



ADM WORKING GROUP SUBGROUP CALL (8 FEB 2017)

ADM PROCESS – BEST PRACTICES

OBJECTIVE OF MEETING

To review the existing ADM process flow, and create industry best practices in regards to the full ADM lifecycle.

NOTES

First round of review was to go over the suggestions from the breakout sessions during the November 2016 ADMWG Workshop in regards to the best practices for the ADM process.

- 1) Ensure that all communication in relation to disputes is handled via BSPlink only and eliminate email communication.**

The group discussed the issue where the “feed” of information on ADM comments into Airline systems does not include Post-Billing disputes; therefore it is not easy to manage all disputes via BSPlink with the current system. The ADM project team asked those participants that are also in the Reso subgroup to review the summary in relation to the Post-Billing Dispute changes and to let the team know whether those changes will have a positive impact and resolve the issue described above.

Supplementary information (9th February 2017)

The ADM project team checked internally and the changes to BSPlink as a result of the changes to the dispute mechanism will enable Post-Billing Dispute comments to be included in the dispute file that the Airlines can download. However the development is still in evaluation phase, pending for final confirmation from the PSG mail vote results therefore we should follow up when the results are available, to review the situation.

Some Airlines also mentioned that emails are used as a preferred communication channel rather than BSPlink, as some Airlines have decentralized teams managing different aspects of the ADMs, such as the revenue accounting team may not be the same as who looks after waivers on disputes, or the fare filing. As a result, not everyone involved in the ADM’s dispute lifecycle has access to BSPlink.

Supplementary information (9th February 2017)

ADM project team to explore whether access levels to BSPlink- that will only enable comments in the ADM will be helpful in mitigating this issue.

All GDSs within the group also mentioned that they support this best practice given that the GDSs will have the possibility to be part of the communication chain, and that all communication material, including the comments and respective evidences are all in one place. Therefore there is a need to be able to attach files as well.

The ADM project team will share the proposal once it is received from the support team, in how the communication channel in BSPlink will be enhanced, so that the group can review the same before going forward with the development.



Supplementary information (9th February 2017)

BSPlink team has confirmed that we are expected to receive a mock-up on the module in the next week. Subgroup can review this together in the next meeting.

It was clarified that at this stage, the front end technology will not enable us to make instant notifications using technology such as API/ web services. However this is a fundamental requirement for the new front end project. Until the project is realized the only available outward communication would be through email alerts and flat file transfers. An Airline raised the point that email alerts are functionalities only available to BSPlink Enhanced Agent users, therefore the group would need to keep this in mind when promoting the best practices to encourage agents to check BSPlink regularly for communication in case they are not subscribed to the enhanced user level.

- 2) Resolution 850m should be in sync with today's industry standards, and the industry shall follow the rules outlined by 850m.**

No additional comments.

- 3) ADMs should be issued within 9 months from the last date of travel.**

No objections to this best practice. ADM project team proposed that there should be a validation in the system that will help facilitate this, that will flag either a warning or rejection to the transaction if the detected last date of travel, in the Related Ticket Document Number(s); it's very complex to handle when there are multiple RTDNs to place a validation on every single ADM, that will not slow down the daily processing significantly.

Participants were asked in whether this validation, if feasible, should be a warning or rejection. There were mixed opinions where warnings would cater for those situations that may be exceptional cases, however a rejection would ensure that the time limited is respected in all situations. ADM project team will need to assess the system possibilities in order to find the best solution to this as there was no unanimous agreement to this situation yet.

Second round of discussion was to brainstorm for other best practices that may not have been discussed during the previous workshop. The participants suggested that ARC DMWG best practices should also be put into consideration to see wherever possible, that the two groups are aligned in order to establish global best practices.

Supplementary information (9th February 2017)

ADM project team has obtained first draft of best practices from ARC DMWG team, and will be meeting with ARC team to review any other best practices that result from their upcoming Agent & Airline best practices meeting. This subgroup should have the list of best practices to review before the next call.

- 4) A process established between Airlines and their third party auditing vendors in order to handle and escalate disputes.**

It was brought up by a GDS representative that when liaising with some third party auditing vendors on behalf of Airlines, they experience issues where despite the evidence they provide on behalf of the agent, they are not able to successfully dispute the ADM; an Agent representative echoed the point and expressed that this generally is not an issue when dealing directly with the Airline.



An Airline explained the process that they have established with their vendors is for the vendor to escalate any disputes that involve information the vendors do not have, directly to the Airline to investigate with the Airline's fare filing team and revert to the vendor on the final decision.

In order to ensure that the communication with the vendors would promise the same level of communication quality as direct communication with the Airline, the group proposed that the best practice to establish is for third parties to follow the same set of best practices for the ADM process since they are acting on behalf of the carriers they represent.

5) Alignment in response and investigation deadlines for all parties involved in the ADM dispute process.

It was suggested by an agent representative that often 15 days for the agent to research an ADM is not enough, especially since it includes the time for them to check with the GDSs if they need to. However, Airlines are given 60 days to reply to any disputes. As for GDSs, they have individual Service Level Agreements (SLA) with their customers and this is not considered as part of the process.

A few airlines agreed that they observed that agents often do not have enough time to react to the ADMs initially and as a result they receive many disputes, both pre-billing and post-billing. In addition, post-billing disputes create a lot of extra work on the Airline's side to create credit memos to the agent.

The suggestion was to bring the response time to a similar level to all parties so that there is an equal amount of time for each party to react and investigate into the ADM. The initial discussion was to establish a 30-day best practice, although a few parties in the call already expressed that in a few cases this is not realistic.

The GDSs in the call committed to check their internal SLA policies to see currently what their timeframes are, and to revert to the ADM project team privately. For the Airlines, the project team will put this discussion point as an agenda item on the upcoming workshop so that we could observe more feedback before finalizing this best practice.

To be followed up with a wider audience to ensure that the date to suggest is reasonable for the majority of actors in the process.

Next call will be scheduled for March, and the group shall be discussing:

- Follow up on items 1 & 3
- ARC's DMWG best practice list
- Best practices on requesting and responding to ACM requests
- Best practices on Post-Billing Disputes

APPENDIX A

SUBGROUP ATTENDEES

Below is the list of all registered members of the subgroup, and there indicated, the participants of the calls detailed this set of minutes.

Name	8 th Feb
------	---------------------



Amber Wan	*
Amy Tyan	*
Carolina Arteta	
Clare Townsend	
Dawn Love	*
Ellen Rozar	
Guillaume Donnier	
Hope Harper	*
Jesper Shou	*
Kerstin Dosch	*
Krzysztof Zaba	*
Mien Rotthier	*
Mike Walker	*
Steve Gusevski	
Sylwia Forma	*
Teresa Young	*
Thierry Teruel	*
Timothy DeLaney	
Usha Sarkar	*