

Q & A on APFA's support for AA's Anti-Trust Immunity (ATI) filing

Why is APFA supporting AA's Anti-Trust Immunity (ATI) filing?

American, along with BA and other **oneworld** alliance carriers, have continually expressed the need for a "level playing field" to compete with UA, DL and our other major competitors who have been granted ATI and have seen increased revenues from them for years.

Based on extensive analysis by our own legal counsel and economic experts, we believe potential job loss is greater if the ATI is not granted while job prospects increase with an approved ATI.

Why did we wait so long to support the ATI?

We took the time necessary to fully review the possible impact on our members, our only deciding factor in this decision. Information from AA, from sources in Washington and the EU, changed frequently and needed constant revision. Recent and increased competition for Pacific region alliance partners—including JAL, a current **oneworld** member—also came under consideration. In the end, we believe that the current climate of airline alliances and imminent decisions due from both the Department of Transportation and European Commission on Competition, tipped the scale clearly in favor of support by APFA.

Do we have assurances or agreements that our jobs are protected?

While there are no written assurances of job protection, the ATI agreements are structured so that the only way the alliance brings revenue to AA is if AA's own aircraft does the flying. Given the protections afforded in the pilots' scope language, the strongest compared to other alliances, our attorneys and economists firmly believe we will have more Flight Attendant jobs with an alliance in place than we would without an alliance.

The information I have seen from APA says the ATI will result in job losses. APFA says it will protect jobs. How do I know who is telling the truth?

We fully respect APA's position as they believe it is best for their members. Our review of other ATIs, and the proposed ATI with BA and IB, show that it is in our members' best interest that the ATI be approved. (TWU has also come to the conclusion that approval of the ATI is important for the future of their members.) Airlines in the other approved alliances have seen increases in the international flying for their Flight Attendants. All evidence points to more potential for job loss if the ATI is not approved.

I thought I heard that other Flight Attendant unions oppose alliances as it hurts their members. Is that true? If so, why is APFA supporting this at AA?

APFA supports a level playing field for all airlines. We would much prefer that every airline have to tough it out on their own. However alliances and ATIs are a fact of life and AA has to compete with carriers that have approved, long-standing ATIs.

If our major competitors are allowed to be in an alliance, but AA is prevented from being in one, then that harms our members. We believe the other unions—which already reap benefits from their carrier's own alliances—would not want to be the lone man out in the current aviation environment.