to, or in operation is likely to, exclude a non-participants from any market; and
   d. Any agreement that is intended to, or in operation is likely to induce airlines or their suppliers or agents to engage in collective anticompetitive behaviour, or to collectively punish any business enterprise for its exercise of independent business judgment.

2. Recognizing that the existence of an unlawful agreement or concerted practice may be inferred from circumstances, including the exchange of information by competitors, discussions or disclosures of the following types of information, are also PROHIBITED, except when such information has otherwise been made public or IATA competition counsel advises that such discussions are legally permissible:
   a. Individual airline rates, charges or surcharges;
   b. Individual airline costs;
   c. An individual airline’s intentions regarding increasing, reducing or reallocating aircraft capacity (including entering or exiting routes);
d. An individual airline’s intentions regarding charging for certain products or services or changes to the existing charges for such products or services;

e. Information on individual airlines customers; and

f. Any other sensitive commercial or proprietary information that the company would not disclose in the absence of an express or implied agreement to exchange such information for the purpose of reducing or restricting competition in the airline industry.

3. The foregoing applies equally to email discussions, instant messaging and social media discussions whether directed to announced participants or other parties not present in the meeting. Participants are reminded that live streaming of this meeting to parties not present in person is not permitted except as indicated by and with the express permission and knowledge of the Chairperson and IATA and only in the event that specific participation on a given item from a party not present in person is required. Unauthorized recording of the meeting is prohibited.
**Administrative Items**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Opening of Meeting and Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Competition Law Guidelines for IATA Industry Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Delegate Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Principal and Primary Vendor Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Introduction to the Voting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Date and Place of Next General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Any Other Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Vendor Prize Draws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Close of Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8th IBS OPS GM Updates and Reporting Items**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR1</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG Chairperson’s Report on IBS OPS WG Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR2</td>
<td>Moving Interline Billing Standards from IFAC to PSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR3</td>
<td>The year in ICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR4</td>
<td>Bankruptcy and Special Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR5</td>
<td>Future of Interline Billing and Settlement Standards with Offers &amp; Orders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11th SIS GM Updates and Reporting Items**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>IATA Welcome presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2</td>
<td>Report from the SIS Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Industry Economic Performance Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4</td>
<td>SIS General Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR5</td>
<td>SIS GM10 Action Items Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR6</td>
<td>SIS E-Invoicing Legal Compliance and Tax Reporting Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR7</td>
<td>MISC Invoices Data Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR8</td>
<td>IBS OPS GM Agenda Papers Impact on SIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR9</td>
<td>Suppliers to Airlines e-Invoicing Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR10</td>
<td>Rejections Reduction Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR11</td>
<td>SIS SLA Performance and Customer Satisfaction Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The General Meetings’ running orders will be published in IATA’s “SSW” online communities and via industry communication at least one (1) week prior to the Industry Meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper No. / RAM Chapter / Paragraph</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Impacts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 Multi</td>
<td>Reflecting Governance Changes to RAM (Not for Voting-information Only)</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Intro Terminology</td>
<td>Definition of Normal &amp; Special Fares in TERMINOLOGY</td>
<td>CZ-784 CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Intro Terminology</td>
<td>Definition of Planned Schedule Change in TERMINOLOGY</td>
<td>CZ-784 CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Intro Terminology</td>
<td>RAM Definition for Planned Schedule Change</td>
<td>S7-421 DBA S7 AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 A2 1.8.2.1</td>
<td>Clarification Regarding TFCs Exempt from Involuntary Situations</td>
<td>LH-220 DEUTSCHE LUFTHANSA AG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 A2 1.8.2.1</td>
<td>Billing Interline Taxes/Charges (TFCs)</td>
<td>CZ-784 CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 A2 1.8.2.2</td>
<td>Billing Interline Taxes/Charges (TFCs)</td>
<td>KC-465 JSC AIR ASTANA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 A2 2.5 &amp; 2.6 &amp; 2.8</td>
<td>Settlement of Involuntary Rerouting and Planned Schedule Changes</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 A2 3</td>
<td>Involuntary Published Discounted Fare</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 A2 4.1.5</td>
<td>Billing for Inadmissible Passengers</td>
<td>MF-731 XIAMEN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11 A4 3.2.3</td>
<td>Refund Adjustment for Involuntary Downgrades</td>
<td>JL-131 JAPAN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 A8 5.2.2.6</td>
<td>New “Finalized-SIS Suspension” status in SIS</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13 A8 &amp; A10 5.2.2.7</td>
<td>Stopping Open-Ended Correspondences in the Industry—Reducing the correspondence iterations to 10</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG &amp; SIS SG</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14 A8 &amp; A10 5.2.2.7</td>
<td>Stopping Open-Ended Correspondences in the Industry—BM Reason Code 6C</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG &amp; SIS SG</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15 A10 2.3.9</td>
<td>Detailed Rejection Reason</td>
<td>MF-731 XIAMEN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16 A12 1.3.4</td>
<td>Reissued/Exchanged Tickets</td>
<td>CZ-784 CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17 A13 &amp; B5 Attachment C &amp; A</td>
<td>Country Name Change for Turkey (Not for Voting-information Only)</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18 B9 Whole Chapter</td>
<td>Flight Interruption Manifest Billing Rules</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19 B New IATA Currency Information Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 A5 1.1</td>
<td>Basic Billing Rules for Cargo Billings</td>
<td>NH-205 ALL NIPPON AIRWAYS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 A6 Attachment A</td>
<td>Examples of Cumulative Charges Method</td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 B New SPA Checklist (Cargo)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IBS OPS WG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agenda Items

To be presented at the 11th SIS General Meeting – 20th September 2022 / 09:00 AST (GMT +3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS Item</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Impacts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>SIS Adding export function in the page of Invoice Search</td>
<td>MF-731-XIAMEN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>SIS Reports</td>
<td>CZ-784-China Southern Airlines</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SIS Validation of AWB Prime Billing</td>
<td>CZ-784-China Southern Airlines</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Enables changing default number of the records per page shown on SIS Search Results screen</td>
<td>NH-205-ALL NIPPON AIRWAYS CO. LTD.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>SIS Price Changes – ISPA Attachment A</td>
<td>IATA SIS Steering Group</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moving Interline Billing and Settlement Standard-Setting Activities from IFAC (Industry Financial Advisory Council) structure under the PSC (Passenger Services Conference)

The IFAC agreed to move the development of Interline Billing and Settlement Standards out of the IFAC structure and place it under the PSC reporting to PASB (Pay-Account Standards Board) under the provisions of the PSC Resolution 633. In collaboration with IBS OPS WG and PASB, IATA created the attached detailed FAQ document that addresses all aspects of this critical governance change. The FAQ document was circulated to the revenue accounting community with the IATA Bulletin on 09th June 2022 and uploaded to the IATA Revenue Accounting Extranet and the IBS OPS GM SSW Site. During the IBS OPS GM, there will be a presentation by IATA addressing the important aspects of this industry governance change.

Within the framework of this governance change, a new WG (Working Group) of interline billing and revenue accounting experts under PASB will be created. The new WG will focus mainly on developing and maintaining billing and settlement standards between airlines and any 3rd party transportation provider using Enhanced and Simplified Distribution (EASD) based on the passenger offer and orders standards (NDC and One Order). This is in line with the IATA Advisory Councils' and IATA Board of Governors' direction to continue industry progress toward true airline retailing with offers & orders.

The new Working Group will start its activities in October 2022. The proposals relating to all billing and settlement standards (both new and classic RAM standards) will be developed by this new WG of experts under PASB and will be voted for adoption by all IATA Member airlines under the PSC.

Any IATA Member Airline can participate in this new billing and settlement working group under the PSC structure and be part of ownership and leadership in defining the future interline billing and settlement of Orders. Any IATA Member Airline representative with interline billing and settlement processes expertise, especially with offers & orders industry standards (NDC/OO) knowledge, is welcome to join this new WG.

Please send an email to standards@iata.org copying meydanlia@iata.org by filling in the below information by the 30th of September 2022 if you are willing to join the new Interline Billing and Settlement Working Group.

1. Personal data of nominee:
   1. Name and Surname;
   2. Airline;
   3. Position;
   4. Telephone number and email;
   5. The number of years served in this position.

2. Please state if you have prior experience with IATA Governance (Conferences, Committees, Working Groups, etc.)

3. Please state if you are willing to commit your time and effort to contribute to the WG work plan.
Subject: Reflecting Governance Changes to RAM (Not for Voting-information Only)

Submitted by: Secretary

Note: IBS OPS WG supports this proposal

Background:

The Industry Financial Advisory Council (IFAC) decided to move the development of Interline Billing and Settlement Standards, as published in the Revenue Accounting Manual (RAM), out of the IFAC structure and place it under the PSC (Passenger Services Conference) reporting to PASB (Pay-Account Standards Board), in accordance with the provisions of the PSC Resolution 633.

Problem:

RAM needs to be updated as per this Industry decision.

Proposed Solution:

IATA RAM-2023 will be updated accordingly to reflect this important governance change.

The summary of RAM changes will include;

1. Converting all RAM references for the PSC, reporting to PASB
2. The current IBS OPS WG and IFAC Group ToRs (Term of references) will be deleted
3. The references to CoD (Committee on Differences) will be deleted as there is no airline arbitrage possible within the governance structure of PSC.

The changes will be validated by the RAM Editor Group before being published in RAM 2023
Subject: Definition of Normal & Special Fares in TERMINOLOGY

Submitted by: CZ-784 China Southern Airlines

Background:
Interline Prorate Advisory Committee (IPAC) proposed to change the current Definition of a Normal & Special Fare in PMP (Prorate Manual Passenger) Section C, Definitions, Symbols and Extracts from the RAM, Paragraph A) Definitions in April 2022 as follows:

“For proration purposes, a fare shall be classified as Normal or Special based on the Fare Type Code filing by the Fare Owner in the Fare Quote systems.”

90% of the votes cast were in agreement with the proposal, and the effective date of the new definition of a Normal/Special fare is 01 June 2022.

Problem:
In RAM2022, the definition of Normal & Special Fares in TERMINOLOGY states that:

“For settlement purposes, a fare shall be classified as normal/unrestricted or special/restricted based on the filling by the fare owner in the Fare distribution system and/or GDS under the fare rule title and explanation.”

Since the new definition of Normal & Special Fares has been updated in PMP, a different description may lead to different interpretations, increasing the number of disputes and rejections.

Proposed solution:
We propose to amend the definition of Normal & Special Fares in RAM Chapter “Introduction and Administration” 8- “Terminology” (Explanation of definitions used in the Revenue Accounting Manual). The amendment is highlighted below in red;

For settlement purposes, a fare shall be classified as normal/unrestricted or special/restricted based on the fare type code filing by the fare owner in the fare Quote Systems distribution system and/or GDS under the fare rule title and explanation.

Note: the way the fare is filed in ATPCO under the Category Display Code in ATPCO Rule Rec 01 PRC CAT is to be used.
Subject: Definition of Planned Schedule Change in TERMINOLOGY

Submitted by: CZ-784–China Southern Airlines

Background:

RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 2.7 describes how tickets shall be settled in the case of conflicting designations of Planned Schedule Change and Involuntary Reroute; if the number of days, 2 days and 5 days are met, ignore the schedule change designation and consider the ticket to be an Involuntary Reroute.

Problem:

The definition of Planned Schedule Change in TERMINOLOGY states that,

Any ticket with an indication of schedule change in the endorsement/restriction area of the ticket shall be considered to be issued due to Planned Schedule Change.

The statement above needs to be updated accordingly as the relevant sentence has been removed from Chapter A2 Paragraph 2.6, and Paragraph 2.7 was newly added in the 2022 version.

Proposed solution:

To avoid misunderstanding, we propose to add the below red highlighted relevant sentence in RAM Chapter “Introduction and Administration” 8–“Terminology” (Explanation of definitions used in the Revenue Accounting Manual):

“Planned Schedule Change means any modification to the operation of a flight as filed in an airline’s schedules which may require passenger notification, and/or rebooking and/or re-ticketing. Planned Schedule Changes procedures are defined in Recommended Practice 1735.

Any ticket with an indication of schedule change in the endorsement/restriction area of the ticket shall be considered to be issued due to Planned Schedule Change.

In case of conflicting indicators for involuntary reroute and planned schedule change; if the 2 days and 5 days rules are met, the schedule change designation shall be ignored, and the ticket shall be considered to be an involuntary reroute. If not met, the ticket shall be considered to be a Planned Schedule Change.

Additionally, if a ticket is designated as an involuntary reroute and is issued more than 2 days, regardless of the time difference, prior to the first scheduled departure date shown on the reissued ticket, then the ticket shall be considered to be a planned schedule change.

Note: An involuntary change to an originally ticketed itinerary is required to meet the conditions of a Planned Schedule Change.”
Subject: RAM Definition for Planned Schedule Change

Submitted by: S7-421-dba S7 Airlines

Background:

Regarding the explanation of definitions used in the Revenue Accounting Manual/Planned Schedule Change, it is necessary to bring the wording about Planned Schedule Change in accordance with editions in RAM 2022.

Problem:

The sentence “Any ticket with an indication of schedule change shown in the endorsement/restriction area of the ticket shall be considered to be issued due to Planned Schedule Change” was deleted in RAM 2022 Ch.A2, 2.6. The same sentence is in “Explanation of definitions used in the Revenue Accounting Manual,” but it was not deleted in RAM 2022.

Proposed Solution:

To delete “Any ticket with an indication of schedule change shown in the endorsement/restriction area of the ticket shall be considered to be issued due to Planned Schedule Change” in “Explanation of definitions used in the Revenue Accounting Manual.”
Subject: Clarification Regarding TFCs Exempt from Involuntary Situations

Submitted by: LH-220-Deutsche Lufthansa AG

Background:

The application of TFCs for involuntary changes has been intensively discussed in the last years. The aim of publishing an updated rule in the RAM edition of 2020 was to simplify the settlement of TFCs in case of involuntary situations.

RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 1.8.2.1 stipulates the settlement of TFCs in case of revised routings due to involuntary changes to the original routings. According to the wordings of this paragraph, the TFC arising from the revised routing shall be deemed applicable. It further states that the exemptions filed in RATD relating to involuntary changes shall be applied irrespective of the reason.

Problem:

It is understood that if a tax code is filed as exempt from involuntary changes, a “Y” is reflected in the field “Invol Exempt” in Enhanced RATD.

As per RATD, the Invol Exemption field reflects a “Y” indicating exemption.

Besides the “Y” indicator as mentioned above, RATD filing allows entering an additional note to the tax code exempt from involuntary situations. It has been observed that sometimes, these involuntary exemption notes do not contain standard, clear wordings and therefore present an unclear or contradictory interpretation to the “Y” indicator. Additionally, such additional notes also limit the exemption i.e., these cannot be interpreted or evaluated by any system automatically. As a result, it leads to disputes in settlement of TFCs for involuntary affected coupons, thereby defeating the very purpose of simplification of the settlement process.
**Proposed Solution:**

We propose the following changes to the existing wordings.

**Current wordings**

**RAM 2022 Chapter A2, 1.8.2.1**

For involuntary changes, the TFC amounts published in IATA Revenue Accounting Tax Database (RATD) arising from the revised routing shall be deemed applicable, but Tax exemptions filed in RATD relating to involuntary changes shall be applied irrespective of the reason.

**Examples:**

Original Ticket:

HKG-BCN  
TFCs collected: G3 + HK

Billable TFC:  
\[
\text{HKG-BCN} = \text{G3 + HK + I5 (I5 not collected)}. 
\]

Voluntary or Schedule Change Reissued Ticket:

HKG-LHR-BCN TFCs collected on the original ticket: G3, HK

Billable TFCs:  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HKG-LHR} &= \text{FR + HK + I5 (even if not collected on the original ticket).} \\
\text{LHR-BCN} &= \text{UB + GB (even if not applicable to the original ticket)}
\end{align*}
\]

Involuntary Reissued Ticket:

HKG-LHR-BCN TFCs collected on the original ticket: G3, HK

Billable TFCs:  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HKG-LHR} &= \text{FR + HK + I5 (even if not collected on the original ticket).} \\
\text{LHR-BCN} &= \text{UB (even if not collected on the original ticket).}
\end{align*}
\]

GB is **not** billable as there is an exemption filed in RATD for involuntary rerouting and it was not applicable to the original ticket.

**Note:** The GB tax involuntary exemption filed in RATD states that the GB tax for the revised journey shall remain the same as applicable to the original journey.
Proposed wordings:

RAM 2022 Chapter A2, 1.8.2.1

For involuntary changes, the TFC amounts published in IATA Revenue Accounting Tax Database (RATD) arising from the revised routing shall be deemed applicable, but Tax exemptions filed in RATD relating to involuntary changes shall be applied irrespective of the reason. Further, the tax exemption notes related to involuntary exemption shall be ignored.

Examples:

Original Ticket:

HKG-BCN TFCs collected: G3 + HK

Billable TFC: HKG-BCN = G3 + HK + I5 (I5 not collected).

Voluntary or Schedule Change Reissued Ticket:

HKG-LHR-BCN TFCs collected on the original ticket: G3, HK

Billable TFCs: HKG-LHR= G3 + HK + I5 (even if not collected on the original ticket).

LHR-BCN= UB + GB (even if not applicable to the original ticket).

Involuntary Reissued Ticket:

HKG-LHR-BCN TFCs collected on the original ticket: G3, HK

Billable TFCs: HKG-LHR= G3 + HK + I5 (even if not collected on the original ticket).

LHR-BCN= UB (even if not collected on the original ticket).

GB is not billable as there is an exemption filed in RATD for involuntary rerouting as indicated by a “Y” in the enhanced RATD in column “invol exempt”.

Note: The GB tax involuntary exemption filed in RATD states that the GB tax for the revised journey shall remain the same as applicable to the original journey.
**Subject: Billing Interline Taxes/Fees/Charges (TFCs)**

**Submitted by: CZ-784-China Southern Airlines**

**Background:**

RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 1.8.2.1 describes how the TFC amount shall be settled in the case of Involuntary Change For involuntary changes. The TFC amounts published in the IATA Revenue Accounting Tax Database (RA TD) arising from the revised routing shall be deemed applicable, but exemptions filed in the RA TD relating to involuntary changes shall be applied irrespective of the reasons.

**Problem:**

This paragraph has been interpreted differently by various IATA member airlines, leading to an increasing number of disputes and rejections. For example,

Original ticket:
FCO-AMS-CAN  TFCs collected: IT, MJ, CJ, RN, etc.
Billable TFCs: FCO-AMS = IT, MJ  
               AMS-CAN = CJ + RN

Involuntary Reissued Ticket:
FCO-FRA-CAN  TFCs newly collected: DE, OY, RA, etc.
Billable TFCs: FCO-FRA: MJ, IT (To be determined)  
               FRA CAN=DE + OY + RA

● **Interpretation one:** According to RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 1.8.2.1, exemption filed in the RATD relating to Involuntary Changes shall be applied for TFCs arising from the revised routing. IT tax is collected on the original ticket even though there is a blanket exemption for IT tax filed in the RATD for involuntary rerouting with no caveats or exceptions, IT tax is billable because FCO did not arise as a result of the new routing.

● **Interpretation two:** Even though IT tax is collected on the original itinerary, there is a blanket exemption for IT tax filed in the RATD for involuntary rerouting with no caveats or exceptions, meaning IT tax is not billable.

**Proposed solution:**

To minimize the number of disputes, we propose to **add a new example to RAM Chapter A2 paragraph 1.8.2.1 as follows:**

Original ticket:
FCO-AMS-CAN  TFCs collected : IT, MJ, CJ, RN, etc.
Billable TFCs: FCO-AMS = IT, MJ  
               AMS-CAN = CJ + RN

Involuntary Reissued Ticket:
FCO-FRA-CAN  TFCs newly collected : DE, OY, RA, etc.
Billable TFCs: FCO-FRA: MJ  
               FRA CAN=DE + OY + RA

IT tax is **not** billable as there is an exemption filed in RATD for involuntary rerouting, and there are no caveats or exceptions.
Subject: Billing Interline Taxes/Fees/Charges (TFCs)

Submitted by: KC-465-JSC AIR ASTANA

Background:

There is a misunderstanding between airlines in billing airport taxes for involuntary re-issued coupons. Some airlines bill TFC based on new revised routing, whilst others — are based on the old one taken from the “Fare calculation” area.

Problem:

For example, a ticket with routing AAA-BBB-CCC was involuntarily re-issued by the ticketing carrier XX to a new ticket with routing BBB-CCC operated by carrier YY (AAA-BBB was flown with the original ticket).

Based on RAM A2 1.8.2.2 altered in April 2020 (TFC amounts published in the (RATD) arising from the revised routing shall be deemed applicable) some airlines think that YY should use for billing taxes applicable for departure from BBB, considering it’s stopover as the routing of the new ticket is BBB-CCC.

However, based on RAM A2 1.8.2.2 (The determination of applicable TFC must be based on the complete ticket data of the revised routing and cabin class, including both the “From/To” panel and “Good for Passage” sections and the “Fare calculation” area) other airlines think that YY based on info from Fare calculation where it is seen that in original ticket BBB was transit should use for billing taxes applicable for departure from BBB transit.

Proposed Solution:

We would like to delete the below strikethrough parts highlighted in yellow from the 3rd paragraph of RAM Chapter A2 1.8.2.2;

“The determination of the applicable TFC must be based on the complete ticket data of the revised routing and cabin class, including both the “From/To” panel and “Good for Passage” sections, and the “Fare calculation” area, and cabin class, if available, unless an exemption filed in the RATD applies.”
Subject: Settlement of Involuntary Rerouting and Planned Schedule Changes

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background:

At the 7th IBS OPS GM 2021, it was agreed to modify the RAM Chapter A2, Paragraphs 2.5 & 2.6 & 2.7 with the purpose of decreasing the rejections due to Involuntary reasons.

Problem:

Involuntary and Planned Schedule change coupon level identification continues to be one of the main reasons for rejections. The lack of an exhaustive list of the different combinations of scenarios in the RAM leaves room for misunderstanding and has resulted in airlines seeking further clarification from IATA.

Proposed Solution:

The IBS OPS Working Group propose to remove the existing examples found in RAM A2 Paragraphs 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7 and replace them with a new Scenarios Table in RAM A2. Paragraph 2.8 which provides a summary of all the possible scenarios to assist with the coupon level identification between Involuntary Reroute and Planned Schedule Change.

RAM Chapter A2 paragraph 2.8 will be renamed ‘Involuntary Reroute and Planned Schedule Change Scenario Table, and Flow Chart (Resolution 735d).’

We also propose to amend the existing intermediary sentence found in RAM A2 Paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6:

‘A flowchart to assist with the application of timeframes in R735d and help distinguish between Involuntary Rerouting and Planned Schedule Change is provided in Paragraph 2.8’ to read as follows:

‘A scenario table and a flowchart to assist with the application of timeframes in R735d and help distinguish between Involuntary Rerouting and Planned Schedule Change are provided in Paragraph 2.8.’
RAM A2 Paragraph 2.5

When counting the number of days for this procedure, the calendar day following the date of the reissued ticket shall be day one.

Example:
- Issue Date = 01 May
- Scheduled Departure Date = 06 May
- The timeframe between issue date and scheduled departure date is 5 days

A flowchart to assist with the application of timeframes in R 735d and help distinguish between involuntary rerouting and planned schedule change is provided in Paragraph 2.6.

Examples:
- Example 1: Date of Issue of Reissued Ticket – 01 May
  - First scheduled departure date on reissue – 02 May
  - Treat As: INVOL

RAM A2 Paragraph 2.6

**Passenger and Excess Baggage Billing Rules—A2**

Tickets reissued due to Planned Schedule Change shall be settled in accordance with RAM A2, 1.1 and Chapter A2, Paragraph 3 based on the ticketed information and date of issue of the original ticket.

The TFC to be used for interline billing in case of Planned Schedule Change shall be in accordance with RAM A2, 1.8.2.1 and relevant paragraphs of A2, 1.8.

When counting the number of days for this procedure the calendar day following the date of the reissued ticket shall be day one.

Example:
- Issue Date = 01 May
- Departure Date = 06 May
- The timeframe between issue date and scheduled departure date is 5 days

A flowchart to assist with the application of timeframes in R 735d and help distinguish between involuntary rerouting and planned schedule change is provided in Paragraph 2.8.

Examples:
- Example 1: Endorsement/Restriction Text shows – SKCHG
  - Treat As: Schedule Change

- Example 2: Endorsement/Restriction Text shows – INVOL
  - Date of Issue of Reissued Ticket – 01 May
  - First scheduled departure date on reissue – 04 May
  - Treat As: Schedule Change
RAM A2 paragraph 2.7

Conflicting Indicators for Involuntary Reroute and Planned Schedule Change

In the case of conflicting designations of Planned Schedule Change and Involuntary Reroute, apply the conditions of RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 2.6. If the number of days: 2 days and 5 days are met, ignore the schedule change designation and consider the ticket to be an Involuntary Reroute. If not met, the ticket shall be considered a Planned Schedule Change.

Example:
Endorsement/Restricted Text shows – Invol due to Sched Change
Date of Issue of Reissued Ticket – 01 May
First scheduled departure date on reissue – 02 May

Treat As:
Involuntary

Involuntary Reroute and Planned Schedule Change Scenario Table – to be added to RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 2.8

1 Both INVOL and SKCHG indicators are mentioned in FCA and/or Endorsement/Restrictions box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 days or less</td>
<td>Invol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>Less than 5 days</td>
<td>Invol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>5 days or more</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Neither INVOL or SKCHG indicators are mentioned in FCA and/or Endorsement/Restrictions box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than 2 days</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>No need to check days Gap</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Only SKCHG indicator is mentioned in FCA and/or Endorsement/Restrictions box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All coupons</td>
<td>No need to check days Gap</td>
<td>Voluntary re-issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All coupons</td>
<td>No need to check days Gap</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Only INVOL indicator is mentioned in FCA and/or Endorsement/Restrictions box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 days or less</td>
<td>Invol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>Less than 5 days</td>
<td>Invol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>5 days or more</td>
<td>Voluntary re-issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b)</th>
<th>Coupon No.</th>
<th>The difference in days vs. issued date</th>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than 2 days</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining coupons</td>
<td>No need to check days Gap</td>
<td>Schedule Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 1 a)
Endorsement/Restriction box: INVOL due to Schedule Change
Date of Issue of Reissued Ticket – 01 May
Original Routing: HKG CX x/LON BA EWR AA x/PHX AA LAX
Revise Routing: LON UA x/EWR UA IAH AA LAX
Coupon 1: (LON-EWR) Ticket Departure – 01 May INVOL
Coupon 2: (EWR-IAH) Ticket Departure – 05 May INVOL
Coupon 3: (IAH-LAX) Ticket Departure – 06 May **Schedule Change**

Example 4 a)
Endorsement/Restriction box: INVOL
Date of Issue of Reissued Ticket – 01 May
Original Routing: HKG CX x/LON BA EWR AA x/PHX AA LAX
Revise Routing: LON UA x/EWR UA IAH AA LAX
Coupon 1: (LON-EWR) Ticket Departure – 01 May INVOL
Coupon 2: (EWR-IAH) Ticket Departure – 05 May INVOL
Coupon 3: (IAH-LAX) Ticket Departure – 06 May **Voluntary**
Subject: Involuntary Published Discounted Fare

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background

There was an intent in the IBS GM 2018 to clarify the procedure to determine the value of an INVOL Published - discounted fare, but the proposal failed by a close vote.

Problem:

When a ticket with a published fare with a non-industry standard ticket designator is involuntarily rerouted, it seems there is not a standard interpretation to calculate the ATBP value of the new ticket. The ticket designator indicates that the fare has been discounted or ticketed under an incentive commission program, and the IATA member airlines have based their evaluation on one of the following methods:

1. Some airlines consider the FFBB/DDD as an entire fare basis, which will not match exactly to a published fare but instead treat them as private and determine the lowest applicable fare as per RAM Chapter 2 Paragraph 2.5.5.
2. Other airlines only use the characters to the left of the special character (/), disregard the ticket designator, and use 100% of the published fares based on RAM Chapter 2 Paragraph 3.
3. Lastly, there are airlines using the fare values reported on the ticket as the basis for proration.

Proposed Solution:

With the objective of reducing the rejections, it is important for the industry to clarify the correct evaluation method in case of an Involuntary reroute of a published/discounted fare.

IBS OPS WG considers the correct interpretation is that the applicable fare shall be based on the published Fare basis indicated on the ticket. The fare basis does not include the ticket designator to the right of the slash (/).

IBS OPS WG proposes to amend RAM Chapter A2 paragraph 3 by adding an additional note as follows:

"Note 3: To locate the fare basis in an official tariff, the fare basis shall be identified as all characters to the left of the first slash (/) only."
Subject: Billing for Inadmissible Passengers

Submitted by: MF-731-Xiamen Airlines

Background:

Under Chapter A2, Section 4.1.5, the airlines that participated in the outbound carriage to transport the inadmissible passenger back to the origin point shall receive the amount prorated from the outbound ticket itself.

Problem:

Some airlines are confused with the "normal interline basis", and consider it as ‘normal fare’, which is an extremely large amount instead of the SRP method mentioned in the previous section of 4.1.2.

Proposed Solution:

To clarify the ‘normal interline basis’, we suggest using the terms in 4.1.2, which make the new 4.1.5 as below:

An airline participating in the outbound carriage of an inadmissible passenger shall bill the ticketing airline on a normal interline basis in accordance with MPA-P (Multilateral Proration Agreement – Passenger) unless there is a bilateral agreement between the participating and the ticketing airlines.
Subject: Refund Adjustment for Involuntary Downgrades

Submitted by: JL-131-JAPAN AIRLINES

Background:

RAM Chapter A4 Paragraph 2.1.1 stipulates when a refund adjustment may be performed. It refers to "a change in the entitled class of service (cabin of travel)"; however, the examples only refer to refund adjustments related to "Unavailable for travel" scenarios, and Paragraph 3.2.2 only refers to refund adjustments in the case of a voluntary downgrade.

Problem:

Currently, there is no clear rule about refund adjustment for involuntary downgrades, and it often happens that:

When your partner carrier is the issuing carrier, and you are the operating carrier, they compare the original fare of the purchased class of service and some low fare of the performed class of service, and then they ask you to adjust the difference.

When the same partner carrier is the operating carrier, and you are the issuing carrier, you ask them to adjust the difference in the same manner as above, but they compare the original fare of the purchased class of service and some high fare of the performed class of service, then they tell you there’s no or little difference.

There is no consistency, and it causes disputes.

Proposed Solution:

We propose to add a clear rule of refund adjustment for involuntary downgrades.

3.2.3. The amount of an interline adjustment which arises due to involuntary downgrading shall be the difference between:

• The official fare or prorated portion thereof of the original coupon in the purchased class of service according to RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 1.1. and,

• The lowest applicable published fare or prorated portion thereof of the new coupon(s) in the performed class of service and original routing according to RAM Chapter A2 Paragraph 3

The adjustment shall be processed as per RAM Chapter A4 Paragraph 2.1.2.

Example:

(a) Airline XX issues an electronic ticket with the following routing:
   Coupon 1 AAA-BBB (XX) Business Class
   Coupon 2 BBB-CCC (ZZ) Business Class

(b) XX carries the passenger as planned in Business Class
(c) Due to overbooking, ZZ downgrades the passenger in Economy class on the BBB-CCC

(d) ZZ charges XX for the original sector BBB-CCC based on the ticketed Business Class fare

(e) Passenger is claiming a compensation for the difference in class of service to XX

(f) XX as the original issuing airline refunds the class difference to the passenger

(g) XX adjusts the billed value via interline and charges ZZ via billing memo for the interline adjustment as per RAM A4-3.2.3. and RAM A4-3.2.4.

Calculation:

Collected published Business Class Fare: USD 1,000
Lowest applicable published Economy Class Fare: USD 200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prorate Factors</th>
<th>Original Billing Value</th>
<th>New Billing Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA-BBB</td>
<td>800 USD</td>
<td>- USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB-CCC</td>
<td>200 USD200</td>
<td>USD40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Billing Adjustment: USD160

Note: SPAs are out of scope.

The current Paragraph 3.2.3 shall be renumbered as 3.2.4
Subject: New "Finalized-SIS Suspension" status in SIS

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background:

Correspondence is actioned in SIS, which enables both parties to discuss and close the items in dispute in a central manner while keeping the audit trail of the discussions. The RAM time limit rules are embedded in SIS.

If the airline is not responding within the time limit, then the correspondence is expired. If the reply was not sent by the initiator of the correspondence, then there is no further action, and the correspondence is closed. If the reply was not sent by the non-initiator of the correspondence, then the other party has the right to issue a billing memo for no response.

In cases of suspension, bankruptcy, or cessation of operations, the ICH will conduct a Special Clearance pursuant to Procedure 18. If the correspondence is resolved with authority to bill granted during the 6 months recording of the claims period, these transactions will be included in the Special Clearance.

Problem:

The RAM (Chapters RAM A8 5.2.2.6, A10 5.2.2.6, and A13 4.4.7) specifies the deadline announcing the IATA Clearing House Special Clearance has passed; any open correspondence with the suspended carrier can no longer be considered for settlement via the IATA Clearing House. This means that IATA Revenue Accounting Manual time limit rules are no longer enforceable after the IATA Clearing House Special Clearance has been completed.

Any discussion, agreement, and settlement with the suspended carrier on these correspondence cases can only continue by a bilateral agreement on a bilateral level. However, since the correspondences are still active in SIS, the entities continue sending the correspondences back and forth as they are afraid that should they not reply, then they would receive a debit for no reply in SIS.

Solution:

We are proposing that once the deadline announcing the IATA Clearing House Special Clearance has passed, there should be a new “Finalized-SIS Suspension” status to any open correspondences involving this bankrupt entity. These correspondences will be updated to this new “Finalized-SIS Suspension” status, and no further action can be taken on these correspondences within SIS. They will still be available for another two months to download. Any further discussions between parties happen outside of SIS on a bilateral basis.

The text in the RAM in the above chapters will be further modified as follows:

"For transactions settled via IATA Clearing House, in case of suspension, of one of the parties from IATA Clearing House, the time limits above apply. If the correspondence is resolved with authority to bill granted during the post-suspension claim submission period designated under IATA Clearing House Procedure 18, transaction(s) will be included in the Special Clearance. Once the deadline announcing the IATA Clearing House Special Clearance has passed, any open correspondence with the suspended carrier can no longer be considered for settlement via the IATA Clearing House."
This means that IATA Revenue Accounting Manual time limit rules are no longer enforceable after the IATA Clearing House Special Clearance has completed. Furthermore, post the completion of this special clearance, any open correspondence related to the suspended entity will be in a "Finalized-SIS Suspension" status in SIS. Any discussion, agreement, and settlement with the suspended carrier on these correspondence cases can only continue by a bilateral agreement on a bilateral level outside of SIS."
Subject: Stopping Open-Ended Correspondences in the Industry – Reducing the correspondence iterations to 10

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG & SIS SG

Billing category: Passenger Non-Sampling & Cargo

Background:

Correspondence is actioned in SIS, which enables both parties to discuss and close the items in dispute in a central manner while keeping the audit trail of the discussions. The RAM time limit rules are embedded in SIS, and if either party has not responded within the time limit, then the correspondence is expired. If the reply was not sent by the initiator of the correspondence, then there is no further action, and the correspondence is expired. If the reply was not sent by the non-initiator of the correspondence, then the other party has the right to issue a Billing Memo for no response.

Unlike the 3 stages of rejections for Passenger -non-sampling & Cargo, there is no fixed number of stages/iterations defined for correspondence. A correspondence can continue to ‘be alive’ in SIS if each party sends a reply within the time limits specified in the RAM.

Problem:

In March 2019, an additional email alert was developed in SIS to inform airline managers of correspondences that exceed 7 iterations. While this has helped to raise awareness, this only solves part of the issue as both parties need to work together to close the correspondence. Airlines have been complaining about such correspondences that continue for years.

Below are some analyses done by the SIS Operations team on passenger correspondences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correspondence Iteration Count Range</th>
<th>Sum of Count of # of Iterations</th>
<th>% of Count</th>
<th>Sum of USD Value</th>
<th>Avg USD Value</th>
<th>% of Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>34,156</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10,931,731.01</td>
<td>$ 327,383</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>8,672</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4,868,417.00</td>
<td>$ 577,777</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8,175,104.00</td>
<td>$ 372,557</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4,891,298.00</td>
<td>$ 699,049</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>289,888.00</td>
<td>$ 466,767</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>61,013</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29,003,435.01</td>
<td>$ 3,773,890</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 56% of the count of correspondences in the industry gets closed between 1 - 7 iterations, and another 14% gets closed in 8 - 10 iterations. However, 29% of correspondence continues post 10 iterations.

In terms of the amount in USD being disputed, 37% gets closed between 1 -7 iterations, and another 14% gets closed in 8 - 10 iterations. However, 48% of the USD correspondence value continues post 10 iterations.

In most of these iterations, nothing new is being added, but parties are just sending it back and forth to keep the correspondence alive as per the RAM time limits. There is no incentive to close the correspondence, and it ends up being a time-consuming and costly activity for both parties.
In Cargo Correspondences, 100% of correspondence iterations are handled within the range "1 - 7"

**Solution:**

Introduce a change in the RAM rule to limit all correspondence stages to 10 for Passenger non sampling and Cargo billing categories that are equal to or less than USD 500 (Last stage correspondence value). After reaching stage 10, these correspondences will remain with the party who received it last. Post this, no further correspondence exchange can be done, and both the parties have 6 months to agree on the outcome. This is applicable regardless of the number of rejections included in each applicable correspondence.

Correspondences greater than USD 500 will continue like today (no change).

Post discussion that should take place during the 6 months, if both parties agree, then there can be either of the two actions that they can take in SIS:

1) If the correspondence -non-initiating party accepts the explanations, they can now grant authority to the Correspondence initiating party. The correspondence initiating party can then send a Billing Memo (reason code ‘6A-Debit on Authority’) via SIS as per the defined RAM time limits.

2) If the correspondence initiator accepts the explanations of the other party and there is no amount to be settled, they can now close the correspondence.

If both parties are not able to agree to a resolution in 6 months, then the correspondence will be expired in SIS and be purged 2 months later.

Example (Passenger/Cargo) – Flow of correspondence:

XX Prime Billing to YY
YY → 1st Stg Rejection to XX
XX → 2nd Stg Rejection to YY
YY → 3rd Stg Rejection to XX → the $ value is with YY

XX now initiates a correspondence against YY for USD 500.
1st stage Initiation – XX to YY
2nd stage reply – YY to XX
3rd stage reply XX to YY
4th stage reply YY to XX
5th stage reply XX to YY
6th stage reply YY to XX
7th stage reply XX to YY
8th stage reply YY to XX
9th stage reply XX to YY
10th stage reply YY to XX

Each stage from 1 to 9 has 2 months’ time limit to reply

Once the 10th stage is initiated Correspondence is now stopped in SIS

The moment XX receives the 10th stage, the correspondence it is frozen, and no further correspondence can be done. Both parties discuss outside SIS, and if they agree, YY clicks on the ‘Authority to bill’ and ‘Send’. This will allow XX to raise a billing memo with reason code 6A for the agreed amount.

The second scenario is where XX accepts the explanation of YY and decides that no further amount is in dispute. In such a case, XX can close the correspondence.

**RAM update 1:** The RAM is to be updated as follows by adding the following new RAM Chapters A8 5.2.2.7 and A10 5.2.2.7 paragraphs;

“If an agreement between both parties has not been reached at stage 10 of the correspondence, the correspondence is then stopped in SIS for Passenger and Cargo billing categories provided that the disputed correspondence amount is equal to or less than USD 500. This is applicable regardless of the number of rejections included in each applicable correspondence.

This correspondence rule will not be applicable for correspondences greater than USD 500, and the other correspondence rules under RAM Chapter A10 5.2 and A8 5.2 should be followed.

Both parties have 6 months from this date to agree on the correspondence outside SIS. If they agree, then the ‘authority to bill’ box can be checked in SIS, and the correspondence is sent back to the initiating party. The correspondence initiating party can then bill the authorizing party with a correspondence Billing memo (reason code 6A) through SIS.

In the situation where the initiating party agrees to the explanation of the other party, then they can close the correspondence from their end in SIS.
If both parties are not able to agree to a resolution in 6 months, then the correspondence will be expired in SIS and be purged 2 months later.

"Example (Passenger/Cargo) – Flow of correspondence:

XX Prime Billing to YY
YY -> 1st Stg Rejection to XX
XX -> 2nd Stg Rejection to YY
YY -> 3rd Stg Rejection to XX; the $ value is with YY

XX now initiates a correspondence against YY.

1st stage Initiation – XX to YY
2nd stage reply – YY to XX
3rd stage reply XX to YY
4th stage reply YY to XX
5th stage reply XX to YY
6th stage reply YY to XX
7th stage reply XX to YY
8th stage reply YY to XX
9th stage reply XX to YY
10th stage reply YY to XX

Each stage from 1 to 9 has 2 months’ time limit to reply

Once the 10th stage is initiated Correspondence is now stopped in SIS for correspondence amounts that are equal to or less than USD 500

RAM update 2: The below part in RAM Sampling Chapter B1 Attachment A paragraph 10.1.7 will be added as highlighted in red;

On receiving the Form XF, the carrying airline, if still in disagreement with the issuing airline, must initiate correspondence in accordance with RAM Chapter A10, Paragraph 5.2 via IS-WEB, no later than four months after the closure date of the period four clearance in which the Form XF was included. When initiating correspondence resulting from Form XF, the applicable Sampling Constant must be observed.

The New RAM paragraph RAM Chapter A10 5.2.2.7 will NOT be applicable for sampling billings.

Note***Effective Date of the Proposal: May P1, 2023
Subject: Stopping Open-Ended Correspondences in the Industry—BM Reason Code 6C
Paper 2

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG & SIS SG

Billing category: Passenger Non-Sampling & Cargo

Background:

This paper is a continuation of Stopping Open-Ended Correspondences in the Industry Paper 1 (previous paper—P 13). This paper will be presented and voted upon only if Paper 1 (P13) has been approved.

Problem:

In part 1 of the paper, the proposal is to stop correspondence at stage 10 for correspondence amounts less than USD 500. If both parties are not able to agree to a resolution in 6 months, then the correspondence will be expired in SIS and be purged 2 months later.

In such instances, the non-initiator could just wait for all correspondences to reach 10 stages and let the correspondence expire rather than review and action them correctly.

Solution:

Introduce a new RAM rule for correspondence that has completed the 10 stages, and the additional 6 months timeline has now expired without both parties agreeing. In such cases, the correspondence initiating member can send a billing memo with reason code ‘6C—Debit on expired correspondence’ (this new code to be introduced in SIS) and bill 50% of the amount in dispute within 2 months from the correspondence expired date. All the aspects of the billing memo (time limit, amount) will be validated by SIS, and no further rejection action can be taken.

Example (Passenger/Cargo)—Flow of correspondence:

XX Prime Billing to YY
YY → 1st Stg Rejection to XX
XX → 2nd Stg Rejection to YY
YY → 3rd Stg Rejection to XX → the $ value is with YY

XX now initiates a correspondence against YY for USD 500.
1st stage Initiation – XX to YY
2nd stage reply – YY to XX
3rd stage reply XX to YY
4th stage reply YY to XX
5th stage reply XX to YY
6th stage reply YY to XX
7th stage reply XX to YY
8th stage reply YY to XX
9th stage reply XX to YY
10th stage reply YY to XX

The moment XX receives the 10th stage, the correspondence is frozen, and no further correspondence can be done. Both parties discuss outside SIS.

If XX and YY don’t agree, and the correspondence expires after 6 months. In this case, XX sends a billing memo within 2 months of the correspondence expiry to YY for USD 250 (50% of the amount at stage 10).

RAM update 1: The RAM is to be updated by adding the following RAM Chapters A8 5.2.2.7 and A10 5.2.2.7 paragraphs.

“If an agreement between both parties has not been reached at stage 10 of the correspondence, the correspondence is then stopped in SIS for Passenger and Cargo billing categories provided that the disputed correspondence amount is equal to or less than USD 500. This is applicable regardless of the number of rejections included in each applicable correspondence.

This correspondence rule will not be applicable for correspondences greater than USD 500, and the other correspondence rules under RAM Chapter A10 5.2 and A8 5.2 will be followed.

Both parties have 6 months from this date to agree on the correspondence outside SIS. If they agree, then the ‘authority to bill’ box can be checked in SIS, and the correspondence is sent back to the initiating party. The correspondence initiating party can then bill the authorizing party with a correspondence Billing memo (reason code 6A) through SIS.

In the situation where the initiating party agrees to the explanation of the other party, then they can close the correspondence from their end in SIS.
“If both parties are not able to agree to a resolution in 6 months, then the correspondence will be expired in SIS and purged 2 months later. In such cases, the initiating member can send a billing memo with reason code ‘6C-Debit on expired correspondence’ (this new code to be introduced in SIS) and bill 50% of the amount in dispute within 2 months from the correspondence expired date. All the aspects of the billing memo (timelimit, amount) will be validated by SIS.”

“Example (Passenger/Cargo) – Flow of correspondence:

XX Prime Billing to YY
YY → 1st Stg Rejection to XX
XX → 2nd Stg Rejection to YY
YY → 3rd Stg Rejection to XX; the $ value is with YY

XX now initiates a correspondence against YY.

1st stage Initiation – XX to YY
2nd stage reply – YY to XX
3rd stage reply XX to YY
4th stage reply YY to XX
5th stage reply XX to YY
6th stage reply YY to XX
7th stage reply XX to YY
8th stage reply YY to XX
9th stage reply XX to YY
10th stage reply YY to XX

Each stage from 1 to 9 has 2 months’ time limit to reply

Once the 10th stage is initiated Correspondence is now stopped in SIS for correspondence amounts that are equal to or less than USD500

After 6 months YY and XX still don’t agree and the correspondence expires in SIS. XX is now able to bill YY with reason code 6C for 50% of the amount in dispute.

**RAM update 2:** The following new SIS reason code will be added in RAM Chapter A9 - Billing Memo Reason Codes for Passenger Billings;

"Reason Code: **6C**
Reason Description: **Debit on expired correspondence**
Bilateral Agreement Required: **No**
Coupon Breakdown Record Mandatory: **No**
Comment: **RAM Chapters A10 5.2.2.7**"
The following new SIS reason code will be added in RAM A7 - Billing Memo Reason Codes for Cargo Billings:

"Reason Code: 6C  
Reason Description: **Debit on expired correspondence**  
Bilateral Agreement Required: **No**  
Coupon Breakdown Record Mandatory: **No**  
Comment: **RAM Chapters A8 5.2.2.77**"

In addition, the following changes need to be made in:

RAM CH A7 Attachment D - Cargo Billing Memo  
RAM CH A9 Attachment D – Passenger Billing Memo

**C85** Correspondence Ref Number 11 Numeric Conditional  
This is the reference number provided by SIS for the Correspondence cases to link the Billing Memo based on “Authority to Bill” or Expiry of Correspondence.  
It should match the Audit Trail information maintained in SIS  
It should be populated in case the Reason Code is “6A”, “6B” or “6C”

**A50** Net Billed Amount 15 Numeric Mandatory  
It should be equal to the sum of Net Amount Billed in Coupon Breakdown(s), if a breakdown exists.  
The amount should match the correspondence amount for which authority was granted in case BM Reason Code = 6A. The amount should be equal to the last correspondence which was not replied to and got expired in case of BM Reason Code = 6B.  
The amount should be equal to 50% of the last correspondence, which was not replied to and got expired in case of BM Reason Code = 6C

**RAM update 3:** The below part in **RAM Sampling Chapter B1 Attachment A paragraph 10.1.7** will be added as highlighted in red;

On receiving the Form XF, the carrying airline if still in disagreement with the issuing airline must initiate correspondence in accordance with RAM Chapter A10, Paragraph 5.2 via IS-WEB, no later than four months after the closure date of the period four clearance in which the Form XF was included. When initiating correspondence resulting from Form XF, the applicable Sampling Constant must be observed.

The New RAM paragraph RAM Chapter A10 5.2.2.7 will **NOT** be applicable for sampling billings.

**Note:** **Effective Date of the Proposal: May P1, 2023**
Subject: Detailed Rejection Reason

Submitted by: MF-731-Xiamen Airlines

Background:

Under RAM Chapter A10, Section 2.3, Detailed Rejection Reason requirement, there is no specific requirement to support Schedule Change rejections with a copy of the original ticket image.

Now, we do have a separate section for Schedule Change rerouting in other chapters, for example in A2 as below screenshot shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Passenger and Excess Baggage Billing Rules—A2**

Tickets reissued due to Planned Schedule Change shall be settled in accordance with RAM A2, 1.1 and Chapter A2, Paragraph 3 based on the ticketed information and date of issue of the original ticket.

The TFC to be used for interline billing in case of Planned Schedule Change shall be in accordance with RAM A2, 1.8.2.1 and relevant paragraphs of A2, 1.8.

Problem:

Some airlines do not provide details of the original ticket issue date on the new ticket or any other form of evidence for the Schedule change coupons due to various reasons (for example ground staff carelessness during peak hours, GDS system failure etc.).

Proposed Solution:

To minimise the rejection stages, we suggest that we add a new sub-paragraph under RAM Chapter A10, numbered 2.3.10, with the heading:

**Schedule Change**

When the original ticket issue date is not present on the new schedule change document, the original issuer shall provide details of the original ticket issue date, with any form of evidence as the supporting documentation, such as the electronic copy of the original document, a screenshot from the internal ticketing system etc."

The existing RAM Chapter A 2 Para 2.3.10 (Other) shall be renumbered to 2.3.11.
Subject: Reissued/Exchanged Tickets

Submitted by: CZ-784-China Southern Airlines

Background/Problem:

CZ submitted the proposal about RAM Chapter A12 Paragraph 1.3.4 (P15) last year. However, we now found that the Note of RAM Chapter A12 Paragraph 1.3.4 lack conjunction “or”.

RAM2022 Chapter A12 Paragraph 1.3.4:

1.3.4 Reissued/Exchanged tickets originally sold outside the country of commencement of travel

When tickets sold for passenger transportation commencing outside the country of payment are reissued/exchanged for voluntary rerouting or due to planned schedule change, billings of the new tickets shall be based on the correct fare in the "Fare" box in the currency of the country of commencement of travel.

Note: Tickets issued in exchange for EMDs for "Involuntary Rerouting" shall be billed based on the correct amount in the currency of the country of payment.

Proposed Solution:

The conjunction “or” should be added to the note of RAM Chapter A12 1.3.4 between “for EMDs” and “for Involuntary Rerouting”.

We propose to amend RAM A12 paragraph 1.3.4 Note as per below:

Note: Tickets issued in exchange for EMDs or for "Involuntary Rerouting" shall be billed based on the correct amount in the currency of the country of payment.
Subject: Country Name Change for Turkey (Not for Voting - information Only)

Submitted by: Secretary

Background:

The country name for “Turkey” officially changed to “Türkiye”.

Problem:

References in RAM for “Turkey” need to be changed to Türkiye.

Proposed Solution:

Revise the references of “Turkey” in RAM Chapters A13 and B5 to “Türkiye”.
Subject: RAM B9—Flight Interruption Manifest Billing Rules

Submitted by: Secretary

Background:
To facilitate automated and simplified interline billing and settlement of disrupted passengers, since 2016, the issuance of Flight Interruption Manifests to transfer disrupted passengers has not been an acceptable procedure, and the standards to issue and accept FIMs have been rescinded. Accordingly, the continued presence of references to FIMs in the RAM is no longer valid and should be deleted.

Problem:
The continued presence of this chapter in RAM continues to promote the use of FIMs in lieu of reissuing the tickets and therefore limits the opportunities for further financial processes efficiencies in interline billing and settlement.

Proposed Solution:
Delete the whole RAM Chapter B9 and remove all references to FIMs from RAM.

Notes:
The SIS FIM reason and source codes will be available for use for now by the industry as there is still bilateral interline use of FIMs between IATA airlines.

A reference to ISPG (Integrated Settlement Participation Guide) will be included about how to use the FIM reason and source codes.

The continuation of SIS FIM reason and source codes will be reviewed by the SIS SG next year.
Subject: IATA Currency Information Table

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background:
With the support and request of PASB (Pay-Account Standards Board), IATA published the "Currency Information Sheet" on the below IATA Exchange Rates web page under the "Compare the exchange rates" part.

Problem:
IBS OPS WG agreed that it would be useful to include the "compare the exchange rates" table (in the IATA Exchange Rates webpage) as a link in a RAM B Chapter.

Proposed Solution:
Add the below part in a RAM B Chapter:

"4. Currency Information Table (for information purposes only)

"IATA Exchange Rates Files Comparison" table can be viewed from the below IATA IATA Exchange Rates web page link. under the "Compare the exchange rates" part;

https://www.iata.org/en/services/finance/xrates/
Subject: Basic Billing Rules for Cargo Billings

Submitted by: ANA (All Nippon Airways)

Background:

RAM Chapter 5, paragraph 1 explains the Basic Billing Rules for Cargo Billings. In paragraph 1 the basic entitlement is described as follows:

"The billing carrier is entitled to receive the rate (a prorated portion thereof) applicable on the date of issue of the air waybill for the journey flown, irrespective of erroneous entries of rates on air waybills.

Problem:

RAM Chapter 5 clearly defines the billing carrier's entitlement to bill the prorated share of the transported "journey". However, the underlying idea to bill the prorated share for the whole journey (or "section" as defined in the Cargo Prorate Manual) in one Interline invoice is not explicitly stated.

This method is the standard interline process, which goes along with the agreed prorate rules. It is supported by the fact that the billed carrier cannot validate the correctness of another carrier's separately billed flight legs and, therefore, cannot calculate expected values for separate incoming invoices. Furthermore, a possible rejection process becomes much more complicated because it is not clear which incoming invoice is to be rejected in such cases.

To avoid misunderstandings, a clarifying statement should be inserted in RAM, explaining that the general idea is to write one interline invoice for the complete journey flown, regardless of whether the billing carrier has transported more than one flight leg.

Example:

Prepaid AWB (Issuer Carrier "A"), Origin: HAM / Destination: LAX.

The shipment is transferred to Carrier "B" in FRA for onward transportation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight legs:</th>
<th>HAM ------ FRA -------------- NYC -------- LAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flight Carrier:</td>
<td>A          B          B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Prorate Manual Cargo, the prorate share is calculated for each section flown:

Section HAM-FRA (Carrier A): HAM-FRA e.g. 100 USD
Section FRA-LAX (Carrier B): FRA-LAX e.g. 700 USD

Accordingly, the standard billing procedure would be that carrier "B" bills "A" for the prorated share of 700 USD in one interline invoice. (No separate billings for FRA-NYC and NYC-LAX).
Proposed solution:

To clarify the underlying concept of the standard interline billing procedure, an additional sentence shall be inserted in RAM Chapter A5, paragraph 1.1;

"Accordingly, as a standard process, the billing carrier bills for the complete carried "section" (i.e., the consecutive carriage between two or more points as defined in Prorate Manual Cargo) in one interline invoice, unless there is a specific arrangement between the billing participants."
Subject: Examples of Cumulative Charges Method

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background:

RAM chapter A6 explains the principle of the Cumulative Charges Method and how it is to be applied for Cargo Charges Collect shipments:

Under this method, all carriers participating in the transportation of a shipment will bill the carrier designated as the receiving carrier on the transfer information form.

Examples are provided in the attachment of this chapter.

Problem:

Example 1 illustrates charges collect shipment.

a) The picture illustrating the routing of the shipment does not match the following text with regard to the first carrier (SR instead of LX).

b) Furthermore, the example implies that an LX AWB is used. This should be mentioned explicitly to avoid possible confusion.

Because if the AWB of another airline had been used here, an origin transfer would have taken place, and this would lead to a further billing from the AWB issuing carrier to the first transporting carrier for the ISC amount.
Proposed solution:

Change the carrier of the first flight segment in the routing illustration to "LX" and specify that an LX AWB is used, to clarify the underlying assumptions of this example:

Example 1

Shipment (LX AWB) sent Charged Collect ZRH/CAI routed as under:

Zurich ---------- Rome ---------- Athens ---------- Cairo

1 2 3
LX BA CY
GBP8 GBP12 GBP13
Subject: SPA Checklist (Cargo)

Submitted by: IBS OPS WG

Background:

IBS OPS GM approved a Passenger SPA Checklist in 2019 that was added to RAM in 2019 as a RAM B Chapter in order to minimize incorrect or missing coding or disagreement on the interpretation of the terms of the bilateral commercial agreements (SPAs).

Multiple IATA Airlines requested IBS OPS WG to create a similar SPA Checklist for interline cargo.

Problem:

IBS OPS WG is aware that a significant contributor to rejections is incorrect or missing coding or disagreement on the interpretation of the terms of the bilateral commercial agreements (SPAs).

Proposed Solution:

IBS OPS WG formed the inserted / below Cargo SPA Checklist, and this checklist will be added as part of the RAM B Chapter for the airlines who are willing to use it during their SPA Coding.

Cargo SPA Checklist_June 2022.xlsx
## CARGO SPA CODING CHECK LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CODING OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL CONTENT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2L-code/AWB prefix</td>
<td>Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPA Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airline Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner contact address</td>
<td>General adress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Billing address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Interline SPA Saler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interline Acc. Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability and insurance</td>
<td>governed by respective contract of transport (further claims)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. VALIDITY DATE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Flight date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature date</td>
<td>Other Unique Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinue Date</td>
<td>Flight date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. AWB Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWB prefix</td>
<td>Own AWBs (include/exclude)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPA Partner AWBs (include/exclude)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-AWB / Paper / Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-AWB only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper AWB only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Cargo</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Handling Codes</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. weight</td>
<td>Applicable / Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC / PP allowance</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. JOURNEY TYPE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable market (FROM/TO pairs: airports/cities/countries/IATA areas/user defined area)</td>
<td>SPA applicable / SPA not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport/City exclusions</td>
<td>SPA not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flights / Trucks</td>
<td>Generally included/excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Particular flight/truck included/excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint carriage required (Direct/Transfer)</td>
<td>Required / Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage by sponsored carrier</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party participation in routing</td>
<td>Include / Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-transfer at final destination</td>
<td>Allowed / Not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Rates to be applied:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum amount</td>
<td>Applicable / Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Breakpoint application (Application of next higher weight break, if available and if this results in lower total charge)</td>
<td>Allowed / Not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate type</td>
<td>Per kg rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat rate (UDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of TACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Charges / Rate Lines (optional per breakpoint)</td>
<td>Applicable for general cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicable rate for special cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season Rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Charge Calculation Base</td>
<td>Chargable weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharges included in rates</td>
<td>Generally Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include/exclude particular charges/fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Surcharges, if not included in rates</td>
<td>Fuel charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handling Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Local Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. SURCHARGE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcharge calculation base</td>
<td>Chargable weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. INTERLINE FEE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interline Service Charge (ISC %)</td>
<td>Allowed / Not allowed (waive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. SETTLEMENT METHOD:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Discrepancies</td>
<td>IATA Revenue Accounting Manual (RAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate by Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing</td>
<td>IOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilateral (NON-ODI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Currency / Listing Currency</td>
<td>IATA 5 Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate</td>
<td>Mean Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Footnote / Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>Revenue Accountants should provide feedback to their Revenue Management team before SPA is finalized to ensure SPA clarity and codability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check contents with legal department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note1: The Category Description is not intended to be a complete list of variables but rather a sample

Note2: The Cargo SPA Coding Check list is not binding. It aims to assist the airlines in drafting their Cargo SPAs by making sure that all critical details are considered.
SIMPLIFIED INVOICING AND SETTLEMENT GENERAL MEETING
TUESDAY | 20 SEPTEMBER 2022

Administrative Items

A1 Opening of Meeting and Welcome
A2 Competition Law Guidelines for IATA Industry Meetings
A3 Delegate Introductions
A5 Introduction to the Voting System
A6 Date and Place of Next General Meeting
A7 Any Other Business
A8 Vendor Prize Draws
A9 Close of Meeting

11th SIS GM Updates and Reporting Items

SR1 IATA Welcome presentation
SR2 Report from the SIS Steering Group
SR3 Industry Economic Performance Updates
SR4 SIS General Update
SR5 SIS GM10 Action Items Update
SR6 SIS E-Invoicing Legal Compliance and Tax Reporting Update
SR7 MISC Invoices Data Quality
SR8 IBS OPS GM Agenda Papers Impact on SIS
SR9 Suppliers to Airlines e-Invoicing Update
SR10 Rejections Reduction Update
SR11 SIS SLA Performance and Customer Satisfaction Update

Agenda Items

To be presented and discussed at the 11th SIS General Meeting – 20th September 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS Item</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Impacts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>SIS Adding export function in the page of Invoice Search</td>
<td>MF-731-XIAMEN AIRLINES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>SIS Reports</td>
<td>CZ-784-China Southern Airlines</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SIS Validation of AWB Prime Billing</td>
<td>CZ-784-China Southern Airlines</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Enables changing default number of the records per page shown on SIS Search Results screen</td>
<td>NH-205-ALL NIPPON AIRWAYS CO. LTD.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>SIS Price Changes – ISPA Attachment A</td>
<td>IATA SIS Steering Group</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIS GM11 – SIS Participation Agreement

For your information, below is an extract from the SIS Participation Agreement (ISPA) outlining the steps to perform amendments to SIS.

6. MODIFICATIONS

6.1 Amendments to System functionality may be submitted as a proposal to the SIS General Meeting duly convened in accordance with paragraph 5.2 and shall be referred initially to the SIS Steering Group for review. If accepted by the SIS Steering Group they will be referred to SIS Operations (as defined in Attachment C) for analysis and costing. SIS Operations shall develop the specifications and, at their discretion, confirm them with the SIS Steering Group (as defined in Attachment C). The final agreed proposal shall be submitted to the SIS Steering Group for approval. Changes to system functionality may be proposed by the Participants at any time before the deadline of the SIS General Meeting. Major changes to system functionality must be approved by IATA to ensure operational efficiency.

6.2 Amendments to System functionality as a result of industry mandated changes shall be initiated by the SIS Steering Group and referred to SIS Operations for review and costing. SIS Operations shall develop the specifications and, at their discretion, confirm them with the SIS Steering Group. The final agreed proposal shall be submitted to the SIS Steering Group for approval.

6.3 Amendments to the then current Agreement which are accepted by IATA and agreed by seventy five percent (75%) of those present at the SIS General Meeting, duly convened in accordance with paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 shall become effective and shall be applied by all SIS Participants, as from a date which shall be determined by the SIS Participants present and entitled to vote at the SIS General Meeting.

6.4 To be eligible to vote for changes to this Agreement with Attachments, the Participant must be transmitting and receiving invoices through the Service.

6.5 Where changes to the RAM, ACH Manual of Procedure, or other industry rulings require changes to this Agreement, the SIS Steering Group is empowered to agree to the appropriate amendments to this Agreement. The SIS Steering Group shall notify the Participants of all amendments, giving their date of effectiveness.

6.6 In addition, when IATA’s review of an operational and/or individual Participant problem suggests that an editorial change would improve understanding, IATA may make editorial amendments provided they do not change the intent of the Agreement and/or procedures. Editorial amendments that do not change the intent of the Agreement and/or procedures will be notified via the RAM. IATA will notify the ACH Secretary-Treasurer.

6.7 All changes and amendments made in accordance with paragraphs 6.5 and 6.6 above will be submitted to the next SIS General Meeting for final ratification.
Subject: SIS Adding export function in the page of Invoice Search

Submitted by: MF-731 Xiamen Airlines

Background:

Currently, by searching the invoice, we are unable to export details of the uploaded invoices during the current billing period before the closure date. The ‘Invoice Search’ page, only shows the detail of each invoice.

Below screenshot from the ‘Passenger’ part.

Problem:

Providing the export function, we could export the selected invoices, better help the user to check the status of the invoice, the amount of the invoice or the company of the invoice in the local server or in house IPRA system.

Proposed Solution:

We suggest that the team provide a button similar to the submission button, to allow the user export selected invoices.
Subject: SIS Reports

Submitted by: CZ-784 China Southern Airlines

Background:

The module of “Reports-Cargo” on ISWEB can provide query and download services for the interline billing data, so the users can obtain the required data according to requirements.

Problem:

Module “Reports-Cargo” includes 4 sub-modules which are Receivables, Payables, RM-BM-CM Details Report, and Correspondence Status. At present, SIS users must copy the memo number one by one from RM-BM-CM Details Report to their own settlement system to get the linked AWB number, before users review the billing history.

Proposed solution:

To make it more user-friendly and improve the working efficiency, we propose that ISWEB add the linked AWB number in RM-BM-CM Details Report.
Subject: SIS Validation of AWB Prime Billing

Submitted by: CZ-784 China Southern Airlines

Background:

Today SIS offers validations of information provided by billing carriers on a prime AWB billing, list in RAM Chapter A7 - Attachment B.

Problem:

In SIS Cargo billing category, billing carriers should offer detail information about an AWB when uploading prime billing invoices. However, we identify that the nature of goods which is one of the important factors to assess the interline billing amount of an AWB, is not included in SIS validation.

The description of specific goods, published in *The Air Cargo Tariff Manual* by IATA, is consist of 4 numeric. With this information, it can help to reduce adjustments and increase efficiency of settlement.

Proposed Solution:

We propose that SIS shall add the nature of goods in AWB prime billing invoice as an "optional" information, and a validation to ensure this information could only be blank or consist of 4 numeric.
Subject: Enables changing default number of the records per page shown on SIS Search Results screen

Submitted by: NH-205 ALL NIPPON AIRWAYS CO. LTD.

Background:

Currently when users enter the search criteria and click the “Search” button on any screen on SIS, search results are shown on a list. These are listed only up to 5 items by default. If there are more than 6 search results, the user must increase the number of records displayed on a page by the “Drop-down” or clicking the “Arrow” to see the next numbers of items. For example, there are 29 results in the image below, the number of records per page are required to be set to more than 30 to see all items at once or click the “Arrow” 3 times to see all items.

Problem:

If the airline which always has more than 6 results even after narrowing down the search criteria, the user must click the next page or select the drop-down to change the number of records per page every time to see all search results. This is an inconvenient and inefficient operation.

Proposed Solution:

Since such search result screens are frequently used in all categories of the SIS, we propose to add a new functionality that allows users to set any minimum number of records per page (5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 150, 200) to be displayed by default in all categories.
Subject: SIS Price Changes – ISPA Attachment A

Submitted by: SIS Steering Group

Background:

As described in Attachment A – “Pricing Schedule” of the Standard IS Participation Agreement, the SIS service is run on an operational cost-recovery basis and the applicable membership and participation fees should cover the necessary costs to operate the service and maintain a neutral revenue.

SIS prices have been reviewed in order to incentivize the correct usage of the platform and promote quality of data being exchanged that is impacting the process efficiency on both, billing and billed parties.

It has been observed that a lot of efforts and processes are related to Rejections and correspondence management. The cost per transaction is very low and, in an effort, to discourage unnecessary rejections and correspondences, the prices have been changed for Passenger and cargo rejections and correspondences.

In Miscellaneous, there are cases where participants misuse the system and instead of providing detailed information, just attach a supporting document with multiple lines of data. This causes the receiving party to manually enter and reconcile these details. To stop this misuse, price of supporting documents for Miscellaneous will be changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction Type</th>
<th>Old Price</th>
<th>New Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Passenger/Cargo Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos, Correspondence</td>
<td>$0.0342</td>
<td>$0.0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc: Correspondence</td>
<td>$0.0016</td>
<td>$0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC Supporting Documents Per KB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment A of the IS Participation Agreement will be amended accordingly to reflect the new pricing and effective January 1st, 2023.
Note: The General Meetings’ running orders will be published in IATA’s “SSW” online communities and via industry communication at least one (1) week prior to the Industry Meetings.

Thank you for participating in this year’s Industry Meetings

For any questions contact wfsim@iata.org