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Today’s Cabin Size Baggage: What’s in a Name

Ridha Aditya Nugraha *

Abstract

This article explains cabin size baggage issues which have arisen along with the increased popularity of the low-cost carrier business model. The stringent cabin size baggage policies introduced by low-cost carriers have the potential of infringing on consumer rights. One of the main reasons is the confusion and conflicts caused by an absence of a harmonized definition of cabin size baggage dimensions. IATA has announced a recommended size, however it has only limited power within the current airline industry. The airline association, as the last resort, should seek to defend passengers’ fundamental rights in this matter by creating a equilibrium between good moral and business principles, thus proactively defending their airlines from potential negative legal or political blowback and consequences.

Today’s Airline Business: The Low-Cost Carrier Phenomenon

The history of the airline business was traditionally characterized by state intervention and interference¹. This remained true until the 1980’s, when airlines were regarded as operating inefficiently and thus costing their owners, which was the state, a lot of money². However due to national pride, these airlines kept operating through (heavy) subsidies, since many states did not want to see their flag carriers disappear³.

Liberalization and privatization of national airlines, combined with foreign direct investment has opened a new chapter on how the aviation business operates today. One of the objectives of liberalization in the European Union (EU) and deregulation in the USA was to force airlines to operate more efficiently⁴. Taxpayers’ money must be better allocated rather than paying for unprofitable business endeavors. In order to reach this objective, liberalization covers three main areas which are pricing, capacity and market access, and finally the application of competition law to the air transport sector⁵.

*Alumnus of the International Institute of Air and Space Law, Universiteit Leiden (LL.M. (Adv.)) and Universitas Indonesia (S.H.). Member of German Aviation Research Society. Has working experience in a Jakarta-based corporate law firm and EU airline. The author wishes to thank the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan), the Indonesian Ministry of Finance, the Republic of Indonesia for its scholarship and funding support for this research. Comments could be addressed to r.a.nugraha@umail.leidenuniv.nl. Disclaimer: the views expressed are purely those of the author.
The adoption of the EU’s third package of air transport liberalization legislation has changed the face of the European airline industry, leading to the privatization of the traditional state-owned flag carriers and the emergence of the low-cost carriers. The latter has become a phenomenon within the last decade, where it could be seen as a way to ‘solve’ inefficiency within airline business. Furthermore, ‘efficient’ has become the central philosophy to do business where airlines in the low-cost segment offer only their passengers essential needs, which are safe and reliable journeys.

Low-cost carriers introduce new business methods for ticket fare reductions, such as using secondary airports and providing less on-board service to its passengers. There are no free snack or beverage service, no business class service, and no newspapers offered as by the traditional airlines. Check-in baggage and cabin baggage are another issue where there has been stricter conditions, regarding its size and/or weight. Online check-in is encouraged since there will be additional cost for doing this at the airport desk with some airlines. Most low-cost carriers also are not using aerobridges for the boarding process, with Schiphol Airport as the perfect example where there is a special gate designed without aerobridges for Easyjet and Ryanair. Perhaps low-cost carriers service could be described simply with one sentence: “you get what you pay for, and no more than that”.

The situation above could be seen as characteristic of airlines doing business within low-cost segments. Low-cost carriers are also called low-cost airlines, or no-frills, discount, low-fares, budget or value-based airlines or carriers. The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has developed a definition of a low-cost carrier as follows:

“an air carrier that has a relatively low-cost structure in comparison with other comparable carriers and offers low fares and rates. Such an airline may be independent, the division or subsidiary of a major network airline or, in some instances, the ex-charter arm of an airline group.”

Based on this ICAO definition, some of well-known low-cost carriers are given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airline</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country of AOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kulula.com</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastjet</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetstar</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Australia</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Airlines</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndiGo</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citilink</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Air</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirAsia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AirAsia X</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Airways</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanwings</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transavia</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to see how low-cost carriers respond to the current intense competition climate, where cooperation between low-cost carriers and full-service airlines has become a reality. Vueling and British Airways have entered into a partnership leading to code-shared flights for some intra-EU routes\(^1\). AirAsia X is another interesting case where a low-cost carrier even serves long-haul flights, such as Melbourne-Tokyo\(^1\) or Hong Kong-Perth\(^1\) routes which take more than six hours. Jetstar Airways also follows the AirAsia X path, serving long-haul flights in Asia and the Oceania region\(^1\). Considering increased competition within the airline business in the following years, no doubt such innovations will continue to appear.

This paper shall describe such innovations and their impact on passengers’ rights.

**What is Cabin Size Baggage?**

At present the low-cost carrier model has become one of the main elements within the airline business. Its strong presence has meant many practices of low-cost carriers have become standard across the current airline business, with cabin size baggage restrictions being one important example. This sub-chapter shall describe further the cabin size baggage issue within the current competitive airline business in connection with the fundamental rights of airline passengers as consumers.

**Low-Cost Carriers: Establishing New Perspective(s)**

There was a time when airline passengers need not be worried regarding their cabin baggage. As long it seemed to fit in the cabin, then the ground crew or stewardess were unlikely to object or interfere with the passengers’ cabin baggage. It could be said that the phrase “consumer is the king” was still valid in this regard at that time.

However, the appearance of low-cost carriers has changed how the airline business is done. Since low-cost carriers offer only basic services to “strive for cost and time efficiency”\(^1\), it is not surprising they seek additional income for every extra service provided towards their passengers.
Cabin baggage has become one of these extra services, that has become more limited and restricted than it used to be. This situation has influenced airlines’ policies towards cabin baggage size and weight across the world, although with variations in different regions. Passengers’ basic needs are decided to be sufficiently met by small cabin baggage with certain dimension and/or a hand bag which certainly must be smaller than the baggage. As a ‘compensation’, exceeding the dimension or restrictions means purchasing extra product. The purpose of this measure is to minimize costs through reducing fuel usage by limiting cargo weight; reducing ground handling service fees18; and also to keep boarding process efficient for on-time flight schedule19.

A definite new perspective towards cabin size luggage has been established in the mind of airline passengers by the restrictions of low cost carriers. Passengers accept that there is no free lunch within low-cost carrier flights. As long as passengers can reach the destination on-time along with their baggage, they tend to forgive the lack of service encountered when flying with low-cost carriers, as they value price relative to the benefits30.

Furthermore this new concept of handling cabin size baggage has also been adopted by some full-fare airlines. British Airways is one example where a baggage gauge now to be found as well during boarding process21. This sort of restrictive practice is not what airlines’ passengers traditionally except when travelling with full-fare airlines22. Considering today’s competitive market, it is not surprising though if even full-fare airlines they take this step to minimize every possible cost.

Determining Cabin Size Baggage and Price

All passengers in the world are paying more attention to each airline’s baggage policy, both hold and cabin baggage, when travelling in order to avoid penalty fees. The International Air Transport Association (IATA) established a basis for a cabin size baggage definition when they acknowledge a limitation of 56 cm x 45 cm x 25 cm following the foiled terror plot of 10 August 200623. This size was deemed as a potential countermeasure which was developed in the context of improving security, namely to counter the potential threat posed by liquids, gels and aerosols24.

The size has decreased into 55 cm x 35 cm x 20 cm under the IATA Proposed Cabin OK Size which at the moment has been paused, but not withdrawn, to reassess the initiative25. This Cabin OK Size Baggage measure is aimed to be guaranteed on board even when the flight is full26. However this invention is not aimed to establish an industry standard27, thus leaving the ultimate choice to each member airline. So far IATA recognizes a 56 cm x 45 cm x 25 cm as the maximum dimension of a cabin size baggage28.

Unfortunately IATA has no binding power towards its member airlines’ policy on determining maximum and minimum dimensions of cabin size baggage, let alone towards non-member airlines. Thus harmonization of cabin size baggage still seems a distant concept.

The table below shows airlines’ policies on cabin baggage size, whether a member of IATA or not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airline</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cabin Baggage Policy (in cm)</th>
<th>Oversize Cabin Baggage Penalty or Extra Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AirAsia</strong>&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>56 x 36 x 23 + one handbag or laptop bag</td>
<td>no information regarding penalty fee at boarding gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citilink</strong>&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>56 x 36 x 23 + one handbag or laptop bag</td>
<td>no information regarding penalty fee at boarding gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easyjet</strong>&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>56 x 45 x 25</td>
<td>£ 45 at boarding gate as a cabin baggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 30 at bag drop counter as hold baggage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ryanair</strong>&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>55 x 40 x 20 + one small bag 35 x 20 x 20</td>
<td>£ 50 or € 50 at boarding gate (depends on airport location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transavia</strong>&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>55 x 40 x 25 not guaranteed on busy flights or 45 x 40 x 25 guaranteed on board</td>
<td>no information regarding penalty fee at boarding gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prices vary depending on the itinerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vueling</strong>&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>55 x 40 x 20 + one smaller item</td>
<td>€ 35 at boarding gate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all well-known low-cost carriers’ cabin baggage policy is bigger than the IATA proposed Cabin OK Size. At least the latter could be set as a de facto minimum dimension of a cabin size baggage, although not guaranteed of being brought on-board if the flight is full.

A strong market presence will lead to a power to determine the market. With its huge market capital, Ryanair successfully established its cabin baggage size when the airline and Samsonite, the world’s biggest luggage provider, launched the “Ryanair’s Cabin Baggage”\(^\text{17}\). Thus Ryanair’s standard (a 55 cm x 40 cm x 20 cm) could be considered as cabin size standard within the stores across Europe. Probably it could be more popular than the new IATA Proposed Cabin OK Size at some Ryanair destinations.

After the size, then comes the price. The latter means paying extra or a penalty fee which occurs when airline passengers do not meet airlines’ cabin size baggage policy. This kind of fee varies between airlines, and of course depends on which airport one is departing from. No clear criteria for determining such prices has been found so far. This situation leads into question whether airlines make extraordinary profit from an excess of 1 cm or even 0.5 cm on a baggage gauge; or in other words are exploiting their passengers through this type of practice.
Infringement of Consumer Rights

Research and analysis has demonstrated there is very little security benefit to restricting cabin baggage size and quantity. The effectiveness of restricting cabin baggage size as a security measure is doubtful since airport security staff at screening checkpoints shall make a comprehensive check, regardless of size. However IATA and its member airlines have their own recommendations and policies regarding this matter, where most airlines have also taken into account commercial considerations.

The ICAO has recommended IATA member airlines to establish policies on cabin baggage, especially regarding its size, based on IATA recommendations. This means ICAO primarily recognizes IATA member airlines’ freedom towards their commercial policies on cabin baggage, even if it may have a negative impact towards the passengers. ICAO’s position also means a harmonized global policy on cabin size baggage shall be quite difficult to achieve, since each region has its own market characteristics.

From a consumer perspective, this policy could have negative implications on passengers convenience, especially for those who normally prefer to carry their bags onboard with them. With more and more code-shared or connection flights, cabin size baggage could become a new issue for transit and transfer passengers, where they need to check-in their cabin baggage since it may be oversized by the regulations of the connecting airline. Additional money must be spent, or even worse, the transit and transfer passengers’ cabin baggage could arrive one or two days later than the originally planned flight. Important issues will arise if the passenger brings his or her life-supporting medicine within the baggage and due to the chaotic situation during transit and transfer, could not bring it onboard potentially causing harm to the passenger. This situation is even more likely to happen on intercontinental flights which connect two or more un-harmonized airlines’ cabin baggage policies.

For example, a passenger travelling Garuda Indonesia with student status from Jakarta to Amsterdam sometimes receives a waiver from Soekarno-Hatta International Airport’s ground crew to bring up to three items into the cabin. When the student has a connecting flight to another destination from Amsterdam Schiphol with KLM, most likely the student will receive some trouble with the quantity of his or her carry-on items as well as with the dimensions. The un-harmonized airlines’ cabin baggage policy, even though both airlines are members of the SkyTeam alliance, potentially could harm the student passenger who may not be aware of these differing policies across the continents.

The lack of awareness by consumers and their associations of how standards ensure consumer protection is one of the biggest obstacles. Within this context, a consumer is defined as a natural person who seeks or acquires goods, services, or money for personal, family, or household use. The consumer as special economic actor is the ultimate subject of consumer protection. In many countries, national consumer organizations work to influence their governments to protect consumers through a pro-consumer legal framework. One of the goals of consumer protection is to deliver a system that achieves as high as possible a level of consumer protection whilst also keeping costs to business to a minimum. Thus it means aiming for an equilibrium which will also not harm airlines’ business.
Consumer law is considered to be a more effective instrument when it prevents rather than provides a remedy for loss or damage of the customers. Its existence is to compensate for the inequality between economic actors on the market and to restore consumer sovereignty. The latter is defined as the state of affairs where the consumer has the power to define his or her own wants and the ability to satisfy these wants at a competitive or reasonable price.

However when it comes to the airline business which is unique, prestigious and sometimes loaded with national and political intrigue, the effectiveness of consumer law and national consumer organizations seem not as strong. The situation that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) measure does not apply to the operation of air services has weakened national consumer organizations' efforts. It is not surprising if some international consumer organizations such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) or the International Marketing Supervision Network (IMSN) shall become increasingly vocal if consumers are being taken advantage of due to unscrupulous airline policies on cabin size baggage in the future.

Unethical business models should have been prohibited since they are against fair trade, especially if the practice injures consumers. Wizz Air's cabin size baggage policy, which is far lower than 'common sense' or IATA standards, has raised a question whether this kind of business innovation should be considered as an unethical business model. First time passengers travelling with the airline probably could fall into the 'trap' or punishment at the boarding gate as a result of not reading the condition of carriage: € 40. An extra fee must be paid during the booking process for bringing a normal cabin size baggage. No strong response towards this kind of business practice means it becomes accepted as legal and encourages more airlines to adopt this policy as well in the name of competitiveness.

A European Union Perspective

Within this regional initiative, the guidelines on the application of Article 81(3) of the European Community (EC) Treaty refer to enhancing consumer welfare standards within a competitive market. Even though the article refers to the economic interests of consumers, this criterion has not become a substantive right of consumers. Thus airline passengers' struggle for their rights still have a long way to go.

Article 153(1) of the EC Treaty has become the other main ground of consumer protection in the EU:

In order to promote the interests of consumers and to ensure a high level of consumer protection, the Community shall contribute to protecting the health, safety and economic interests of consumers, as well as to promoting their right to information, education and to organize themselves in order to safeguard their interests.

Considering the urgency for consumer protection, it could trigger group actions, probably as the last resort, which are legal within some EU member states. The current actions in some member states are as follow:
There is a trend calling for (full) harmonization regarding consumer protection in the EU. The goal is to have a legal certainty within this kind of service. Consumers’ confidence, in terms they are not sufficiently confident that they will be adequately protected when buying services, shall be improved. If harmonization regarding consumer protection in the EU will be enforced, together Regulation No. 2006/2004 and Directive No. 2011/83 could become the instrument. However the latter only deals with various information duties and the right of withdrawal, thus no changes have been made on consumer sales and unfair terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Civil procedural rules allow the victim to pass on his/her claim to a consumers’ association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Plaintiffs with similar but separate claims can institute proceedings before the same court and then ask the court to handle their claims at the same hearing, without joining them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>The rules on legal proceedings allow popular legal actions to be brought in all consumer-related areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>The consumer ombudsman can assist individuals before the court. The trial costs can be entirely covered by a special budgetary fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Legislation exists which enables consumer associations to defend the civil interest of consumers. This does, however, not include actions for compensation for a group of injured persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>In the event of a series of accidents, there is a ‘trial action’ which will subsequently form the basis of compensation between industry and the injured persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>The rules of court provide a procedure whereby one or more of persons having the same interest in a single claim may bring or defend the claim on the behalf of all those interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Consumers’ associations can defend consumers’ interest, but cannot act on behalf of injured persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Multi-party action is possible under the Group Actions Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Popular legal action exists whereby the Public Prosecutor’s Office and Consumers’ organizations can intervene in cases of injury to private individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Consumers’ associations can bring a legal action on behalf of its members. An amendment of the rules on court proceedings will make it possible to bring joint actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Multi-party action can be brought in the courts in England and Wales under a rule of civil procedure on group litigation. Under this procedure one or more individuals can act in a representative capacity and bring proceedings on behalf of others where they have the same interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within the EU airline business, especially in respect of consumer protection, Regulation No. 261/2004 is one of the examples of a harmonized legal framework. It has successfully established a standard on compensation towards airline passengers. However from the airline perspective, the compensation amount which is considered high could destroy the airline business, either full-fare or low-cost carrier, within the competitive airline market. It must be kept in mind: what will the airline passengers’ welfare be without (many choices of) airlines?

No doubt there is a conflict between consumer rights and (freedom of) airlines’ cabin size baggage policy. Strong consumer protection comes from a strong political will. However if airlines tend to help smoothen EU integration and also develop the economy, it seems more difficult to enact a pro-consumer policy. The EU’s motto “common rules for a common market” seems not to answer whether a harmonization of legal framework on cabin size baggage is needed, thus leaving it to one last main actor: IATA.

How Far Could IATA Help?

IATA’s status as a trade association, not a regulatory body, means it has no binding power towards its member airlines. This situation has put IATA in a difficult position towards its (member) airlines cabin size baggage policy. Although IATA could not reach non-member airlines, especially most low-cost carriers, its strong position representing 83% of total air traffic within the airline business could play a significant role to determine a worldwide cabin size baggage dimension. Low-cost carriers have adopted or transformed the dimension according to their own policy depending on market characteristics.

IATA’s mission to represent, lead, and serve the airline industry means the association has a moral obligation to protect airline passengers. It is not only an issue whether the passengers could pay the penalty for cabin baggage size excess or not, but it goes further. Passengers must be seen as human beings, and not as mere objects within this commercial world. They are not dollar trees for making money through this behavior; and IATA has been called to make this issue clear towards the member airlines.

The association should be more creative to ‘outwit’ this stubborn situation by persuading their member airlines, especially those who implement cabin size baggage policy strictly, to provide all necessary information at the check-in counter before the security check. Considering it will be almost impossible for the ground crew to monitor the numbers of cabin baggage brought on the aircraft at the check-in counter, having a special and accessible spot within the airport to put all member airlines’ baggage gauges seems the best option. No doubt IATA has a bargaining position to settle this issue with many of the larger airports. Additional costs for providing such an area is nothing compared to enhancing the reputation that IATA’s member airlines respect their passengers’ rights.

IATA’s moral obligations must be translated into the association’ efforts to establish a guideline on determining penalty fees. IATA should encourage its member airlines of instituting a reasonable, as opposed to extraordinary income, from these type of fees. This would not only protect the passengers, but also the member airlines as well. By having a clear standard for the penalty formula, it shall prevent member airlines from being sued or prosecuted on grounds of infringing consumer rights.
It is better for IATA to take all necessary steps to proactively protect their member airlines from the possibility of group actions such as lawsuits in the future. Facing such actions is a nightmare for them since it will damage their image and negatively impact the business. It is only a matter of time if these practices continue.

There is an urgency for an assessment to balance commercial purpose and consumer rights encouraged by the IATA. This could be a starting point to restore the image of an airline industry that respects their consumer’s rights. Growth within the airline industry will be limited if passengers are dissatisfied.

Concluding Remarks and the Way Forward

One of the purposes of liberalization was to fix inefficiency within the airline business in order to benefit the consumers. A new era of airline competition has come which encourages innovations. As today phenomenon, the low-cost carrier model is one whose growth has had a significant impact on airline competition and business practices.

Today as a significant actor within the airline business, low-cost carriers have left a definite impact. A strict cabin size baggage policy with resulting penalty fees is one of the main attributes of the low-cost carrier business model. IATA also has played a role in determining cabin size baggage dimensions with its recommendation. IATA’s proposed Cabin Size OK, which is currently being reassessed, has the potential to determine a worldwide cabin size baggage standard in the future. Some full-service airlines seems to be following the low-cost carriers’ path in order to minimize costs.

Increasingly stringent cabin size baggage regulations have called into question whether they infringe passengers’ fundamental rights as a consumer. Every airline passenger has the right for pleasant travel, including feeling ‘secure’ from surprise penalties when bringing baggage into the cabin. Transit and transfer passengers’ rights have a greater chance to be infringed since they are using two or more airlines with unharmonized policies on cabin baggage. Considering the rapid developments of this situation, IATA must choose a stand between a pro-consumer or airline approach. An equilibrium does not always mean 50-50. The restoration of an economic balance between consumer and airlines is the goal. However, since IATA does not have binding power, their ultimate efforts must be seen based on moral obligation.

It is better for IATA to proactively take all necessary steps to protect their member airlines from the possibility of group actions such as lawsuits towards (member) airlines in the future. A comprehensive assessment with detailed recommendations towards cabin size baggage and its associated penalties could become a starting point.

There will not be an IATA without airlines, and there will not be airlines without passengers.

---
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