

**Report of the**

**AIR TRAVEL  
INSOLVENCY  
PROTECTION  
ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE**

**31 March 2001**

**Report of the**

**AIR TRAVEL  
INSOLVENCY  
PROTECTION  
ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE**

**31 March 2001**

© Civil Aviation Authority 2001

**Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee**  
**CAA House**  
**45-59 Kingsway**  
**LONDON**  
**WC2B 6TE**

11 July 2001

Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions  
Great Minster House  
76 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DR

Sir

I submit the first Report of the Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee for the year ended 31 March 2001.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Cox', with a horizontal line above it.

John Cox OBE  
Chairman



## ESTABLISHMENT AND ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE

This is the first Report of the Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee which advises the Civil Aviation Authority, the Trustees of the Air Travel Trust and the Secretary of State for Environment, Transport and the Regions on the financial protection arrangements for air travellers and customers of air travel organisers. It was formed to replace the Air Travel Trust Committee with the aim of creating a wider and more effective consultative mechanism for the future. The terms of reference for ATIPAC can be found at Appendix 2 to this report.

As recorded in the final report of the Air Travel Trust Committee, its Members supported the continuation of a committee as serving a useful purpose in bringing together a wide range of views, but it was believed that benefits

could be gained from a broader range of Members. It was felt that the trade body representation needed to be updated to incorporate the wider spread of associations whose members were now affected by the ATOL system, and that the consumer representation should be strengthened. It was also felt that it would be beneficial to continue to have independent representatives who were genuinely independent of and apart from the travel industry. It was agreed that the numbers should be broadly in balance between trade body nominees and those who were independent or represented consumer interests.

ATIPAC held three meetings during the year, in September and December 2000 and in March 2001.



Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee  
**Members at 31 March 2001**



**Roger Harvey** is Chairman of the Incentive Travel and Meetings Association, by which he is nominated, and a Director of Skybridge Travel Ltd.

**Ian Hamer** is nominated by the Air Transport Users Council, of which he is Chairman. He is also Chairman of a group of companies with worldwide interests in the plastics industry.



**John de Vial** is UK Holiday Service Director for Thomson Holidays and is nominated by the Association of British Travel Agents. He is also a director of the Federation of Tour Operators.

**Mike Monk** is currently Head of Financial Services for the Association of British Travel Agents and a former member of the Air Travel Trust Committee. He is nominated by ABTA.



**Tim Robinson** is a partner in Nicholson Graham & Jones, a firm of solicitors specialising in travel law. He is an independent representative.

**John Cox** has been Chairman of the Committee since its formation in April 2000. He was also a past Chairman of the Air Transport Users Council and a former long-term independent member of the Air Travel Trust Committee.



**Tony Russell** is Managing Director of Trailfinders Ltd and was a member of the Air Travel Trust Committee, representing the Association of British Travel Agents. He is now a representative on ATIPAC of the Association of Airline Consolidators.

**Marie-Helene Kutek** is a consumer representative, with a background in local authority consumer advice service and consumer law. She is Vice Chair Institute of Consumer Affairs and was appointed to ATIPAC in April 2001.



**Helen Simpson** is Director of the CAA's Consumer Protection Group, and Secretary of the Air Travel Trust. She represents the CAA.



**Bruce Treloar** is principal Trading Standards Officer with Trading Standards Institute and is a specialist in travel protection. He represents consumer interests.



**Noel Josephides** is Managing Director of Sunvil Holidays and was a member of the Air Travel Trust Committee. He represents the Association of Independent Tour Operators.

**Roger Bray** is an independent freelance travel journalist with a consumer focus, and is an independent representative.



**Colin Senior** is a non-executive Board Member of the CAA, whom he represents on ATIPAC, and also Chairman and a Trustee of the Air Travel Trust.

**Martin Brackenbury** is nominated by the Federation of Tour Operators, of which he is Chairman. He was formerly a member of the Air Travel Trust Committee. He also attends Air Travel Trust meetings as a representative of ATIPAC.



## Review of the Year

### STATE OF THE AIR TRAVEL TRUST FUND

The Air Travel Trust Fund began the year in deficit by £8.03 million, its remaining assets having been exhausted in the summer of 1996. By the year end the deficit had increased to £8.96 million. During the year there was £257,000 expenditure on new failures, £198,000 on administration and one-off legal expenses as well as £528,000 on interest payable. However expenditure for the year was offset by a small extent by the return of prior year advances and the receipt of liquidation dividends.

Overall, net expenditure was £933,000. The Committee is deeply concerned that the annual interest burden is more than double the amount required to

meet the year's passenger claims and that it accounted for around 57% of the increase in the deficit, despite substantial legal costs which represent a non-recurring item.

The Committee maintains that allowing the Trust Fund to remain in deficit is detrimental to the protection system for air travellers and that the delay in putting in place long term arrangements is wholly unsatisfactory. It notes with considerable dismay that the deficit continues to rise, primarily as a result of the interest payable on the debt, and that the impact of any future levy is likely to become an unacceptable cost for the industry and holidaymakers to bear.

### THE TRAVEL INDUSTRY

Towards the end of 1999 the major tour operators were not optimistic about prospects for the following summer. This reflected in capacity offered, and three out of the four largest package holiday operators carried fewer passengers in Summer 2000 than they did in the previous summer season. However, the industry outturn as a whole was much better than expected. The actual level of growth in the traditional package holiday and charter flight sector was 7.5% which was significantly higher than the 4.2% achieved in Summer 1999. This volume growth occurred mainly in direct sell and specialist companies, rather than in the leading brands sold through travel agents. There was also a significant increase in sales direct to the public through call centres, though the proportion of bookings made direct through

the Internet remained comparatively small.

Sales in the Scheduled Bonded and Agency licence category achieved a similar volume increase of 8.0% over Summer 1999. However, their average yield remained virtually static at £369 whereas there was a £23 rise (5.5%) in the average price in the Fully Bonded sector to £450.

While the full year growth to September 2000 was depressed by a poor 1999/2000 winter season and was thus lower at 4.6% than in most recent years, it was nevertheless another stable year with no major failures. Overall, 27.5 million air travellers were protected by ATOL, paying an average £438 to an industry worth £12.0 billion.

## BONDS CALLED IN THE YEAR TO MARCH 2001

At the mid point in the year there were 1,858 holders of an ATOL, a rise of just over 4%. During the year 12 firms ceased trading and subsequently had their ATOL bonds called. As a result just under 200 passengers were repatriated back to the UK at the end of their holiday and a further 4,800 were refunded the money they had paid to their travel organiser. The failure rate in absolute terms had not been lower since 1989 and when expressed as a percentage of firms licensed, the failure rate of 0.65% was the lowest in the Trust's history. Full details of the bonds called and their effects can be found at Appendix 3.

The largest company to fail during the year, in terms of the number of passengers licensed, was Hamilton Travel Limited. Hamilton specialised in the sale of scheduled flight-onlys and had been authorised to carry over 27,000 passengers in the year. It was the 12th largest consolidator when it ceased trading in the middle of the summer season, but fortunately there was little disruption to passengers. Hamilton had been licensed to sell most of its flights under Airline Deeds of Undertaking whereby the airline effectively guarantees to the CAA that it will provide return flights for passengers abroad at the time of failure, and it will honour payments made to Hamilton as if

the money had been paid to them directly. Hamilton had provided a bond to cover customers whose bookings were not covered by Airline Deeds and this proved sufficient to meet expenditure in that category.

Of the twelve firms which ceased trading, only two resulted in a call on the Trust Fund. The largest by a considerable margin was that of Sun & City Holidays Limited which offered packages to the Mediterranean. This company's licence lapsed at the end of March 2000 and had authorised the carriage of 2,038 passengers. The company then changed ownership and ceased trading three months later and the CAA has subsequently received refund claims from just under 2,000 people. The £67,000 bond provided is likely to be insufficient by £247,000. At the year end, the CAA was in the process of investigating the extent of "overtrading" and trading without the authority of an ATOL.

The other case which resulted in a call on the Trust Fund was that of Riddle B J, a sole trader who traded as Chelmer Travel. This firm ceased trading in March 2001 and had sold discounted scheduled flights. Chelmer Travel was a relatively small firm which had been authorised to carry only 200 passengers a year.

## MARKET OUTLOOK

Because of the timing of the Committee's Report it is difficult to make predictions about the forthcoming summer season with any accuracy. At the time of publication and based on the advance bookings of the major tour operators, it is expected that there will be a modest increase in volume in Summer 2001 compared with Summer 2000.

## EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENTS

Towards the end of 1999, the European Commission completed a report on the implementation of Directive 90/314/EEC on Package Travel and Holiday Tours. This report highlighted some fairly major deficiencies in the protection systems of other European States.

The Committee considered as a result the issues arising from the possibility of mutual recognition of Member States' systems, which would permit organisers established in and authorised by other Member States to sell air travel in the UK. The Committee had serious doubts about whether a UK customer who currently has comprehensive financial protection through the ATOL scheme would benefit from this change, and it also believed that most other Member States, because of the more limited size of their package travel markets, were less expert in matters such as repatriation. It concluded that UK customers might be disadvantaged if firms established in other Member States did not have to comply with the requirements of ATOL when selling air travel within the UK. Even for those States that had expertise in these matters, the Committee believed that in practical terms repatriation after a failure must be handled on a local

basis if customers are not to be subject to considerable inconvenience and possibly distress.

The Committee also noted that a Directive on electronic sales was due to be implemented in the UK in January 2002 which raised similar issues on mutuality. Depending on the exact terms of the implementing regulations, this legislation could enable travel organisers from other Member States to sell travel in the UK through the Internet.

The Committee felt strongly that the ATOL protection system was superior to that in most, if not all, other Member States, and that it was important to the UK travelling public. The Committee therefore regarded it as essential that the UK Government did not allow European measures to be interpreted in a way that could damage the ATOL system. It has made representations to Government (both the Department of Environment, Transport, and the Regions and the Department of Trade & Industry) recommending that the UK retained the right to require all operators, wherever in the EU they may be based, to hold an ATOL for flights departing from the UK.

## AWARENESS OF ATOL

A survey of key stakeholders in the travel industry concluded that the ATOL system was well regarded – and perhaps the best protection system for air travel in Europe – and there was no wish for radical change. However, it highlighted as its main weakness the public's lack of clear perception of ATOL and its role. Because the system worked smoothly it had a low profile among the public and policymakers, who took it for granted that difficulties would not occur.

Some respondents to the survey also expressed concern about consumer protection for sales through the Internet. The Committee acknowledged that changes in sales methods would pose challenges for ATOL to ensure that customers booking through

websites remain financially protected. It was accepted that customers could not be prohibited from incurring risks by booking with unlicensed operators, but the Committee felt that the public should be made aware of ATOL and understand the risks.

The Committee endorsed the CAA's proposed strategy of continuing its own advertising campaign to increase awareness of ATOL; of encouraging the public to check the ATOL website for information and verification of the ATOL's validity; of changing the presentation of the ATOL logo to include the word "protected" for emphasis and clarity; and of distributing a new public leaflet. These initiatives were subsequently introduced by the CAA.

## RELATIONSHIP WITH CREDIT CARD COMPANIES

On a number of occasions throughout the year, the Committee discussed the difficulties faced by tour operators whose credit card merchant acquirer had insisted that they provide some form of security. The requirement to provide additional security (often by deferred payments) placed an unnecessary burden on tour operators and might even increase the risk of their failure.

An agreement between the Air Travel Trust, the CAA and named banks known as the 'Credit Card Charter' has been in existence since 1985 and has worked well. However its scope has effectively reduced because of the increased number of new card issuers who are not signatories to the Charter and the fact that internal banking rules permit card issuers to cross-charge the merchant acquirer for holidaymaker claims they have settled. This led to the move by merchant acquirers to obtain security to offset their exposure arising from card issuers' legal liability to settle claims under Section 75 of the Consumer Credit Act. During the year, the CAA proposed a new form of Charter that would give the merchant acquirers increased protection at the expense of ATOL bonds, but in exchange sought assurances from them that they would relax their security requirements.

The basic principles of the proposed new Charter were that the ATOL bond and Trust would continue to meet all group repatriation and resort costs, irrespective of the method of payment, and that claims involving a credit card would

be referred to the card industry only when the bond proved to be insufficient. Additionally, the merchant acquirer would be able to benefit from any surplus bond monies in respect of credit card claims which had been cross-charged by issuing banks who were not signatories to the Charter.

The banks expressed the view that bond rates were set too low, and they argued that they were not sufficiently protected against their potential liability. The CAA highlighted that over the past few years there had been relatively few cases where bonds were insufficient, and it suggested that they could obtain better protection by participating in a new Charter covering an increased number of card issuers. However the CAA stressed that it would not proceed with a new agreement which would give banks better protection, possibly at the cost of increased bond premiums, while those banks continued to insist on separate security. The initial response was encouraging but it later transpired there was no real commitment by the banks to reduce the level of security already taken.

The Committee recommended that the CAA did not proceed with a new Charter unless the banks gave a commitment to reduce their security requirements. At the year end discussions with the banks were still taking place but there was a disappointing lack of any indication on the part of the banks that they were prepared to consider compromises in exchange for the benefits they might obtain from the Charter.

**GOVERNMENT  
CONSULTATION ON THE  
FUTURE OF AVIATION:  
CONSUMER ISSUES**

In December 2000 the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions issued a consultation document on air transport policy entitled 'The Future of Aviation'. The consultation invited ideas and views on a wide range of aviation and airport issues and the Committee felt that most were outside its terms of reference. However, it did respond to a question on Consumer Issues 'Do we need further action to ensure consumers are adequately protected when buying airline tickets directly from airlines?'

The Committee recognised that there was an anomaly in the protection arrangements that currently exist in the UK. Tickets bought through intermediaries such as airline consolidators were likely to be protected by ATOL, but if the same ticket was bought directly from an airline, the consumer would have no guaranteed financial protection. It was thought that consumers might not readily appreciate that depending on their booking method, there would be different levels of financial protection and therefore transparency and clarity of information was essential.

In order to remove this inconsistency there appeared to be a case for protection arrangements being put in place to cover tickets bought directly from airlines. However, given that the main European airports were becoming major hubs for interlining traffic, it appeared both practically ineffective and legally difficult to introduce legislation affecting just

UK airlines, and the Committee considered that the consumer would gain any real benefit only if the initiative was on a Europe-wide basis. If there was to be a Europe-wide initiative, it would be a matter of further debate whether it should extend to all flights departing from within the EU or to all services offered by European airlines. Neither would be wholly satisfactory as an anomaly would still exist: the inconsistency would merely shift to bookings made directly with non-European airlines, or to multi sector journeys where one sector was beyond the EU and possibly operated by a non-EU airline.

The Committee believed that the potential consequences of airline failure should not be underestimated and that such an event could cause considerable inconvenience and hardship to consumers. Repatriation was an issue, although in broad terms other scheduled services were normally available from the same airport, or one nearby, which was not always the case with charter operations.

The Committee concluded that an expansion to the current protection arrangements should be considered. There would be clear consumer benefit if a proposal provided a source of repatriation, but for both parity and effectiveness, any initiative would need to be on a Europe-wide basis. In any event, the consumer should be made aware of the steps he can take to ensure he was financially protected.

## CONCLUSION

The Committee has constantly reminded Government of the need for levy powers to replenish the Trust Fund, and it wishes to reiterate in the strongest possible terms that deficit financing is not a sound basis for a public protection system. The ATOL scheme, supported by the Air Travel Trust, is vital in meeting the United Kingdom's obligations to air travellers under the Package Travel Directive; it is also a consumer benefit that is important to British holidaymakers, and a significant part of the UK travel industry's infrastructure.

During the year, the Air Travel Trust paid a further £528,000 in loan interest; this brought its cumulative interest payments on borrowings to £1.84 million. The Committee regards the Government's delay in putting in place long term arrangements as inexcusable, particularly in light of a general acceptance by the travel industry of the need for a levy. The Committee and the industry are gravely concerned that the longer the necessary action is postponed, the more likely it becomes that the sum necessary to eliminate the Fund's deficit will become unmanageable: beyond a certain level, a levy would represent a significant cost for consumers and

inflict real commercial damage on the industry.

The Committee is disappointed that by the year end credit card merchant acquirers had not agreed to reduce the extent of security from tour operators, as it believes that the banks would gain real benefits from an Agreement with an increased number of participants and a wider scope. The Committee hopes that the negotiations which continued at the year end can be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties, but it supports the CAA's view that any Agreement must be conditional upon a willingness on the part of the banks to compromise.

Finally, the Committee is glad to record that the UK travel industry enjoyed strong market growth during Summer 2000 and Winter 2000/01, which was reflected in a reduced number and size of failures. The calls on the Trust thus remained much lower than they had been during the early-mid 1990s. The Committee believes these results are partly attributable to economic factors, but that they also reflect better management of tour operators and the improvements that have been achieved by the CAA in the regulatory framework. It regards this as a very positive development.



## Appendix 1 Members of the Committee

Mr John Cox OBE		Chairman
Mr Michael Monk	}	Association of British Travel Agents Limited
Mr John de Vial	}	
Mr Martin Brackenbury		FTO Trust Fund Limited
Mr Noel Josephides		Association of Independent Tour Operators
Mr Tony Russell		Association of Airline Consolidators
Mr Roger Harvey		Incentive Travel and Meetings Association
Mr Ian Hamer		Air Transport Users Council
Mr Bruce Treloar	}	Other consumer representatives
Ms Marie-Helene Kutek	}	
Mr Roger Bray	}	Independent representatives
Mr Tim Robinson	}	
Mr Colin Senior	}	Civil Aviation Authority
Mrs Helen Simpson	}	

### Secretariat

Mrs Vanessa Jones	Secretary
Miss Sandra Springett	Assistant Secretary

The Committee was formed in April 2000 and Members were appointed with effect from September 2000. Mr Tim Robinson was appointed as an independent representative in February 2001 in place of Mr Ed Smith. Shortly after the year end the National Consumer Council nominated Ms Marie-Helene Kutek as a representative of consumer interests.

All Members have been appointed to serve on the Committee until September 2003.

# Appendix 2 The Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee's Terms of Reference

## ESTABLISHMENT AND ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE

- 1 The Air Travel Insolvency Protection Advisory Committee ("the Committee") is established by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions to advise on the financial protection arrangements for air travellers and customers of air travel organisers.

## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

- 2 Members of the Committee shall be drawn from:

Association of British Travel Agents	Two Members
Federation of Tour Operators	One Member
Association of Independent Tour Operators	One Member
Association of Airline Consolidators	One Member
Incentive Travel and Meetings Association	One Member
Air Transport Users Council	One Member
Other representatives of consumer interests	One or two Members
Independent representatives not associated with any organisation represented on the Committee	Three or four Members, one of whom is Chairman
Civil Aviation Authority	Two Members

## APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE

- 3 Members shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Aviation Authority, for periods specified at the time of appointment; they may resign at any time. The CAA Chairman will consult the Chairman of the Committee before appointing Members other than from trade associations and the CAA.
- 4 Each represented body may nominate to the CAA up to two alternates, who may attend any meeting in the absence of that body's appointed Member(s).

## MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

- 5 The Committee shall determine its own procedures for and frequency of meetings, including any requirement for a quorum.

## DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

- 6 The Committee shall keep under review and from time to time advise the Civil Aviation Authority, the Trustees of the Air Travel Trust and the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions on the arrangements for the financial protection of air travellers and customers of air travel organisers.

- 7 In particular it shall:
- advise on bonding arrangements and bond levels;
  - advise the CAA and the Trustees on the use of their discretion when making payments from bonds and from the Trust;
  - advise on agreements between the Trustees, the CAA and third parties such as credit card companies;
  - advise the Secretary of State on the need for a reimposition of a levy on the holders of Air Travel Organisers' Licences in order to replenish the Trust Fund, and advise the CAA and the Secretary of State (as appropriate) on the implementation of such a levy;
  - advise the CAA and the Secretary of State as appropriate on any changes to the structure of protection that it concludes are necessary or desirable.
- 8 The Committee shall submit to the Secretary of State an Annual Report on its activities in each year ended 31 March within four months of the end of that year. The Committee shall draw to the Secretary of State's attention at any time matters of concern on which, in its view, action is necessary.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

- 9 Reasonable out of pocket expenses directly incurred by Members of the Committee in attending meetings shall be reimbursed by the Civil Aviation Authority.
- 10 The Civil Aviation Authority shall provide administrative support to the Committee.

**the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
April 2000**

## Appendix 3 Details of Bond Calls and their effects, April 2000 to March 2001

Licence Holder	Date Bond Called	Licensed Passengers	Licensed Revenue	Bond Amount	Number Repatriated	Cost of Repatriation	Number Refunded	Cost of Refunds	Total Expenditure	Call on Air Travel Trust
			£'000	£'000		£'000		£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Galaxy Air Holidays Ltd</b>	27 Jun 00	6,233	2,090	314	16	2	1,050	158	160	0
<b>Sun &amp; City Holidays Ltd</b>	04 Jul 00	2,038	495	67	0	0	1,973	313	314	247
<b>Hamilton Travel Ltd</b>	16 Aug 00	117,544	27,068	107	0	0	245	48	48	0
<b>Grenadier Safaris Ltd</b>	22 Sep 00	165	435	58	8	6	10	19	25	0
<b>Dolunay Holidays Ltd</b>	22 Sep 00	1,200	520	78	100	14	130	31	45	0
<b>Christian Tours (UK) Ltd</b>	23 Jan 01	1,124	930	140	0	0	505	105	105	0
<b>Californian Holidays Ltd</b>	01 Feb 01	1,697	1,253	187	20	1	28	22	23	0
<b>Sundial Travel Ltd</b>	23 Feb 01	3,503	2,368	355	43	30	120	79	109	0
<b>Sun Modiflex Ltd</b>	02 Mar 01	3,000	2,025	313	0	0	191	174	174	0
<b>Trinity Travel &amp; Tours Ltd</b>	06 Mar 01	1,765	600	60	0	0	5	1	1	0
<b>Riddle B J</b>	22 Mar 01	200	100	10	0	0	9	20	20	10
<b>Lindsay P J, Ahmad R</b>	26 Mar 01	3,826	1,045	142	0	0	509	142	142	0
<b>Total (12)</b>		<b>142,295</b>	<b>38,927</b>	<b>1,829</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4,775</b>	<b>1,111</b>	<b>1,166</b>	<b>257</b>

### NOTES

- 1 The administration of all cases above may not have been completed. Administration costs which were incurred in paying passengers' refunds have been included in the Cost of Refunds.
- 2 The figures for Total Expenditure and any call on the Air Travel Trust reflect amounts already spent and estimated further expenditure.
- 3 Where a call on the Air Travel Trust is indicated, this is the difference between expected total expenditure and available bond monies. The call on the Air Travel Trust may include the expenditure of accrued interest.
- 4 The above totals may not agree to the sum of the figures shown in the table due to rounding differences.

## Appendix 4 Historical Movement of Reserve Fund Against Industry Turnover

Year ended 31 March	Turnover £'m	Passengers '000	Bonds Called During Year	Calls on Reserve Fund During Year £'m	Total Fund at Year End £'m	Calls as % of Turnover	Calls as % of Fund at Start of Year	Fund as % of Turnover
1979	574	4,173	2	0.08	14.78	0.01		2.57
1980	813	5,304	2	0.02	16.10	0.00	0.14	1.98
1981	1,200	6,165	2	0.00	18.05	0.00	0.00	1.50
1982	1,488	6,662	9	3.02	15.64	0.20	16.73	1.05
1983	1,595	7,067	11	3.10	16.61	0.19	19.82	1.04
1984	1,893	7,938	9	0.58	19.44	0.03	3.49	1.03
1985	2,004	8,623	20	1.91	19.52	0.10	9.83	0.97
1986	2,123	8,662	18	1.36	22.10	0.06	6.97	1.04
1987	2,406	9,849	8	2.20	22.75	0.09	9.95	0.95
1988	3,118	12,598	16	1.23	23.18	0.04	5.40	0.74
1989	3,629	14,490	9	0.28	23.44	0.01	1.21	0.65
1990	3,704	13,982	21	0.40	23.71	0.01	1.70	0.64
1991	3,807	13,083	22	11.61	26.70	0.30	48.95	0.70
1992	3,253	10,110	16	0.73	5.01	0.02	2.75	0.15
1993	4,436	13,575	24	6.66	9.84	0.15	132.83	0.22
1994	5,180	14,528	20	1.58	8.82	0.03	16.07	0.17
1995	5,966	16,678	23	3.51	5.65	0.06	39.77	0.09
1996	6,874	18,812	31	4.10	1.87	0.06	72.65	0.03
1997	8,318	22,176	26	7.60	(5.26)	0.09	405.69	(0.06)
1998	9,426	25,673	21	0.36	(5.30)	0.004	(6.76)	(0.06)
1999	11,211	26,284	20	2.01	(7.39)	0.018	(37.98)	(0.07)
2000	11,982	27,824	17	0.33	(8.03)	0.003	(4.40)	(0.07)
2001	13,155	29,675	12	0.26	(8.96)	0.002	(3.20)	(0.07)
2002	14,233	31,348						

### Note

- 1 Turnover and Passenger figures represent the total value and number of flights/holidays authorised by all Air Travel Organiser Licences at the start of the year. The figures exclude all trade sales between ATOL Holders
- 2 Calls on Reserve Fund are retrospectively adjusted figures indicating the cost of failures occurring during each year. The figure for Total Fund at year end is taken from the Air Travel Trust accounts and thus incorporates provisions based on estimates at the time of audit; figures are not adjusted retrospectively to show actual expenditure.
- 3 Calls as % of turnover uses the base of turnover in the same year as the calls. Fund as % of turnover applies the Fund at each year end to the turnover licensed for the year following.



