



TMC NDC Adoption Blockers – a summary

This document is a summary of TMC blockers captured from stakeholders across the value chain [airlines, IT providers, GDS, new aggregators, OBTs and mid-back office IT providers and TMCs.]

A challenge makes the “blocker list” if it meets one of four criteria:

1. It prevents ticket issuance
2. No viable workarounds exist
3. Downstream processes are not served
4. There is significant impact to volume generation.

Solutions to these blockers may lie in any of these 3 areas:

1. Implementation: a change in the implementation of one or more parties in the distribution value chain
2. Mindset shifts (I do it like this today and so I need to be able to do it the same way tomorrow)
3. Standard: Missing implementation guidance to drive standardization or missing features

There are 9 blockers that have been captured to unlock TMC volume.

This document is a work in progress.

If you have feedback or would like to offer a solution to any of the blockers mentioned here, please [let us know here](#).

Contents

1. Missing data from airlines for downline processes (e.g. tax breakdown, reference to original order in servicing scenarios) 	3
2. TMC are receiving offer conditions and offer descriptions in different ways OR not at all 	4
3. Varied implementation of Price Guarantee time limits by airlines impacts approval processes 	5
4. Inability to service an order when a TMC is supported by multiple NDC API users: 	6
5. Existing queue capabilities and processes depending on passives need to be rebuilt 	7
6. Lack of automated involuntary servicing processes implemented by airlines 	8
7. OrderHistory not implemented by airlines 	9
8. Refund processing is not streamlined across the value chain, preventing downstream automation. 	10
9. Need for streamlined implementation processes when TMC requests multiple changes to an Order on the same day (exchange/void) scenario 	11

If you have feedback or would like to offer a solution to any of the blockers mentioned here, please [let us know here.](#)



Prevents ticket issuance



No workarounds exist



Significant impact to volume generation



Downstream processes are not served

1. Missing data from airlines for downline processes (e.g. tax breakdown, reference to original order in servicing scenarios)

1.1. The issue

The following data is inconsistently provided by airlines:

- Reference to the original order when changes result in an exchanged ticket
- Tax breakdown by passenger type in refund scenarios

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served e.g. impact on BSP reconciliation; tax breakdown on invoice

1.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines providing the data consistently in the OrderViewRS back to the TMC.

Standard documentation

A use case that demonstrates the value of providing these data elements.

1.3. The 2020 action

- Airline action – return the data required in this blocker
- TMC action -work with MBO and OBT partners to integrate new data elements

1.4. Owning groups

1.5. Other comments

2. TMC are receiving offer conditions and offer descriptions in different ways OR not at all

2.1. The issue

The following challenges refer to airline's description of their offers:

- Little or no information on corporate discounts and other valuable information such as loyalty benefits, payment benefits etc. that could unlock new volumes and help the TMC demonstrate savings to the corporate.
- Inconsistent way of communicating the fare rules - and it is often in free text [addressed in 19.2 Implementation Guide].
- Not all airlines believe the advance purchase, min/max stay and combinability rules are necessary in the NDC context and therefore it is not being returned in shopping flows.

Blocker because:

There is significant impact to volume generation for TMCs that need stronger justification in support of implementing NDC.

2.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines to return offers that demonstrate value to the TMC and corporate.

Airlines to return [offer rules in machine readable](#) format for streamlining processes at the TMC.

Airlines to return offers that reflect combinability conditions (CR discussions in place to standardize this approach) and conditions for ancillaries, not just the flight.

Standard documentation

Clear guidelines on when airlines should provide the offer rules - during AirShop or OfferPrice.

Mindset shift opportunities

For airlines, to be mindful of the TMC context and provide the full details to help them serve their clients.

For TMCs to set new expectations and appreciate that, for example, the min/max, advance purchase logic does not apply in many NDC airline flows.

2.3. The 2020 action

- Airline action – return the data required in this blocker
- TMC action – help travel consultants to set new expectations.

2.4. Owning groups

2.5. Other comments

3. Varied implementation of Price Guarantee time limits by airlines impacts approval processes

3.1. The issue

Not all airlines implement the price guarantee time limit (PGTL). And for those who do, the meaning of the PGTL is not consistent or the next steps to manage the order is not consistently implemented.

- Example, some airlines guarantee the fare only, some guarantee the fare + taxes
- If PGTL is not populated, in practice, TMCs are forced to use instant ticketing. For long hauls (higher prices) instant ticketing poses a challenge because of TMC approval processes.

Blocker because:

There is significant impact to volume generation for TMCs that need stronger justification in support of implementing NDC.

3.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines who implement PGTL, to know that TMCs would like the guarantee on the total amount, not just the base fare.

Price Guarantee is optional and an airline may choose to implement the offer time limit and payment time limits and not the PGTL. TMCs to build implementations to cover this difference.

Standard documentation

Implementation guidance around doing a reprice before OrderChange in the absence of price guarantee time limit.

Current implementation guidance is [here](#). To see how repricing of an Order can be used in conjunction with this time limit, see section **3.5.4.12** "*Order Repricing when Price Guarantee Time Limit has been exceeded, after Order has been created*" in the 17.2 Implementation Guide.

3.3. The 2020 action

3.4. Owning groups

3.5. Other comments

4. Inability to service an order when a TMC is supported by multiple NDC API users:

4.1. The issue

TMCs would like airlines to accept their request to service an order in the following use cases which match the setup of the TMC operations:

- TMC uses one IATA# to make the initial booking (order) and another IATA# to service the same order [e.g. robotics, offline ...]
- The TMC be able to service the order using multiple seller platforms or tools [e.g. OBT, aggregator, robotics...]

Blocker because:

Downstream processes aren't served.

4.2. The solution depends on

Standard

Deeper discussions are needed to develop API delegation in NDC.

Clarity on what the standard supports to identify API users so TMCs and airlines can streamline their implementations to match these requirements.

Implementation

There are different security models being implemented by airlines.

Implementations to align to the conclusions coming out of the broader issues of API delegation in NDC.

4.3. The 2020 action

4.4. Owning groups

4.5. Other comments

5. Existing queue capabilities and processes depending on passives need to be rebuilt

5.1. The issue

This is noted by TMCs as a commercial blocker.

It is largely around TMCs needing to put alternative solutions in place for airlines that don't support passives.

Processes triggered from queues that work from passives make this a blocker if no alternative in place.

It is noted that a queuing process for events such as schedule change, cancellation are still relevant in NDC.

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served when an alternative to passives is not in place. These include quality checks, integration with duty of care systems etc. that are built around passives.

5.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

TMCs need to build out alternate solutions to address the functionality that passives support in lieu of airlines and GDSs not supporting passives.

Mindset shift opportunity?

5.3. The 2020 action

5.4. Owning groups

5.5. Other comments

6. Lack of automated involuntary servicing processes implemented by airlines

6.1. The issue

The implementation of Order Change Notification differs from airline to airline.

- Not all airlines have implemented automated policies to support voluntary changes after invol change. Only some airlines support waiver codes.
- Disrupted services not communicated to TMCs in involuntary scenarios (e.g. paid meal or seat no longer available)

In addition, most airline sandboxes don't support disruption scenarios. This means TMCs cannot test their involuntary end to end flows with their NDC airline partner.

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served and impact to volume

6.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines to automate policies and procedures to support voluntary changes after an involuntary change.

Airlines / TMCs to leverage the statuses in the order to communicate / know about the impact of the disruption on paid services.

- Possible in 17.2. The OrderItem is pushed in the OCN without the services that were

cancelled, and the ActionType code is set to "update", Streamlined in 19.2.

Airline sandboxes to support disruption incl. during agent onboarding.

Note that 19.2 has functionality to streamline the options that the TMC need when receiving the notif from the airline

Mindset shift opportunity

In voluntary-after-involuntary scenarios, there is a potential mindset shift around the use of waivers.

6.3. The 2020 action

Sharing airline best practices from pre-19.2 implementations.

Airlines and TMCs to become familiar with the features introduced into 19.2 to enhance these processes. NDC InFocus on [Servicing in NDC](#) and the associated webinar are resources.

6.4. Owning groups

6.5. Other comments

19.2 has functionality to streamline the options that the TMC need when receiving the notification from the airline.

7. OrderHistory not implemented by airlines

7.1. The issue

Airlines have not implemented Order History.

[OrderHistory is the NDC message that agent systems use to get visibility of all changes made to the order.]

The impact of this is that

- TMCs may not have visibility of passenger changes made directly with the airline.
- If, for technical reasons, a notification was not communicated to the TMC, the Order History is the mechanism to 'catchup' on changes missed.

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served if this data is missing in the TMC systems.

7.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines, Aggregators, TMCs to implement OrderHistory

7.3. The 2020 action

Increase awareness of the advantages to the airline of implementing OrderHistory.

7.4. Owning groups

7.5. Other comments

19.2 has enhancements to streamline the OrderHistory capabilities, including a new version number element. This helps the TMC know if it missed an update.

8. Refund processing is not streamlined across the value chain, preventing downstream automation. 📌

8.1. The issue

Airlines solutions to make voluntary changes vary - APIs, airline portals, phone. This is inefficient for TMC operations.

Missing Order data returned to the TMC in the refund process. This includes

- Accountable document status
- Document data such as taxes, fees, penalty amount.
- Tax breakdown by passenger type

TMCs have various processes to check for potential / outstanding refunds:

- The status is used by travel consultants and robotics to check for potential refunds. Often the document status is not updated by the airline.
- OrderList is a mechanism that could allow TMCs get a list of NoShow orders.
 - o OrderList capability is not widely implemented by airlines

Refunds are not supported by all NDC aggregators

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served if this data is missing in the TMC systems.

8.2. The solution depends on

Implementation

Airlines to return the document data specified, including the statuses, in the OrderViewRS. This includes an effort in airline implementations to manage the orchestration between tickets/coupons and Order statuses.

Airlines to integrate voluntary changes in the API to streamline the processing of request refunds. This includes streamlining the value retained on unused tickets.

8.3. The 2020 action

Explore how the implementation of OrderList with the ability to search by coupon status, would help address this blocker in an NDC flow.

Pilot to solve downstream impact of wrong/missing statuses and impact on downstream processes?

8.4. Owning groups

8.5. Other comments

9. Need for streamlined implementation processes when TMC requests multiple changes to an Order on the same day (exchange/void) scenario 📌.

9.1. The issue

In scenarios where an agent issues the ticket but shortly after realizes there is an error, today the agent is able to void the ticket, make the correction and issue the ticket again without losing the segments held.

With NDC, when a TMC requests multiple changes on the same day this process is not well supported:

- TMCs would like to receive the details (status, correct amounts etc.) of the tickets that have been impacted by the cancellation.
- This is to properly report to the Mid Back Office of seller to match against BSP data.

Blocker because:

Downstream processes are not served if this data is missing in the TMC systems.

9.2. The solution depends on

Standard documentation

Implementation guidance to handle the equivalent of a 'cool' off period - i.e. waiving penalties for changes/cancellations within 24hrs, including ticket.

Implementation

Clarity on how the airline supports the equivalent of a 'cool' off period - i.e. waiving penalties for changes/cancellations within 24hrs, including ticket.

9.3. The 2020 action

Get clarity on these first

9.4. Owning groups

9.5. Other comments