



DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
DOCKET SECTION

96 APR 16 AM 11:41

International Air Transport Association

Washington Office

April 10, 1996

Montreal / Geneva

Mr. Donald H. Horn
Assistant General Counsel
for International Law, C-20
Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

OST-95-232

Dear Mr. Horn:

Air Carriers met in Miami on the 31 of January and the 1st of February 1996 in a meeting conducted in accordance with the Department's Order 96-1-25 extending the carrier's discussion immunity. I forwarded a report on that meeting to you with a letter dated February 15, 1996.

This is to supplement that report. The material enclosed here was distributed at that meeting and completes the documents listed in the revised index:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| WP 2A | Legal Opinion concerning DOT Order 96-1-25 |
| WP 7 | Paper on Electronic Ticketing and the Warsaw System |
| WP 8 | IATA/ICC Aviation Liability Disputes Resolution
(Arbitration) |
| Info Paper 5 | Extract from Minutes taken at the 51st IATA AGM |

Sincerely,

David M. O'Connor
Regional Director, US

Enclosure

cc: Docket OST 95-232 ✓
Ms. Jennifer Richter, Dept. of State
Mr. Gary Allen, Dept. of Justice
Mr. Lorne Clark, General Counsel, IATA

27 pgs.

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

1776 K STREET, N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
 (202) 429-7000

BERT W. REIN
 (202) 429-7080

FACSIMILE
 (202) 429-7048

January 29, 1996

Lorne Clark, Esq.
 General Counsel
 International Air Transport Assoc.
 2000 Peel Street
 Montreal, P.Q.
 CANADA H3A 2R4

VIA FAX

Dear Lorne:

We understand that IATA intends to convene a LAG Subcommittee meeting in Miami commencing 31 January 1996. That meeting will consider a number of issues relating to implementation of the IATA Intercarrier Agreement ("IIA"), including the possibility of a Supplementary Intercarrier Agreement ("SIA") harmonizing IIA implementation globally or on routes to/from/through the United States. IATA seeks to benefit from the immunity granted by Order 96-1-25 in conducting the Miami meeting. In that connection, you have requested our views on the limitations (if any) arising from footnote 6 (p. 3) of that Order.

Order 96-1-25 granted IATA's December 22, 1995 request for an extension of the immunity granted to IATA by Order 95-7-15. In its application, IATA specifically requested immunity broad enough to cover any discussion "directed toward producing an acceptable passenger liability regime under the Warsaw Convention." IATA explained that this broad formulation was required because "[a] number of carriers participating in the ALC have, however, not yet concluded that a universal implementing agreement is necessary or desirable for any routes, including routes to and from the United States." (App. p. 6). IATA thus sought to avoid a narrower scope of discussion immunity which would have permitted only discussions "to develop an intercarrier agreement for implementation of the IATA Intercarrier Agreement," (Id. p. 5).

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

Lorne Clark
January 29, 1996 .
Page 2

Ordering Paragraph 1 of Order 96-1-25 adopts IATA's requested scope language, Ordering paragraph 3 imposes certain notification, reporting and agreement approval conditions on discussions pursuant to Paragraph 1 but does not limit the scope of those discussions.' In discussing the scope of immunity accorded, Order 96-1-25 specifically recognizes IATA's concern that not all carriers believe an implementing agreement to be necessary or desirable and acknowledges that the "immunity granted" is "sufficient to permit carriers, on an individual basis, to express their views in this regard-" (Order 96-1-25, pp. 2-3). Footnote 6 further observes that DOT "would not consider, however, that the immunity would extend to any ~~collective understanding~~ that there should be no such Agreement." (Id. p. 3, emphasis added).

By its OWN terms, footnote 6 does not deal with discussion, as such, but relates only to "collective understanding." What it seeks to prohibit is a joint determination -- by resolution, motion or other consensus means -- that no implementation agreement should be entered into by any carrier. In other words, DOT is prepared to see the failure, or even abandonment, of an IATA implementing initiative but it is not prepared to immunize a joint effort to foreclose the independent development of implementing agreements by regional associations or ad hoc carrier groups.²

We understand that IATA has no intention of considering any "collective understanding" that an implementing agreement should not go forward at Miami. To the contrary, IATA intends to explore *fully the possibility* of reaching such an agreement on a global or regional basis. In that context, participants in the meeting may express and consider a position that such an agreement is unnecessary, undesirable or unachievable so long

¹ We understand that IATA intends fully to comply with the conditions in Ordering Paragraph 3.

² DOT's objective is, as stated in Order 96-1-25, "to achieve the maximum U.S. and foreign *carrier participation* in the development of a single liability regime that conforms to the Department's guidelines to be applicable to and from the United States." (Id., p. 3). DOT anticipates the possibility that it would base its "proposed regulations" on "an agreement developed by the carriers and approved by us." (Id., f.n. 7). Thus, DOT seeks to foreclose a joint effort to inhibit the development of any implementing agreement which could provide a "voluntary" foundation for U.S. regulatory action.

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

Lorne Clark
January 29, 1996
Page 3

as no "collective understanding" to that effect is sought or reached. In these circumstances, and given IATA's intentions, we do not believe that footnote 6 of Order 96-1-25 imposes any significant limitation on the conduct of the Miami meeting.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Bert Rein", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Bert W. Rein

BWR: lhw

Electronic Ticketing

An ad hoc working group of the LAG met in Geneva January 17th and 18th to review the legal issues associated with Electronic Ticketing for international transportation.

IATA's Director of Passenger Services made a presentation and participated in the meeting to provide technical expertise. In addition a list of specific questions was submitted to the working group by the Passenger Services Conference.

While the operations people would prefer to eliminate all paper, they accept that certain documentation will be necessary and their initial implementation scenarios have always contemplated distribution of some documents. The mandate of the legal group is to determine the minimum requirements and develop options for delivery to the passenger.

It was taken as given by the Group that notwithstanding the IIA, carriers will insist that electronic ticketing provide all necessary notices to comply with Warsaw and to ensure their conditions of contract and carriage are enforceable.

It was the unanimous view that there are no insurmountable legal obstacles. In its simplest form, the "wallet" delivered today would be mailed to the passenger, or delivered at check-in.

Individual members of the group are preparing papers on a specific list of agreed issues for the next meeting, to be held in Montreal in mid-March.

The issues discussed and being researched by the Group are essentially those set out in the recent DOT Request for Comments on Electronic Ticketing (attached).

21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location when, the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 10, 1996.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 96-493 Filed 1-18-96; 8:45 am].

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Chapter II

[Docket No. OST-96-993; Notice 96-1]

RIN 2105-AC38

Ticketless Travel: Passenger Notices

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: The Department is seeking comment on passenger notice requirements as applied to ticketless air travel. This action is taken on the Department's initiative.

DATES: Comments on the issues discussed in this document should be received by March 19, 1996. Late-filed comments will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to Docket Clerk, Docket No. OST-96-993, Room PL-401, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590. For the convenience of persons who will be reviewing the docket, it is requested that commenters provide an original and three copies of their comments.

Comments can be inspected from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Commenters who wish the receipt of their comments to be acknowledged should include a stamped, self-addressed postcard with their comments. The docket clerk will date-stamp the postcard and mail it to the commenter. Comments should be on 8 1/2 by 11 inch white paper using dark ink and should be without tabs and unbound.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Kelly, Aviation Consumer Protection Division, Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW, Room 10405, Washington, DC 20590. telephone (202) 366-5952.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Various DOT regulations require U.S. and foreign air carriers to provide consumer notices on or with passenger tickets. These notices provide information about protections afforded

by federal regulations! limitations on carrier liability, and contract terms that passengers may not otherwise be aware of. These ticket notice requirements are listed below.

Subject/Source (14 CFR)

Oversales—§ 250.11

Domestic baggage liability—5 254.5

International baggage liability—

§ 221.176

Domestic contract of carriage terms—

§ 253.5

Terms of electronic tariff

(International)—§ 221.177(b)

Refund penalties (domestic)+ 253.7

Fare increases (International)—

§ 221.174

Death/Injury liability limits

(International)—§ 221.175

Over the past few years, a number of airlines have begun selling air service with "ticketless travel," also known as "electronic ticketing." Under this concept a passenger or travel agent calls the airline, makes a reservation and purchases the transportation during the call, typically by credit card. No "ticket," as that document has traditionally been configured, is issued. Instead, the passenger is orally given a confirmation number and/or is sent a written itinerary. Upon checking in at the airport the passenger simply provides his or her name, furnishes identification, and is given a boarding pass or other document that is used to gain access to the aircraft.

The Department of Transportation supports the development of ticketless travel. The process has the potential to reduce carrier and agent costs, and thereby costs to consumers, and to make air transportation easier to purchase. At the same time, the Department has been concerned that necessary information in the passenger notices described above be provided to all passengers in a ticketless environment at a time and in a manner that makes the information useful. A number of carriers that offer ticketless travel have approached the Department and asked what procedures we would find to be acceptable in this area. In response, we have pointed out the importance of providing the same general level and timeliness of notice that is presently required for traditionally-ticketed passengers, as indicated in the discussion that follows. As far as we are aware, virtually all carriers that offer ticketless travel are providing those notices in the manner and at the time that we have recommended.

We realize that this is a dynamic area of air transportation. We are publishing this Federal Register notice in order to seek comment on all aspects of the issue

of consumer notices in a ticketless air travel environment so that unnecessary documentation burdens can be eliminated, consistent with providing needed information to consumers in a timely fashion.

Discussion

At the time that the various passenger notice requirements described above were issued, all passengers received tickets. It appears that the ticket was chosen as the means for conveying required consumer information simply because tickets were a universally-available medium for documenting the carrier/passenger contract of carriage and providing notice in writing to individual passengers. We have found no evidence that the use of the word "ticket" in these notice rules contemplated that only airline passengers who receive traditional tickets are able and entitled to benefit from the information in these notices.

Indeed, there is ample evidence that these notice requirements were enacted in order to provide important information to all airline passengers. In issuing a rule requiring a ticket notice disclosing baggage liability limits, the Civil Aeronautics Board noted:

As we stated in EDR-182, inadequate knowledge by the traveling public of the limits on liability for loss of or damage to baggage has been a recurring source of consumer complaints and this continues to be the case. [T]he Board has determined that the traveling public is entitled to effective notice of both Warsaw Convention and other baggage liability limitations. [ER-691 issued August 24, 1971; 36 FR 17034.]

In 1977 the Board issued a rule requiring a ticket notice disclosing overbooking practices. The agency stated:

... while we find nothing unlawful in a carrier's attempt to insulate itself against a common law action of fraudulent misrepresentation by filing a tariff rule, such carrier and its agents should be required to provide the passenger with actual notice of its overbooking practices. Although, as the carriers point out, a passenger may be legally presumed to have knowledge of a carrier's tariffs, it is clearly unrealistic to expect passengers to have actual knowledge of the contents of tariffs. (ER-987 issued February 28, 1977; 42 FR 12420.)

In 1982, as domestic tariffs were being phased out, the Board issued a rule permitting carriers to continue to incorporate terms by reference into contracts with passengers, as they had with tariffs, but requiring a ticket notice disclosing the existence of the incorporated terms. The rule also required specific notice of certain terms affecting the refundability of the fare. The Board stated that it wanted to:

... make sure that the travelling public are able to And out the terms they am 'buying Into" whenever they purchase an airline ticket, so that they can make an informed choice of carrier, class and flight, and protect themselves (for example, by buying extra insurance) against undesired risks . . . This rule is intended to alert passengers, and prospective passengers, that important terms are incorporated in ticket contracts . . . [ER-1302 issued September 27,1982; 47 FR 52134; 14 CFR Part 253.]

One of the primary concerns of airlines at the time that the rule permitting continued incorporation of contract terms (14 CFR Part 253) was adopted was the possibility of being subjected to widely divergent standards involving notice of contract terms by the courts of many different states which might have jurisdiction over their contracts. Part 253 preempts state courts from involvement in the issue of notice of contract terms, so long as carriers comply with its provisions. Presumably, carriers that offer ticketless travel want to incorporate contract terms by reference and take advantage of liability limitations to the same extent as carriers that issue tickets. However, it is open to question whether courts will view a carrier's contract of carriage to be enforceable by a carrier if a consumer does not receive timely written notice of its applicability to the air transportation being purchased. At this point, we continue to believe that Part 253 strikes a balance between the Department's responsibility to protect consumers and its desire to allow airlines the maximum flexibility possible for their business decisions. Accordingly, for the same reasons that were cited when the part 253 disclosure rules were enacted, both carriers and passengers could face increased risks if notice of the incorporated contract of carriage terms were not to be provided to ticketless passengers in a timely fashion. We seek comment on whether carriers selling ticketless travel expect that their respective contracts of carriage will apply to the purchased transportation. We also seek comment on the costs and the benefits of providing notice of any incorporated contract of carriage terms to ticketless passengers within a few days after the purchase transaction, and the methods by which this could be accomplished. In addition to comments on all of the above issues, we specifically ask for comment on the issue of preemption if carriers do not provide written notice to ticketless passengers similar to that required under part 253.

In addition to conveying consumer notices, an airline ticket serves as a record of the passenger's reservation.

The definition of "confirmed reserved space" in the Department's denied boarding rule (14 CFR § 250.1) is:

... space on a specific date and on a specific flight and class of service of a carrier which has been requested by a passenger and which the carrier or its agent has verified, by appropriate notation on the ticket or in any other manner provided therefor by the carrier, as being reserved for the accommodation of the passenger.

Thus, if a passenger has a ticket reflecting confirmed reserved space (generally indicated by the notation "OK" in the Status field), that passenger has a reservation for purposes of our denied boarding rule even if the carrier cannot locate the reservation in the computer. Under that rule, that passenger is entitled to compensation if not boarded. Ticketless passengers could be at a disadvantage in this regard if there is no evidence in their possession of having a reservation on a particular flight. The confirmation number provided at the time of the purchase may help the carrier locate the reservation, but if the computer record cannot be found, the confirmation numbers now being used may not establish the passenger has a reservation on the specific flight for which he or she is checking in. Therefore, failure to provide confirmed passengers with an adequate written record of the confirmation could lead to numerous disputes between airlines and passengers regarding entitlement to denied boarding compensation as required by part 250. Such a written record could be the confirmation number alone, if the carrier has a system that allows airport agents to use a confirmation number to determine the status of the reservation associated with that number without resort to its computer reservation system (e.g., by using a coded confirmation number). However, if a carrier does not have a procedure free of reliance on a single computer reservation system, in order to achieve the same end it may be advisable for a written record of the reservation to be sent to the passenger at the time of the purchase to identify the specific flights, dates and classes of service purchased by the passenger, consistent with section 250.1. We ask for comments on whether passengers in a ticketless environment should receive evidence of their confirmed reservation independent of a carrier's computer reservation system and, if so, by what means.

Another issue raised by ticketless travel is that the passenger may have no record issued by the carrier or its agent of the fare that was quoted to and

accepted by the passenger during the telephone call or other transaction with the transportation was purchased. The charge record from the passenger's credit card company may not arrive in the mail until after the flight, and should there be a disagreement at the time in over the correct fare, the passenger would have no evidence of the amount that he or she had agreed to pay. Although airline tickets contain fare information, no existing rule requires such a written record of the fare, and thus some carriers may not wish to create one for ticketless passengers. However, to the extent that written material is given to ticketless passengers in order to address other issues discussed here, providing a written record of the fare (perhaps generated from the record of the purchase transaction) would obviate many potential disputes over the amount of the fare. Comments are invited on how carriers deal with fare disputes with all passengers, but particularly with passengers who purchase tickets by phone, and on how often such disputes occur.

To the extent that carriers revise their systems as a result of any of the issues discussed in this Notice, it may be easier to incorporate fare information now than to have to add it later. It is likely that many business travelers will need a written statement of the fare for expense reports in any event. Providing fare documentation on a ticketless transaction may encourage more business travelers to use the system, which may in turn reduce carrier costs. We seek comment on the desirability and practicality of providing fare information in writing to ticketless passengers.

Article 3, section 2 of the Warsaw Convention (49 Stat. 3000.49 U.S.C.A. 1502) requires that before a carrier can assert Warsaw liability limits for personal injury or death or for lost or damaged baggage with respect to a particular international passenger, the carrier must provide that passenger a ticket which states, *inter alia*, that the transportation is subject to the Convention's rules. This issue will need to be addressed.

Ticketless carriers that are providing consumer notices as we have recommended have been furnishing those notices in writing. We have advised those carriers that written notice could be provided through electronic text media such as "e-mail" and faxes. Oral notice during a telephone transaction alone would not meet the requirements of the current regulations that apply to ticket notices. The consumer notices that currently

appear on tickets are lengthier than the brief oral notice now required for code-sharing (14 CFR § 399.89) and the more detailed notices proposed for code-sharing and change-of-gauge service (59 FR 4083% and 60 FR 377%). In addition, the code-sharing and change-of-gauge disclosures are alerts about a single fact, while the ticket notices contain more-detailed information that passengers may want to refer to during check-in or even after the flight (e.g., in the event of a problem). Finally, a written notice avoids disputes over what Cas said. To the extent that information in the notices currently required on tickets is provided to ticketless passengers, we seek comment on whether we should specify the methods by which this information should be transmitted and the timing of such notice.

We have stated to carriers that have contacted us about ticketless travel that the intent of the current regulations for notices on tickets is to ensure that the notices to passengers are provided in conjunction with the purchase transaction. Consistent with this concept, we have advised these carriers that we believe that on a ticketless sale the notices should be sent to the purchaser (via mail, fax, "e-mail," personal delivery, or other timely means) within a few days after the purchase transaction. The purposes of the consumer notices may not be served if they are handed to passengers as they check in at the airport, or put in a queue to be mailed just before each passenger's flight. It is at the time of the purchase transaction that a passenger puts his or her money at risk on a restricted fare, and also enters into a contract. Passengers may wish to take certain actions before the flight as a result of reading the consumer notices, such as purchasing additional insurance or packing differently (e.g., putting expensive items in a carry-on bag). At the same time, we have also advised carriers that we recognize that if a passenger makes a ticketless purchase only a few days before departure and it would be impossible or unreasonably costly to get the required written material to him or her before the day of the flight, it may be necessary to provide this written material upon check-in at the airport. Such a procedure is similar to that now followed when tickets purchased by telephone within a few days of departure cannot be mailed due to the lack of time. We seek comment on the question of when any notices, if required, should be provided.

Some carriers have introduced machines that accept a credit card or "smart card." If the machine delivers a standard ticket, the required

information must be on the ticket, pursuant to the Department's current regulations on ticket notices. If the machine processes a ticketless sale, a page containing the required information could be printed out with each transaction, or the machine could print the passenger-specific data (i.e., confirmation information and fare) on a receipt and a supply of the consumer notices could be kept in a container attached to the machine with a sign asking customers to take one. We seek comment on whether written notices, if required, should be provided during such transactions, and how they should be furnished. Should passengers who read and sign special "disclosure forms," which provide all currently required notices, in order to obtain a "smart card" also receive notices with each air transportation purchase?

Several airlines and Computer Reservations System vendors allow subscribers of commercial online services to make reservations and purchase air transportation (both ticketed and ticketless) online. A number of airlines have established home pages on the World Wide Web, raising the prospect of electronic sales of air transportation via that medium. To the best of our knowledge, most current online sales of air transportation result in the mailing of a ticket, which should normally include the required notices. However, in the case of an online ticketless purchase (as opposed to simply a reservation), the question arises whether the consumer information that currently appears on or with tickets should be provided, and if so, how. One way to do this would be to offer a prominent, convenient and inexpensive (in terms of connect-time charges) option for the passenger to download or print the notices during the purchase transaction. Another would be to "e-mail" the notices to the passenger's "e-mail" address. Simply advising the customer that the consumer information is available to be read elsewhere online may not be adequate, just as it would not be satisfactory in a conventional ticketing transaction for the seller to tell the passenger where he or she could locate the required notices. Comments on these issues are invited.

The current regulations concerning ticket notices state that the notices must appear on tickets issued by travel agents. In two recent rulemakings the Department has proposed new written notices to be given to passengers who book code-sharing flights or change-of-gauge flights. Those proposed rules specifically take ticketless travel into account, and they would, if adopted, require that the written disclosure

proposed in those rules be given to persons who book through travel agents. See 59 FR 40836, August 10, 1994, "Disclosure of Code-Sharing Arrangements and Long-Term Wet Leases," and 60 FR 3778, January 19, 1995, "Disclosure of Change-of-Gauge Services." Those who comment on this notice on ticketless travel should be aware that the conclusions and analysis set forth here do not reflect any of the comments filed in the two dockets cited above. Any party that filed comments in those dockets on the issue of disclosure by travel agents is invited to file similar comments here.

We are currently of the view that providing timely written notice to ticketless passengers should not be unduly burdensome to carriers. The various procedures discussed in this Notice would represent no increase in required passenger notices; implementing the procedures (which we have previously recommended to carriers) would simply mean that the written information that has in the past been required to be provided to all passengers should continue to be provided to all passengers. We believe that virtually all carriers that offer ticketless travel have been following all of the procedures described in this Notice since last year, and doing so does not appear to have inhibited their ticketless programs. The high level of adherence to the ticketless travel notice procedures recommended by US and described in this Notice is, in part, attributable to the fact that it is in the best interests of the carriers and their customers to adopt such a system, as well as the apparent ease of following those procedures.

The notices in question would easily fit on the front and back of a single 8½ by 11 inch sheet of paper. If formatted differently or if the international notices are not provided to domestic passengers, the notices fit on the front of a single sheet. [The Department's Aviation Consumer Protection Division has created a sample sheet which is available by contacting the individual listed at the beginning of this notice under "For Further Information." It is also available electronically through the World Wide Web at <http://www.dot.gov/dotinfo/general/rules/aviation.html>]

Some airlines that have implemented or studied ticketless travel have stated that most of the cost savings result from the elimination of "back office" processing of ticket coupons, physical security for ticket stock, and cumbersome procedures for refunding lost tickets, rather than from simply eliminating the printing of tickets

themselves. Those **advantages** would be unaffected by **notice procedures** such as those described in **this** document. We request specific comments on the monetary costs and the **benefits** of **implementing** the notice **procedures** discussed **above**.

The **procedures** discussed in this Notice are not new ones. As indicated above, over the past year we have communicated our views on this issue to several **carriers that** offer ticketless **travel, and we have shared them** with the Air Transport **Association** of America. In the two recent rulemakings mentioned above in which the Department has proposed new written notices to be given to passengers on code-sharing flights or change-of-gauge **flights**, the proposed provisions have been phrased to require the notices "at the time of sale" rather than on or with a "ticket." The code-sharing **proposal** states in the Supplementary Information **section** that "[T]he separate written notice requirement would apply whether or not the consumer is given an actual ticket to **evidence** the transportation"

It has been suggested that requiring ticketless passengers to be given written information is inconsistent with the fact that many airline passengers make reservations in advance but pickup their tickets at the airport. We seek comment on this point, because we see no direct inconsistency. The existing rules on ticket notices state that the notices are to be provided on or **with** the ticket. If the **ticket** is not furnished until the **passenger** arrives at the airport, that is when the **passenger completes** the contract with the carrier and should receive the notices, even if he or she had made a telephone **reservation two** weeks earlier. A passenger who makes a reservation by phone but purchases the ticket at the airport is not putting his or her money at risk at the time of the telephone reservation, nor is he or she entering into a contract at that point.

On the other hand, we recognize that it may not be uncommon for a passenger to purchase a ticket by credit card over the telephone a **few** days before departure, leaving insufficient time for the ticket to be mailed and requiring that it be picked up at the airport, at which time the required notices would first be provided. We ask for comments on the number of travelers who may purchase air travel in this manner and whether there have been any specific problems associated with **such** travelers not receiving required notices until they receive their ticket upon arrival at the airport. We ask that **commenters** address specific reasons for any problems or lack of problems experienced by

travelers in this area (e.g., **Am short-** notice purchases **likely** to be most common among business **persons or** other **frequent** travelers **who may** already be **familiar** with **contract** terms provided in required notices?).

It has also been suggested that there is no justification for requiring such written notices on ticketless transactions in the airline industry **when reservations** for hotel rooms and rental **cars are** routinely made by telephone; with **merely a confirmation** number being given to **the** customer. However, these services are seldom paid for **in full** at the time of the reservation, and there is generally more flexibility to change reservations than is the case on a discount airline ticket. Also, few hotel or car rental transactions are subject to the terms of a **50-page** contract of carriage as is common **in air** travel; Finally, state and local governments **are** not preempted from regulating hotel stays and car rentals, but those levels of government are preempted by federal law from regulating air carrier rates, routes or services. Nonetheless, comments on this issue are welcome.

The Department wishes to arrive at the most efficient and flexible means of delivering necessary consumer information without hindering the development of ticketless travel. To that end, we seek comment on all aspects of the **agency views** expressed in this Notice, especially with respect to **any** increased costs that may be imposed by adherence to the notice procedures **which** we have recommended and which are discussed above.

An electronic version of this document is available at <http://www.dot.gov/dotinfo/general/rules/aviation.html>

Issued this 5th day of **January, 1996** at **Washington, DC.**

Mark I. Gerchick,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

FR Doc. 96-546 Filed 1-18-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-62-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Parts 230, 239, and 270

[Release Nos. 33-7263; IC-21663; S7-32-95]

RIN 3235-AG63

Calculation of Yield by Certain Unit Investment Trusts

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Proposed amendments to rules and forms; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Commission is extending from January 29, 1996 to March 29, 1996 the comment period for Investment Company Act Release No. 21538. This release proposed for public comment rule and form amendments that would require certain unit investment trusts ("UITs") to use a uniform formula to calculate yields quoted in their prospectuses, advertisements, and sales literature.

DATES: Comments on the proposed amendments should be received on or before March 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted in triplicate to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. All comment letters should refer to File No. S7-32-95. All comments received will be available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anthony R. Bosch, Senior Attorney, Office of Disclosure and Adviser Regulation, (202) 942-0721, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 22, 1995 the Commission published Investment Company Act Release No. 21538 which proposed for comment rule and form amendments that would standardize the calculation of yield quoted in the prospectuses, advertisements, and sales literature of certain UITs.¹ The Commission requested that comments on the proposal be received by January 29, 1996.

In a letter dated December 14, 1995 the Investment Company Institute ("ICI") requested a 60-day extension for the period for commenting on the proposal.² The ICI requested the extension to allow additional time for further research, data generation, analysis, and discussion.

To permit additional time for research, data generation, analysis, and discussion and in light of the importance of comments on this subject, the Commission believes that a 60-day extension is appropriate. The comment

¹ Investment Company Act Rel. No. 21538 (Nov. 2, 1995) [60 FR 61454 (Nov. 29, 1995)].

² Letter from Craig S. Tyle, Vice President and Senior Counsel, Investment Company Institute, to Barry P. Barbash, Director, Division of Investment Management (Dec. 14, 1995).

January 1996

IATA/ICC Aviation Liability Disputes Resolution (Arbitration)

Background

One of the major objectives of the IIA is to reduce litigation. Since the new system provides for “full recoverable compensatory damages”, there will no longer be any need “to break the liability limits”, and Warsaw Article 25 and a charge of “willful misconduct” will be virtually moot. In the vast majority of future disputes under the IIA, the sole issue in contention will be the **quantum** of damages.

Dispute Resolution

Litigation on quantum alone will, by definition, be easier, cheaper and quicker. Nevertheless it would still involve the judicial system, some choice of law issues, and be subject to the vagaries of a judicial calendar. If the claimant were to have the option of an acceptable, speedy and inexpensive alternative means of dispute resolution, it is quite likely that litigation could be further drastically reduced.

IIA Arbitration Proposal

The proposed alternative dispute resolution system is designed to:

- make arbitration very attractive to claimants, as opposed to litigation
- provide for effective and speedy decisions
- eliminate the possibility of non-quantum issues adversely affecting settlement
- remove the cost burden from the claimant
- assure the airline (and claimant) that decisions will be equitable and reasoned
- provide for subsequent review, where warranted, *e.g.* in cases of serious injury leading to possible additional medical expenses

In essence, the system could work as follows -

- ◆ IIA signatory carriers would agree in advance on the composition of **five** arbitral panels of (10 - 15) arbitrators each, from the main geographical areas of the world (Africa/Middle East, Asia, Europe, Latin America/Caribbean, and North America)
- ◆ The arbitrators would be eminent individuals with impeccable credentials, experienced in a directly relevant field *e.g.* aviation law, aviation insurance, accident compensation etc.

- + following an accident, when a claimant chooses to seek redress under the IIA (as opposed to his/her inalienable right to claim under Warsaw/Hague), and the airline and claimant could not agree on compensation, the latter would be offered the right to select a single arbitrator or a panel of three from the pre-agreed list for the geographical region he/she chooses
- ◆ the claimant would be guaranteed that -
 - a) within (60) days of all relevant material having been submitted to the arbitrator(s), a decision **will** be rendered;
 - b) the airline would accept the decision and pay the award within (30) days;
 - c) all the costs of the arbitration would be borne by the airline; and
 - d) should the arbitrator(s) so stipulate, the question of possible further payments to the claimant on account of serious injury with undefined medical prognosis could be reviewed within a fixed timeframe.

Benefits to the Airline

- 3 minimise the likelihood of Warsaw/Hague litigation and attendant costs
- ⇒ elimination of adverse publicity from lengthy legal cases
- 3 building up of a body of arbitration “jurisprudence” setting out realistic compensation levels in different regions of the world (leading to more “predictability”)
- ⇒ ability to set arbitrators’ fees in advance
- 3 satisfy governments, and the travelling public, that the system is fair and defensible
- 3 avoid legal/jurisdictional difficulties associated with quantum payable “according to. the law of the passenger’s domicile” since arbitration will automatically take this into account.



RECEIVED BY
IATA LEGAL DEPARTMENT
01 FEB 1996

26 January 1996

Mr. Lorne S. Clark
General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
International Air Transport Association
Geneva


Dear Mr. Clark,

This will refer to the preliminary exchanges between IATA and the ICC concerning possible arrangements for alternative dispute resolution, which could be linked as an option to the implementation mechanisms of the IATA Inter-carrier Agreement (IIA). The **organisational** meeting of the IATA/ICC Working Party on Aviation Liability Dispute Resolution, held in Paris on the 26th of January, was very useful in our view, and we look forward to cooperating with IATA on these matters over the next few months.

We note your belief that it would be **useful** to include some IATA Members airline representatives in the Working Party, and understand that you will raise this at the Legal Meeting on Liability to take place in Miami at the end of the month. We agree that such participation would indeed be **helpful** and look forward to the results of your consultations with the carriers. Meanwhile we are proceeding with the preparation of the documentation for the first substantive meeting of the Working Party on 1 March. Let me also say that this initiative, designed to try and reduce litigation on Warsaw Convention disputes and provide a speedy, **effective** and attractive alternative, is timely and should be well received by governments, consumer groups and the air transport industry at large.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,



Jean-Charles Rouher
Secretary General



**EXTRACT FROM MINUTES TAKEN AT THE 51ST IATA AGM,
KUALA LUMPUR, 30-31 OCTOBER 1995**

IATA INTERCARRIER AGREEMENT

Chairman of the Board of Governors, Ron Allen (Delta Airlines) noted the four Resolutions which were being submitted for AGM approval. The first Resolution pertained to the **Intercarrier Agreement on Passenger Liability and the 1975 Montreal Protocol Number 4**, dealing with cargo. The Chairman noted that governments, carriers and interested groups had struggled for some forty years with the limits of liability for passengers. Due to the inability to obtain consensus to update the Warsaw Treaty System, many governments had, over recent years, taken individual action, and others were contemplating such action. The danger was that the proliferation of national systems of liability would lead to exactly the type of situation the Warsaw Convention was designed to avoid.

The Chairman explained the background to the development of the Intercarrier Agreement which was being presented for endorsement by the AGM. The Airline Liability Conference, held in Washington D.C. in June 1995, and chaired by IATA's General Counsel, had established Working Groups in which a number of legal experts from Member airlines participated. The Intercarrier Agreement had been painstakingly drafted by these groups and subsequently approved by IATA's Legal Advisory Group. It had been endorsed by the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) as well as by several Regional Associations, and the Board of Governors had endorsed the Resolution at its meeting the previous day.

The Chairman believed the 1995 AGM had an historic role in considering endorsement of the Intercarrier Agreement and he commended the Agreement to Delegates as a viable compromise solution which should be broadly supported.

Regarding Montreal Protocol No. 4, which dealt with cargo, the Chairman noted that, although this instrument had never been contentious, it had historically been tied to ratification of Montreal Protocol No. 3 on passenger liability. The Chairman urged rapid action to promote separate ratification of Montreal Protocol No. 4 as its entry into force would remove the major legal obstacle to the use of electronic air waybills for international cargo shipments, with significant cost savings for carriers and the industry at large.

The President called Delegates' attention to a recommendation of the Board of Governors that the AGM adopt a Resolution on the Intercarrier Agreement on Passenger Liability and 1975 Montreal Protocol No. 4 on Cargo. Mr Bloch (TA) said he was pleased to propose a motion to adopt the Resolution. His airline's representative, Mrs Ana de Montenegro, had been elected Rapporteur of the Washington Airline Liability Conference in June and since that time TACA had worked closely with IATA and aviation lawyers around the world in the development and drafting of the Intercarrier Agreement. Mr Bloch commended IATA for its leadership and bold vision and advised that, as CEO of his airline, he would be among the first signatories of the Intercarrier Agreement. Mr Bloch respectfully urged Delegates to unanimously adopt the Resolution.

Mr Loepfe (SR) seconded the motion. Mr Yamaji (JL) said he fully supported the Resolution. His company had worked closely with IATA and airlines in the development of the umbrella Agreement which he believed would preserve the Warsaw System and provide better protection for passengers. There was universal recognition that today's liability limits were out of date and the successful implementation of the new Intercarrier Agreement would avoid the need for governments to take unilateral action to provide higher liability limits for their nationals. Mr Yamaji stated the new Agreement was an important achievement by IATA which would modernise and update the liability regime in a manner likely to survive into the next century. He was proud to be among the first signatories of the Intercarrier Agreement, which would include representatives from each major geographical area. Finally, Mr Yamaji expressed thanks to the Director General, the Secretariat, and particularly to the Chairman of the Airline Liability Conference, for their devoted efforts in developing a realistic and broadly acceptable Agreement.

There being no further comment and no opposition, the President declared the motion carried and the Resolution adopted. The text of the Resolution is set out in the Final Resolutions (Appendix) to these Minutes.

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

1775 K STREET, N. W.
 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
 (202) 429-7000

BERT W. REIN
 (202) 429-7080

FACSIMILE
 (202) 429-7048

January 29, 1996

Lorne Clark, Esq.
 General Counsel
 International Air Transport Assoc.
 2000 Peel Street
 Montreal, P.Q.
 CANADA H3A 2R4

VIA FAX

Dear Lorne:

We understand that IATA intends to convene a LAG Subcommittee meeting in Miami commencing 31 January 1996. That meeting will consider a number of issues relating to implementation of the IATA Inter-carrier Agreement ("IIA"), including the possibility of a Supplementary Inter-carrier Agreement ("SIA") harmonizing IIA implementation globally or on routes to/from/through the United States. IATA seeks to benefit from the immunity granted by Order 96-1-25 in conducting the Miami meeting. In that connection, you have requested our views on the limitations (if any) arising from footnote 6 (p. 3) of that Order.

Order 96-1-25 granted IATA's December 22, 1995 request for an extension of the immunity granted to IATA by Order 95-7-15. In its application, IATA specifically requested immunity broad enough to cover my discussion "directed toward producing an acceptable passenger liability regime under the Warsaw Convention." IATA explained that this broad formulation was required because "[a] number of carriers participating in the ALC have, however, not yet concluded that a universal implementing agreement is necessary or desirable for any routes, including routes to and from the United States." (App. p. 6). IATA thus sought to avoid a narrower scope of discussion immunity which would have permitted only discussions "to develop an inter-carrier agreement for implementation of the IATA Inter-carrier Agreement," (Id. p. 5).

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

Lorne Clark
January 29, 1996 .
Page 2

ordering Paragraph 1 of Order 96-1-25 adopts IATA's requested scope language, Ordering paragraph 3 imposes certain notification, reporting and agreement approval conditions on discussions pursuant to Paragraph 1 but does not limit the scope of those discussions.' In discussing the scope of immunity accorded, Order 96-1-25 specifically recognizes IATA's concern that not all carriers believe an implementing agreement to be necessary or desirable and acknowledges that the "immunity granted" is 'sufficient to permit carriers, on an individual basis, to express their views in this regard.' (Order 96-i-25, pp. 2-3). Footnote 6 further observes that DOT "would not consider, however, that the immunity would extend to any collective understanding that there should be no such Agreement." (*Id.* p. 3, emphasis added).

By its own terms, footnote 6 does not deal with discussion, as such, but relates only to "collective understanding." What it seeks to prohibit is a joint determination -- by resolution, motion or other consensus means -- that no implementation agreement should be entered into by any carrier. In other words, DOT is prepared to see the failure, or even abandonment, of an IATA implementing initiative but it is not prepared to immunize a joint effort to foreclose the independent development of implementing agreements by regional associations or ad hoc carrier groups.²

We understand that IATA has no intention of considering any "collective understanding" that an implementing agreement should not go forward at Miami. To the contrary, IATA intends to explore fully the possibility of reaching such an agreement on a global or regional basis. In that context, participants in the meeting may express and consider a position that such an agreement is unnecessary, undesirable or unachievable so long

¹ We understand that IATA intends fully to comply with the conditions in Ordering Paragraph 3.

² DOT's objective is, as stated in Order 96-1-25, "to achieve the maximum U.S. and foreign carrier participation in the development of a single liability regime that conforms to the Department's guidelines to be applicable to and from the United States." (*Id.*, p. 3). DOT anticipates the possibility that it would base its "proposed regulations" on "an agreement developed by the carriers and approved by us." (*Id.*, f.n. 7). Thus, DOT seeks to foreclose a joint effort to inhibit the development of any implementing agreement which could provide a "voluntary" foundation for U.S. regulatory action.

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

Lorne Clark
January 29, 1996
Page 3

as no "collective understanding" to that effect is sought or
reached. In these circumstances, and given IATA's intentions,
we do not believe that footnote 6 of Order 96-1-25 impose6 any
significant limitation on the conduct of the Miami meeting.

Sincerely yours,



Bert W. Rein

BWR: lhw

Electronic Ticketing

An ad hoc working group of the LAG met in Geneva January 17th and 18th to review the legal issues associated with Electronic Ticketing for international transportation.

IATA's Director of Passenger Services made a presentation and participated in the meeting to provide technical expertise. In addition a list of specific questions was submitted to the working group by the Passenger Services Conference.

While the operations people would prefer to eliminate all paper, they accept that certain documentation will be necessary and their initial implementation scenarios have always contemplated distribution of some documents. The mandate of the legal group is to determine the minimum requirements and develop options for delivery to the passenger.

It was taken as given by the Group that notwithstanding the IIA, carriers will insist that electronic ticketing provide all necessary notices to comply with Warsaw and to ensure their conditions of contract and carriage are enforceable.

It was the unanimous view that there are no insurmountable legal obstacles. In its simplest form, the "wallet" delivered today would be mailed to the passenger, or delivered at check-in.

Individual members of the group are preparing papers on a **specific** list of agreed issues for **the next** meeting, to be held in Montreal in mid-Mar&.

The issues discussed and being researched by the Group are essentially those set out in the recent DOT Request for Comments on Electronic Ticketing (attached).

21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on January 10, 1999.

Darrell H. Pederson,
Acting Manager, Transport Airplane
Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
[FR Doc. 96-493 Filed 1-18-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

14 CFR Chapter II

(Docket No. OST-96-993; Notice 96-1)

RIN 2105-AC36

Ticketless Travel: Passenger Notices

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOT.

ACTION: Request for Comments.

SUMMARY: The Department is seeking comment on passenger notice requirements as applied to ticketless air travel. This action is taken on the Department's initiative.

DATES: Comments on the issues discussed in this document should be received by March 19, 1996. Late-filed comments will be considered to the extent practicable.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to Docket Clerk, Docket No. OST-96-993, Room PL-401, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590. For the convenience of persons who will be reviewing the docket, it is requested that commenters provide an original and three copies of their comments.

Comments can be inspected from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Commenters who wish the receipt of their comments to be acknowledged should include a stamped, self-addressed postcard with their comments. The docket clerk will date-stamp the postcard and mail it to the commenter. Comments should be on 8 1/2 by 11 inch white paper using dark ink and should be without tabs and unbound.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Kelly, Aviation Consumer Protection Division, Office of Aviation Enforcement and Proceedings, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW, Room 10405, Washington, DC 20590, telephone (202) 366-5952.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Various DOT regulations require U.S. and foreign air carriers to provide consumer notices on or with passenger tickets. These notices provide information about protections afforded

by federal regulations, limitations on carrier liability, and contract terms that passengers may not otherwise be aware of. These ticket notice requirements are listed below.

Subject/Source (14 CFR)

Oversales—§ 250.11

Domestic baggage liability—§ 254.5

International baggage liability—

§ 221.176

Domestic contract of carriage terms—

§ 253.5

Terms of electronic tariff

(international)—§ 221.177(b)

Refund penalties (domestic)—§ 253.7

Fare increases (international)—

§ 221.174

Death/injury liability limits

(international)—§ 221.175

Over the past few years, a number of airlines have begun selling air service with "ticketless travel," also known as "electronic ticketing." Under this concept a passenger or travel agent calls the airline, makes a reservation and purchases the transportation during the call, typically by credit card. No "ticket," as that document has traditionally been configured, is issued. Instead, the passenger is orally given a confirmation number and/or is sent a written itinerary. Upon checking in at the airport the passenger simply provides his or her name, furnishes identification, and is given a boarding pass or other document that is used to gain access to the aircraft.

The Department of Transportation supports the development of ticketless travel. The process has the potential to reduce carrier and agent costs, and thereby costs to consumers, and to make air transportation easier to purchase. At the same time, the Department has been concerned that necessary information in the passenger notices described above be provided to all passengers in a ticketless environment at a time and in a manner that makes the information useful. A number of carriers that offer ticketless travel have approached the Department and asked what procedures we would find to be acceptable in this area. In response, we have pointed out the importance of providing the same general level and timeliness of notice that is presently required for traditionally-ticketed passengers, as indicated in the discussion that follows. As far as we are aware, virtually all carriers that offer ticketless travel are providing those notices in the manner and at the time that we have recommended.

We realize that this is a dynamic area of air transportation. We are publishing this Federal Register notice in order to seek comment on all aspects of the issue

of consumer notices in a ticketless air travel environment so that unnecessary documentation burdens can be eliminated, consistent with providing needed information to consumers in a timely fashion.

Discussion

At the time that the various passenger notice requirements described above were issued, all passengers received tickets. It appears that the ticket was chosen as the means for conveying required consumer information simply because tickets were a universally-available medium for documenting the carrier/passenger contract of carriage and providing notice in writing to individual passengers. We have found no evidence that the use of the word "ticket" in these notice rules contemplated that only airline passengers who receive traditional tickets are able and entitled to benefit from the information in these notices.

Indeed, there is ample evidence that these notice requirements were enacted in order to provide important information to all airline passengers. In issuing a rule requiring a ticket notice disclosing baggage liability limits, the Civil Aeronautics Board noted:

As we stated in EDR-182, inadequate knowledge by the traveling public of the limits on liability for loss of or damage to baggage has been a recurring source of consumer complaints and this continues to be the case. [T]he Board has determined that the traveling public is entitled to effective notice of both Warsaw Convention and other baggage liability limitations. [ER-691 Issued August 24, 1971; 36 FR 17034.]

In 1977 the Board issued a rule requiring a ticket notice disclosing overbooking practices. The agency stated:

... while we find nothing unlawful in a carrier's attempt to insulate itself against a common law action of fraudulent misrepresentation by filing a tariff rule, such carrier and its agents should be required to provide the passenger with actual notice of its overbooking practices. Although, as the carriers point out, a passenger may be legally presumed to have knowledge of a carrier's tariffs, it is clearly unrealistic to expect passengers to have actual knowledge of the contents of tariffs. [ER-987 issued February 28, 1977; 42 FR 12420.1]

In 1962, as domestic tariffs were being phased out, the Board issued a rule permitting carriers to continue to incorporate terms by reference into contracts with passengers, as they had with tariffs, but requiring a ticket notice disclosing the existence of the incorporated terms. The rule also required specific notice of certain terms affecting the refundability of the fare. The Board stated that it wanted to:

... make sure that the traveling public are able to find out the terms they are buying into whenever they purchase an airline ticket, so that they can make an informed choice of carrier, class and flight, and protect themselves (for example, by buying extra insurance) against undesired risks. . . . This rule is intended to alert passengers, and prospective passengers, that important terms are incorporated in ticket contracts. . . . [ER-1302 issued September 27, 1982; 47 FR 52134; 14 CFR Part 253.1

One of the primary concerns of airlines at the time that the rule permitting continued incorporation of contract terms (14 CFR Part 253) was adopted was the possibility of being subjected to widely divergent standards involving notice of contract terms by the courts of many different states which might have jurisdiction over their contracts. Part 253 preempts state courts from involvement in the issue of notice of contract terms, so long as carriers comply with its provisions. Presumably, carriers that offer ticketless travel want to incorporate contract terms by reference and take advantage of liability limitations to the same extent as carriers that issue tickets. However, it is open to question whether courts will view a carrier's contract of carriage to be enforceable by a carrier if a consumer does not receive timely written notice of its applicability to the air transportation being purchased. At this point, we continue to believe that Part 253 strikes a balance between the Department's responsibility to protect consumers and its desire to allow airlines the maximum flexibility possible for their business decisions. Accordingly, for the same reasons that were cited when the part 253 disclosure rules were enacted, both carriers and passengers could face increased risks if notice of the incorporated contract of carriage terms were not to be provided to ticketless passengers in a timely fashion. We seek comment on whether carriers selling ticketless travel expect that their respective contracts of carriage will apply to the purchased transportation. We also seek comment on the costs and the benefits of providing notice of any incorporated contract of carriage terms to ticketless passengers within a few days after the purchase transaction, and the methods by which this could be accomplished. In addition to comments on all of the above issues, we specifically ask for comment on the issue of preemption if carriers do not provide written notice to ticketless passengers similar to that required under part 253.

In addition to conveying consumer notices, an airline ticket serves as a record of the passenger's reservation.

The definition of "confirmed reserved space" in the Department's denied boarding rule (14 CFR § 250.1) is:

... space on a specific date and on a specific flight and class of service of a carrier which has been requested by a passenger and which the carrier or its agent has verified, by appropriate notation on the ticket or in any other manner provided therefor by the carrier, as being reserved for the accommodation of the passenger.

Thus, if a passenger has a ticket reflecting confirmed reserved space (generally indicated by the notation "OK" in the Status field), that passenger has a reservation for purposes of our denied boarding rule even if the carrier cannot locate the reservation in the computer. Under that rule, that passenger is entitled to compensation if not boarded. Ticketless passengers could be at a disadvantage in this regard if there is no evidence in their possession of having a reservation on a particular flight. The confirmation number provided at the time of the purchase may help the carrier locate the reservation, but if the computer record cannot be found, the confirmation numbers now being used may not establish the passenger has a reservation on the specific flight for which he or she is checking in. Therefore, failure to provide confirmed passengers with an adequate written record of the confirmation could lead to numerous disputes between airlines and passengers regarding entitlement to denied boarding compensation as required by part 250. Such a written record could be the confirmation number alone, if the carrier has a system that allows airport agents to use a confirmation number to determine the status of the reservation associated with that number without resort to its computer reservation system (e.g., by using a coded confirmation number). However, if a carrier does not have a procedure free of reliance on a single computer reservation system, in order to achieve the same end it may be advisable for a written record of the reservation to be sent to the passenger at the time of the purchase to identify the specific flights, dates and classes of service purchased by the passenger, consistent with section 250.1. We ask for comments on whether passengers in a ticketless environment should receive evidence of their confirmed reservation independent of a carrier's computer reservation system and, if so, by what means.

Another issue raised by ticketless travel is that the passenger may have no record issued by the carrier or its agent of the fare that was quoted to and

accepted by the passenger during the telephone call or other transaction with the transportation was purchased. The charge record from the passenger's credit card company may not arrive in the mail until after the flight, and should there be a disagreement at check-in over the correct fare, the passenger would have no evidence of the amount that he or she had agreed to pay. Although airline tickets contain fare information, no existing rule requires such a written record of the fare, and thus some carriers may not wish to create one for ticketless passengers. However, to the extent that written material is given to ticketless passengers in order to address other issues discussed here, providing a written record of the fare (perhaps generated from the record of the purchase transaction) would obviate many potential disputes over the amount of the fare. Comments are invited on how carriers deal with fare disputes with all passengers, but particularly with passengers who purchase tickets by phone, and on how often such disputes occur.

To the extent that carriers revise their systems as a result of any of the issues discussed in this Notice, it may be easier to incorporate fare information now than to have to add it later. It is likely that many business travelers will need a written statement of the fare for expense reports in any event. Providing fare documentation on a ticketless transaction may encourage more business travelers to use the system, which may in turn reduce carrier costs. We seek comment on the desirability and practicality of providing fare information in writing to ticketless passengers.

Article 3, section 2 of the Warsaw Convention (49 Stat. 3000.49 U.S.C.A. 1502) requires that before a carrier can assert Warsaw liability limits for personal injury or death or for lost or damaged baggage with respect to a particular international passenger, the carrier must provide that passenger a ticket which states, *inter alia*, that the transportation is subject to the Convention's rules. This issue will need to be addressed.

Ticketless carriers that are providing consumer notices as we have recommended have been furnishing those notices in writing. We have advised those carriers that written notice could be provided through electronic text media such as "e-mail" and faxes. Oral notice during a telephone transaction alone would not meet the requirements of the current regulations that apply to ticket notices. The consumer notices that currently

appear on tickets are lengthier than the brief oral notice now required for code-sharing (14 CFR § 399.88) and the more detailed notices proposed for code-sharing and change-of-gauge service (59 FR 40836 and 60 FR 3778). In addition, the code-sharing and change-of-gauge disclosures are alerts about a single fact, while the ticket notices contain more-detailed information that passengers may want to refer to during check-in or even after the flight (e.g., in the event of a problem). Finally, a written notice avoids disputes over what was said. To the extent that information in the notices currently required on tickets is provided to ticketless passengers, we seek comment on whether we should specify the methods by which this information should be transmitted and the timing of such notice.

We have stated to carriers that have contacted us about ticketless travel that the intent of the current regulations for notices on tickets is to ensure that the notices to passengers are provided in conjunction with the purchase transaction. Consistent with this concept, we have advised these carriers that we believe that on a ticketless sale the notices should be sent to the purchaser (via mail, fax, "e-mail," personal delivery, or other timely means) within a few days after the purchase transaction. The purposes of the consumer notices may not be served if they are handed to passengers as they check in at the airport, or put in a queue to be mailed just before each passenger's flight. It is at the time of the purchase transaction that a passenger puts his or her money at risk on a restricted fare, and also enters into a contract. Passengers may wish to take certain actions before the flight as a result of reading the consumer notices, such as purchasing additional insurance or packing differently (e.g., putting expensive items in a carry-on bag). At the same time, we have also advised carriers that we recognize that if a passenger makes a ticketless purchase only a few days before departure and it would be impossible or unreasonably costly to get the required written material to him or her before the day of the flight, it may be necessary to provide this written material upon check-in at the airport. Such a procedure is similar to that now followed when tickets purchased by telephone within a few days of departure cannot be mailed due to the lack of time. We seek comment on the question of when any notices, if required, should be provided.

Some carriers have introduced machines that accept a credit card or "smart card." If the machine delivers a standard ticket, the required

information must be on the ticket, pursuant to the Department's current regulations on ticket notices. If the machine processes a ticketless sale, a page containing the required information could be printed out with each transaction, or the machine could print the passenger-specific data (i.e., confirmation information and fare) on a receipt and a supply of the consumer, notices could be kept in a container attached to the machine with a sign asking customers to take one. We seek comment on whether written notices, if required, should be provided during such transactions, and how they should be furnished. Should passengers who read and sign special "disclosure forms," which provide all currently required notices, in order to obtain a "smart card" also receive notices with each air transportation purchase?

Several airlines and Computer Reservations System vendors allow subscribers of commercial online services to make reservations and purchase air transportation (both ticketed and ticketless) online. A number of airlines have established home pages on the World Wide Web, raising the prospect of electronic sales of air transportation via that medium. To the best of our knowledge, most current online sales of air transportation result in the mailing of a ticket, which should normally include the required notices. However, in the case of an online ticketless purchase (as opposed to simply a reservation), the question arises whether the consumer information that currently appears on or with tickets should be provided, and if so, how. One way to do this would be to offer a prominent, convenient and inexpensive (in terms of connect-time charges) option for the passenger to download or print the notices during the purchase transaction. Another would be to "e-mail" the notices to the passenger's "e-mail" address. Simply advising the customer that the consumer information is available to be read elsewhere online may not be adequate, just as it would not be satisfactory in a conventional ticketing transaction for the seller to tell the passenger where he or she could locate the required notices. Comments on these issues are invited.

The current regulations concerning ticket notices state that the notices must appear on tickets issued by travel agents. In two recent rulemakings the Department has proposed new written notices to be given to passengers who book code-sharing flights or change-of-gauge flights. Those proposed rules specifically take ticketless travel into account, and they would, if adopted, require that the written disclosure

proposed in those rules be given to persons who book through travel agents. See 59 FR 40836, August 10, 1994, "Disclosure of Code-Sharing Arrangements and Long-Term Wet Leases," and 60 FR 3778, January 19, 1995, "Disclosure of Change-of-Gauge Services." Those who comment on this notice on ticketless travel should be aware that the conclusions and analysis set forth here do not reflect any of the comments filed in the two dockets cited above. Any party that filed comments in those dockets on the issue of disclosure by travel agents is invited to file similar comments here.

We are currently of the view that providing timely written notice to ticketless passengers should not be unduly burdensome to carriers. The various procedures discussed in this Notice would represent no increase in required passenger notices; implementing the procedures (which we have previously recommended to carriers) would simply mean that the written information that has in the past been required to be provided to all passengers should continue to be provided to all passengers. We believe that virtually all carriers that offer ticketless travel have been following all of the procedures described in this Notice since last year, and doing so does not appear to have inhibited their ticketless programs. The high level of adherence to the ticketless travel notice procedures recommended by us and described in this Notice is, in part, attributable to the fact that it is in the best interests of the carriers and their customers to adopt such a system, as well as the apparent ease of following those procedures.

The notices in question would easily fit on the front and back of a single 8 1/2 by 11 inch sheet of paper. If formatted differently or if the international notices are not provided to domestic passengers, the notices fit on the front of a single sheet. (The Department's Aviation Consumer Protection Division has created a sample sheet which is available by contacting the individual listed at the beginning of this notice under "For Further Information." It is also available electronically through the World Wide Web at <http://www.dot.gov/dotinfo/general/rules/aviation.html>)

Some airlines that have implemented or studied ticketless travel have stated that most of the cost savings result from the elimination of "back office" processing of ticket coupons, physical security for ticket stock, and cumbersome procedures for refunding lost tickets, rather than from simply eliminating the printing of tickets

themselves. **Those advantages** would be unaffected by notice **procedures** such as those described in this document. We request **specific** comments on the monetary costs and the benefit of implementing the notice procedures discussed above.

The procedures discussed in this Notice are not new ones. As indicated above, over the past year we have communicated our view on **this** issue to several carriers that **offer ticketless travel, and we have shared them** with the Air Transport Association of America. In the two recent rulemakings mentioned above in **which the** Department has proposed new written notices to be given to passengers on code-sharing flights or change-of-gauge flights, the proposed provisions have been phrased to require the notices "at the time of sale" rather than on or with a "ticket." The **code-sharing proposal** states in the Supplementary information section that "[T]he separate written notice requirement would **apply** whether or not the consumer is given an actual ticket to **evidence** the transportation"

It has been suggested that requiring ticketless passengers to be given written information is inconsistent **with** the fact that many airline passengers make reservations in advance but pick up their tickets at the airport. We seek comment on this point, because we see no direct inconsistency. The existing rules on ticket notices state that the notices are to be provided on or with the ticket. **If** the ticket is not furnished until the passenger arrives at the airport, that is when the passenger completes the contract with the carrier and should receive the notices, even if he or she had made a telephone **reservation two** weeks earlier. A passenger who makes a reservation by phone but purchases the ticket at the airport is not putting his or her **money at risk at the time** of the telephone reservation, nor is he or she entering **into a** contract at that point.

On the other hand, we recognize that it may not be **uncommon** for a passenger to purchase a ticket by credit card over the telephone 8 few days before departure, leaving insufficient time for the ticket to be mailed and requiring that it be picked up at the airport, at which **time** the required notice would first be provided. We ask for comments on the number of **travelers** who may purchase air travel in this manner and whether there have been **any specific** problems associated with such travelers not receiving required notices until they receive their ticket upon arrival at the airport. We ask that commenters address specific reasons for any problems or lack of problems experienced by

travelers in this area (e.g., Am **short-notice** purchases likely to be most common **among** business **persons** or other **frequent** traveler **who may** already be **familiar** with contract terms **provided in required notices**?).

It has also **been** suggested that there **is** no justification for requiring **such** written notices on **ticketless** transactions in the airline industry when reservations for hotel room and rental **cars are** routinely made by telephone; **with merely a confirmation** number being given to the customer. However, these services are seldom paid for **in full** at the time of the reservation, and there is **generally** more flexibility to change reservations than is the case on a discount airline ticket. Also, few hotel or car rental transactions are subject to the **terms of a 50-page** contract of carriage as is common **in air travel**. Finally, state and local governments **are** not preempted from regulating hotel stays and car rentals, but those **levels** of government are preempted by federal law from regulating air carrier rates, routes or services. Nonetheless, comments on this issue are welcome.

The Department wishes to arrive at the most efficient and flexible means of delivering necessary consumer information without hindering the **development** of ticketless travel. To that **end**, we seek comment on all aspects of **the** agency views expressed in **this Notice**, especially with respect to **any increased** costs that may be imposed by **adherence** to the 'notice procedures **which** we have recommended and **which** are discussed above.

An electronic version of this document is available at <http://www.dot.gov/dot/info/general/rules/aviation.html>

Issued **this** 5th day of January, 1996 at Washington, DC.

Mark L. Gerchick,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 96-546 Filed 1-18-W 8:45 am]

ILLING CODE 4010-42-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Parts 230, 239, and 270

[Release Nos. 33-7253; IC-21663; S7-32-95]

RIN 3235-AG63

Calculation of Yield by Certain Unit Investment Trusts

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Proposed amendments to rules and forms; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Commission is extending from January 29, 1996 to March 29, 1996 the comment period for Investment Company Act Release No. 21538. This release proposed for public comment rule and form amendments that would require certain unit investment trusts ("UITs") to use a uniform formula to calculate yields quoted in their prospectuses, advertisements, and sales literature.

DATES: Comments on the proposed amendments should be received on or before March 29, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted in triplicate to Jonathan G. Katz, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. All comment letters should refer to File No. S7-32-95. All comments received will be available for public inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anthony R. Bosch, Senior Attorney, Office of Disclosure and Adviser Regulation, (202) 942-0721, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, 459 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 22, 1995 the Commission published Investment Company Act Release No. 21538 which proposed for comment rule and form amendments that would standardize the calculation of yield quoted in the prospectuses, advertisements, and sales literature of certain UITs.¹ The Commission requested that comments on the proposal be received by January 29, 1996.

In a letter dated December 14, 1995 the Investment Company Institute ("ICI") requested a 60-day extension for the period for commenting on the proposal.² The ICI requested the extension to allow additional time for further research, data generation, analysis, and discussion.

To permit additional time for research, data generation, analysis, and discussion and in light of the importance of comments on this subject, the Commission believes that a 60-day extension is appropriate. The comment

¹ Investment Company Act Rel. No. 21538 (Nov. 22, 1995) [60 FR 61454 (Nov. 29, 1995)].

² Letter from Craig S. Tyle, Vice President and Senior Counsel, Investment Company Institute, to Barry P. Barbash, Director, Division of Investment Management (Dec. 14, 1995).

January 1996

IATA/ICC Aviation Liability Disputes Resolution (Arbitration)

Background

One of the major objectives of the IIA is to reduce litigation. Since the new system provides for “full recoverable compensatory damages”, there will no longer be any need “to break the liability limits”, and Warsaw Article 25 and a charge of “willful misconduct” will be virtually moot. In the vast majority of future disputes under the IIA, the sole issue in contention will be the **quantum** of damages.

Dispute Resolution

Litigation on quantum alone will, by definition, be easier, cheaper and quicker. Nevertheless it would still involve the judicial system, some choice of law issues, and be subject to the vagaries of a judicial calendar. If the claimant were to have the option of an acceptable, speedy and inexpensive alternative means of dispute resolution, it is quite likely that litigation could be **further** drastically reduced.

IIA Arbitration Proposal

The proposed alternative dispute resolution system is designed to:

- make arbitration very attractive to claimants, as opposed to litigation
- provide for effective and speedy decisions
- eliminate the possibility of non-quantum issues adversely affecting settlement
- **remove** the cost burden from the claimant
- assure the airline (and claimant) that decisions **will** be equitable and reasoned
- provide for subsequent review, where warranted, e.g. in cases of serious injury leading to possible additional medical expenses

In essence, the system could work as follows -

- ◆ IIA signatory carriers would agree in advance on the composition of five arbitral panels of (10 - 15) arbitrators each, from the main geographical areas of the world (Africa/Middle East, Asia, Europe, Latin America/Caribbean, and North America)
- ◆ The arbitrators would be eminent individuals with impeccable credentials, experienced in a directly relevant field e.g. aviation law, aviation insurance, accident compensation etc.

- + following an accident, when a claimant chooses to seek redress under the IIA (as opposed to his/her inalienable right to claim under Warsaw/Hague), and the airline and claimant could not agree on compensation, the 'latter would be offered the right to select a single arbitrator or a panel of three from the pre-agreed list for the geographical region **he/she** chooses
- ◆ the claimant would be guaranteed that -
 - a) within (60) days of all relevant material having been submitted to the arbitrator(s), a decision will be rendered;
 - b) the airline would accept the decision and pay the award within (30) days;
 - c) all the costs of the arbitration would be borne by the airline; and
 - d) should the arbitrator(s) so stipulate, the question of possible **further** payments to the claimant on account of serious injury with undefined medical prognosis could be reviewed within a fixed timeframe.

Benefits to the Airline

- ⇒ minimise the likelihood of Warsaw/Hague litigation and attendant costs
- ⇒ elimination of adverse publicity from lengthy legal cases
- ⇒ building up of a body of arbitration “jurisprudence” setting out realistic compensation levels in different regions of the world (leading to more “predictability”)
- ⇒ ability to set arbitrators’ fees in advance
- ⇒ satisfy governments, and the travelling public, that the system is fair and defensible
- ⇒ avoid legal/jurisdictional difficulties associated with quantum payable “according to. the law of the passenger’s domicile” since arbitration will automatically take this into account.



RECEIVED BY
IATA LEGAL DEPARTMENT
01 FEB 1996

26 January 1996

Mr. Lorne S. Clark
General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
International Air Transport Association
Geneva

Dear Mr. Clark,

This will refer to the preliminary exchanges between IATA and the ICC concerning possible arrangements for alternative dispute resolution, which could be linked as **an** option to the implementation mechanisms of the IATA Inter-carrier Agreement (IIA). The **organisational** meeting of the IATA/ICC Working Party on Aviation Liability Dispute Resolution, held in Paris on the 26th of January, was very **useful** in our view, and we look forward to cooperating with IATA on these matters over the next few months.

We note your belief that it would be useful to include some IATA Members airline representatives in the Working Party, and understand that you will raise this at the Legal Meeting on Liability to take place in Miami at the end of the month. We agree that such participation would indeed be **helpful** and look forward to the results of your consultations with the carriers. Meanwhile we are proceeding with the preparation of the documentation **for** the first substantive meeting of the Working Party on 1 March. Let me also say that this initiative, designed to try and reduce litigation on Warsaw Convention disputes and provide a speedy, **effective** and attractive alternative, is timely and should be well received by governments, consumer groups and the air transport industry at large.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,


Jean-Charles Rouher
Secretary General



**EXTRACT FROM MINUTES TAKEN AT THE 51ST IATA AGM,
KUALA LUMPUR, 30-31 OCTOBER 1995**

IATA INTERCARRIER AGREEMENT

Chairman of the Board of Governors, Ron Allen (Delta Airlines) noted the four Resolutions which were being submitted for AGM approval. The first Resolution pertained to the **Intercarrier Agreement on Passenger Liability and the 1975 Montreal Protocol Number 4**, dealing with cargo. The Chairman noted that governments, carriers and interested groups had struggled for some forty years with the limits of liability for passengers. Due to the inability to obtain consensus to update the Warsaw Treaty System, many governments had, over recent years, taken individual action, and others were contemplating such action. The danger was that the proliferation of national systems of liability would lead to exactly the type of situation the Warsaw Convention was designed to avoid.

The Chairman explained the background to the development of the Intercarrier Agreement which was being presented for endorsement by the AGM. The Airline Liability Conference, held in Washington D.C. in June 1995, and chaired by IATA's General Counsel, had established Working Groups in which a number of legal experts from Member airlines participated. The Intercarrier Agreement had been painstakingly drafted by these groups and subsequently approved by IATA's Legal Advisory Group. It had been endorsed by the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) as well as by several Regional Associations, and the Board of Governors had endorsed the Resolution at its meeting the previous day.

The Chairman believed the 1995 AGM had an historic role in considering endorsement of the Intercarrier Agreement and he commended the Agreement to Delegates as a viable compromise solution which should be broadly supported.

Regarding Montreal Protocol No. 4, which dealt with cargo, the Chairman noted that, although this instrument had never been contentious, it had historically been tied to ratification of Montreal Protocol No. 3 on passenger liability. The Chairman urged rapid action to promote separate ratification of Montreal Protocol No. 4 as its entry into force would remove the major legal obstacle to the use of electronic air waybills for international cargo shipments, with significant cost savings for carriers and the industry at large.

The President called Delegates' attention to a recommendation of the Board of Governors that the AGM adopt a Resolution on the Intercarrier Agreement on Passenger Liability and 1975 Montreal Protocol No. 4 on Cargo. Mr Bloch (TA) said he was pleased to propose a motion to adopt the Resolution. His airline's representative, Mrs Ana de Montenegro, had been elected Rapporteur of the Washington Airline Liability Conference in June and since that time TACA had worked closely with IATA and aviation lawyers around the world in the development and drafting of the Intercarrier Agreement. Mr Bloch commended IATA for its leadership and bold vision and advised that, as CEO of his airline, he would be among the first signatories of the Intercarrier Agreement. Mr Bloch respectfully urged Delegates to unanimously adopt the Resolution.

Mr Loepfe (SR) seconded the motion. Mr Yamaji (JL) said he fully supported the Resolution. His company had worked closely with IATA and airlines in the development of the umbrella Agreement which he believed would preserve the Warsaw System and provide better protection for passengers. There was universal recognition that today's liability limits were out of date and the successful implementation of the new Intercarrier Agreement would avoid the need for governments to take unilateral action to provide higher liability limits for their nationals. Mr Yamaji stated the new Agreement was an important achievement by IATA which would modernise and update the liability regime in a manner likely to survive into the next century. He was proud to be among the first signatories of the Intercarrier Agreement, which would include representatives from each major geographical area. Finally, Mr Yamaji expressed thanks to the Director General, the Secretariat, and particularly to the Chairman of the Airline Liability Conference, for their devoted efforts in developing a realistic and broadly acceptable Agreement.

There being no further comment and no opposition, the President declared the motion carried and the Resolution adopted. The text of the Resolution is set out in the Final Resolutions (Appendix) to these Minutes.