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# Introduction

## Document purpose

The purpose of this document is to define the scope for the Functional Excise System Specifications (FESS) and the Design Document for National Excise Applications (DDNEA) for EMCS Phase 4.0 corrective and evolutive release.

## Scope

This document records the RFCs that will be implemented in FESS and in DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.0 corrective and evolutive release.

The RFCs included in this document are a subset of the RFCs listed in the “Functional Excise System Specification (FESS) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations” [R03] and in the "Design Document for National Excise Applications for EMCS List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations" [R05].

The full list of the RFCs that will be implemented in FESS and DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.0 corrective and evolutive release is the following:

1. **~~22~~21 FESS RFCs**

* FESS-245;
* FESS-247;
* FESS-248;
* FESS-249;
* FESS-250;
* ~~FESS-251;~~
* FESS-252;
* FESS-253;
* FESS-256;
* FESS-259;
* FESS-260;
* FESS-261;
* FESS-262;
* FESS-263;
* FESS-264;
* FESS-265;
* FESS-266;
* FESS-267;
* FESS-268;
* FESS-269;
* FESS-270;
* FESS-271.

1. **~~25~~24 DDNEA RFCs**

* DDNEA-P3-275;
* DDNEA-P3-276;
* DDNEA-P3-277;
* DDNEA-P3-278;
* ~~DDNEA-P4-279;~~
* DDNEA-P4-280;
* DDNEA-P4-281;
* DDNEA-P4-282;
* DDNEA-P4-283;
* DDNEA-P4-284;
* DDNEA-P4-289;
* DDNEA-P4-292;
* DDNEA-P4-293;
* DDNEA-P4-294;
* DDNEA-P4-295;
* DDNEA-P4-296;
* DDNEA-P4-297;
* DDNEA-P4-298;
* DDNEA-P4-299;
* DDNEA-P4-300;
* DDNEA-P4-301;
* DDNEA-P4-302;
* DDNEA-P4-303;
* DDNEA-P4-304;
* DDNEA-P4-305.

The EMCS Phase 4.0 corrective and evolutive release of FESS and of DDNEA, implements corrective and evolutive RFCs on the already agreed scope for changes that have been revealed during the central and national development activities and some documentation RFCs.

## Applicability

This document is applicable to the previous versions of FESS and DDNEA for Phase 3.4, FESS v3.91 and DDNEA v2.02.

## Structure

This document is organised as follows:

* **Chapter 1 – Introduction**: Introduces the purpose and scope of this document;
* **Chapter 2 – Overview of Changes for this Release**: Groups RFCs by release number;
* **Chapter 3 – Change Requests**: Lists and describes the RFCs in sequential order;
* **Chapter 4 – Annexes**: Provides a series of files with more information about RFCs.

## Reference documents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref.** | **Title** | **Originator** | **Version** | **Date** |
| R01 | Excise Glossary of Terms (GLT) | ITSM3 TES | 2.09 | 03/08/2016 |
| R02 | Functional Excise System Specifications (FESS) | FITSDEV3 | 3.91 | 13/12/2018 |
| R03 | Functional Excise System Specification (FESS) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations | ITSM3 TES | 6.66 | 30/06/2020 |
| R04 | DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 | FITSDEV3 | 2.02 | 22/02/2019 |
| R05 | Design Document for National Excise Applications for EMCS (DDNEA for EMCS) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations | ITSM3 TES | 3.82 | 26/06/2020 |

Table : Reference documents

## Applicable documents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref.** | Title | **Originator** | **Version** | **Date** |
| A01 | EMCS Change Management Process | DG TAXUD | 2.00 | 30/01/2014 |

Table : Applicable documents

## Abbreviations & acronyms

For a better understanding of the present document, the following table provides a list of the principal abbreviations and acronyms used.

See also the ‘list of acronyms’ on TEMPO.

| **Abbreviation/Acronym** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| AAD | Administrative Accompanying Document |
| ACO | Administrative Cooperation |
| AES | Automated Export System |
| ARC | Administrative Reference Code |
| CCN | Common Communication Network |
| CCN/CSI | Common Communication Network/Common System Interface |
| CD | Common Domain |
| CDEA | Centrally Developed Excise Application |
| CLD | Collaboration Diagram |
| CN | Combined Nomenclature |
| COL | Custom Office List |
| CS/MIS | Central Services – Management Information System |
| CS/MISE | Central Services / Management Information System for Excise |
| CS/RD | Central System – Reference Data |
| CTA | Conformance Testing Application |
| DB | Data Base |
| DDNEA | Design Document for National Excise Applications |
| DG TAXUD | Directorate-General Taxation and Customs Union |
| e-AD | Electronic Administrative Document |
| e-SAD | Electronic Simplified Administrative Document |
| EBP | Elementary Business Process |
| EcOp | Economic Operator |
| ECP | Excise Computerisation Project |
| ECS | Export Control System |
| ECWP | Excise Computerisation Working Party |
| ED | External Domain |
| EDI | Electronic Data Interchange |
| EDIFACT | EDI for Administration Commerce and Transport |
| EEC | European Economic Community |
| ELO | Excise Liaison Office |
| EMCS | Excise Movement and Control System |
| EMCS CAB | EMCS Change Advisory Board |
| EOL | Excise Office List |
| EORI | Economic Operators Registration and Identification |
| EPC | Excise Product Code |
| ESS | EMCS System Specifications |
| EWSE | Early Warning System for Excise |
| FESS | Functional Excise System Specifications |
| FMS | Functional Message Structure |
| FRS | Fallback and Recovery Specification |
| FTSS | Functional Transit System Specifications |
| GLT | Glossary of Terms |
| IE | Information Exchange |
| IT | Information Technology |
| LRN | Local Reference Number |
| MRN | Movement Reference Number |
| MS | Member State |
| MSA | Member State Administration |
| MVS | Movement Verification System |
| N/A | Not Applicable |
| NCTS | New Computerised Transit System |
| ND | National Domain |
| NEA | National Excise Applications |
| NMR | Next Maintenance Release |
| RADM | Registration and Authorisation Data Management |
| RFC | Request for Change |
| SAD | Single Administrative Document |
| SEED | System for Exchange of Excise Data |
| SEP | Security Policy |
| STD | State Transition Diagram |
| TA | Testing Application |
| TARIC | Tariff Intégré Communautaire |
| TBD | To Be Determined |
| TCP | Transit Computerisation Project |
| TESS | Technical Excise System Specifications |
| UC | Use Case |
| VAT | Value Added Tax |
| VIES | VAT Information Exchange System |
| WD | Workshop Decision |
| XML | eXtensible Mark-up Language |
| XSD | Directory With XML Schemas |

Table 3: Abbreviations and acronyms

## Definitions

Readers can refer to the EMCS Glossary of Terms [R01] for more detailed definitions of terms where necessary.

# Overview of Changes for this Release

## Changes related to the FESS for EMCS Phase 4.0

| **Release** | **RFC** | **RFC Label** | **Category of Change** | **Status** | **Release Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TBD | FESS-245 | Update of energy products CN codes | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-247 | Update the optionality of <Body Record Unique Reference> in Manual Closure messages | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-248 | Alignment with EPCs under the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/550 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-249 | Update the format of ‘Supporting Document Type’ to allow TARIC codes inclusion | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-250 | Annual Updates of CN Codes 2020 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| ~~TBD~~ | ~~FESS-251~~ | ~~Clarifications regarding the applicability of Temporary Authorisations~~ | ~~Review~~ | ~~Accepted~~ | ~~13/02/2023~~ |
| TBD | FESS-252 | Update description of BR024 and BR025 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-253 | Clarifications on the applicability of rule ‘R251’ | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-256 | Applicability of Degree Plato | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-259 | Updates regarding the use of economic operators in ACO requests | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-260 | Update naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-261 | Clarifications regarding the expected Quantity for e-ADs created after rejection of consignments | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-262 | Clarifications regarding the Explanation on Delay for Delivery process | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-263 | Update of legal references | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-264 | Computerisation of Duty Paid B2B | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-265 | Maintenance of FESS-specific artefacts | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-266 | Removal of technical messages from BPMs | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-267 | Remove references to FESS appendices | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-268 | Deprecation of the IE820 message | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-269 | Handling of Timers for manually closed movements | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-270 | SEED compliance with GDPR/Rev2 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| TBD | FESS-271 | Inclusion of CN Code ‘15180095’ in EMCS | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |

Table 4: Overview of FESS Changes for this Release

## Changes related to the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.0

| **Release** | **RFC** | **RFC Label** | **Category of Change** | **Status** | **Release Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P3-275 | Update the optionality of <Body Record Unique Reference> in Manual Closure messages | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P3-276 | Include entry for ‘IE905’ in TC60 and TC64 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P3-277 | Include the Manual Closure codelists in TC25 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P3-278 | Update the format of ‘Supporting Document Type’ to allow TARIC codes inclusion | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| ~~v2.04~~ | ~~DDNEA-P4-279~~ | ~~Clarifications regarding the applicability of Temporary Authorisations~~ | ~~Review~~ | ~~Accepted~~ | ~~13/02/2023~~ |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-280 | Applicability of ‘C095’ on the IE880 message | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-281 | Update description of BR024 and BR025 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-282 | Documentation update in Manual Closure process description | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-283 | There is no reference to any other RFCs. | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-284 | Clarifications on the applicability of rule ‘R251’ | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-289 | Applicability of Degree Plato | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-292 | Updates regarding the use of economic operators in ACO requests | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-293 | Update naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-294 | Clarifications regarding the expected Quantity for e-ADs created after the rejection of consignments | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-295 | Clarifications regarding the Explanation on Delay for Delivery process | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-296 | Update of legal references | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-297 | Removal of ‘TA’ references | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-298 | Clarifications regarding the structure of the IE917 message | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-299 | Computerisation of Duty Paid B2B | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-300 | Remove references to FESS appendices | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-301 | Deprecation of the IE820 message | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-302 | Handling of Timers for manually closed movements | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-303 | Modification of figures in DDNEA “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” section | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-304 | Correction in DDNEA “III.VI.2.3.4 e-AD Manual Closure and the e-AD is under the 'Accepted' state at the MSA of Destination” section | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |
| v2.04 | DDNEA-P4-305 | SEED compliance with GDPR/Rev2 | Review | Accepted | 13/02/2023 |

Table : Overview of DDNEA Changes for this Release

# Change Requests

## FESS Change Requests

#### FESS-245 – Update of energy products CN codes

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-245 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM283391 | | Known Error | KE18416 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 03/10/2018 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Based on the annual update of the Combined Nomenclature (2019), an impact on the excise energy product codes has been identified. More specifically, according to the updated Combined Nomenclature (2019), the existing CN codes ‘27101251’ and ‘27101259’ shall be removed and a new CN code ‘27101250’ shall be added.  **Proposed Solution**  *The changes described in this RfC shall be applied in the corresponding IE734 as of 10/12/2018.*  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS:   * APPENDIX B: LIST OF CODES   In section ‘2.3 CN CODES’, a new CN code ‘27101250’ will be added and the existing CN codes ‘27101251’ and ‘27101259’ will be removed. The applicable changes are highlighted below in bold/italic:   | **Code** | **Description** | | --- | --- | | … | … | | 27101249 | Light oil with a lead content not exceeding 0.013 g per litre with an octane number of less than 98 or more | | ***~~27101251~~*** | ***~~Light oil with a lead content exceeding 0.013 g per litre with an octane number of less than 98~~*** | | ***~~27101259~~*** | ***~~Light oil with a lead content exceeding 0.013 g per litre with an octane number of 98 or more~~*** | | ***27101250*** | ***Light oil with a lead content exceeding 0.013 g per litre*** | | 27101270 | Spirit type jet fuel | | … | … |   In section ‘2.4 CORRESPONDENCES CN CODE – EXCISE PRODUCT’, a mapping for the newly added CN code shall be added and the mappings for the removed CN codes shall be deleted as shown below:   | **Code** | **Description** | | --- | --- | | E300 | | 27075000 | | E410 | | 27101231 | | ***~~E410~~*** | | ***~~27101251~~*** | | ***~~E410~~*** | | ***~~27101259~~*** | | ***E410*** | | ***27101250*** | | E420 | | 27101231 |   Note: The described changes in this carried-over RFC will be implemented in the corresponding ARIS BPMs. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Low).   Excise BPM (Low):   * New ‘Technical Terms’ for the newly added CN codes described in the [Proposed Solution] section will be added in the ‘CL Excise Product’ matrix model; * The existing ‘Technical Terms’ for the removed CN codes as described in the [Proposed Solution] section will be deleted from the ‘CL Excise Product’ matrix model. | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the list of applicable CN codes outlined in FESS Appendix B will not be aligned with the Annual Update of the Combined Nomenclature (2019). | | Risk assessment | See downstream RFC IE734-031. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream IE734 RfC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** IE734-031 * **Other RFCs:** - | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB and will be confirmed after publication of the updated Combined Nomenclature (2019)** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #180 on 24/10/2018 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-247 – Update the optionality of <Body Record Unique Reference> in Manual Closure messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-247 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM319391 | | Known Error | KE19025 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/05/2019 | | Requester | MSA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As part of RFC FESS-241-‘Extending the Manual Closure Functionality/Rev1’, the data item <Body Record Unique Reference> is included as optional in the <Manual Closure Body> data group of both IE880 and IE881 messages.  As per ‘Rule058’, which is linked with the <Body Record Unique Reference> data item, each <Body Record Unique Reference> should refer to the e-AD Body of the associated e-AD and must be unique within the message.  Based on the above, the <Body Record Unique Reference> data item should not be optional in the IE880 and IE881 messages, as this could potentially allow a Member State to submit such messages having multiple occurrences of the <Manual Closure Body> data group with no association to a corresponding e-AD, since it is not required to specify a <Body Record Unique Reference>.  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.1.1) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:  In the ‘MANUAL CLOSURE Body’ data group diagram, the relationship for the technical term <Body Record Unique Reference> will be updated to ‘Required’. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Low);   DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, FESS will not be correctly updated, allowing the possibility for a Member State to submit manual closure messages having multiple occurrences of the <Manual Closure Body> data group with no association to a corresponding e-AD. | | Risk assessment | See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-275*.* | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-275 * **Other RFCs:** - | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Impact on Technical Annex of Implementing Regulation 2016/323 | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #185 on 09/07/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-248 – Alignment with EPCs under the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/550

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-248 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM325858 | | Known Error | KE19123 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 04/07/2019 | | Requester | MSA-HR | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  According to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/550 the descriptions of product codes E460, E480 and E490 are defined as follows:   * E460: Kerosene, marked falling within CN code 2710 19 25 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC); * E480: Products falling within CN codes 2710 12 21, 2710 12 25, 2710 19 29 and 2710 20 90 (only for products of which less than 90 % by volume (including losses) distils at 210 °C and 65 % or more by volume (including losses) distils at 250 °C by the ISO 3405 method (equivalent to the ASTM D 86 method)) in bulk commercial movements (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC); * E490: Products falling within CN codes 2710 12 11, 2710 12 15, 2710 12 70, 2710 12 90, 2710 19 11, 2710 19 15, 2710 19 31, 2710 19 35, 2710 19 51 and 2710 19 55 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC).   The above descriptions are correctly depicted in FESS v3.91. However, the corresponding section outlining the mapping between CN codes and Excise products is not updated in alignment with the aforementioned product code descriptions.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS ‘Appendix B – List of Codes’:   * Removal of the below entry from the table in Section “*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product”*:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | E460 | 27101921 | | E490 | 27101221 | | E490 | 27101225 | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Low); * DDNEA (None). * FESS Excise BPM (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | The effect of not performing the updates in FESS will be the misalignment between “Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/550” and FESS Appendix B. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** IE734-035 * **Other RFCs:** - | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 18/07/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-249 – Update the format of ‘Supporting Document Type’ to allow TARIC codes inclusion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-249 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM327096 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 07/08/2019 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As described in FESS RFC-240, the ‘Type of Document’ business codelist was updated to include TARIC codes having a ‘an..4’ format, which should be included in the <Document Type> data item in the IE815 and IE801 messages.  However, based on the latest communication with MSAs, it has been agreed that the use of TARIC codes should be extended to <Supporting Document Type> in related administrative cooperation messages (IE721, IE722, IE820, IE867, IE880 and IE881).  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.1.3) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * The format of the existing technical term <Supporting Document Type> will be updated to ‘an..4’.   It shall be noted that the technical term <Supporting Document Type> is included in the data group diagram “SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS for IE721, IE722, 867, IE880 and IE881”, thus this update will be applicable in all corresponding information exchanges. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | The effect of not performing the updates in FESS will be to retain the current situation of EMCS, in which TARIC codes are only allowed to be used in the IE815 and IE801 messages, but not in related administrative cooperation messages (IE721, IE722, IE820, IE867, IE880 and IE881). | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-278 * **Other RFCs:** - | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 12/08/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-250 – Annual Updates of CN Codes 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-250 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM342490 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 02/10/2019 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Based on the annual update of the Combined Nomenclature, the CN codes used in EMCS need to be updated in alignment with any relevant updates.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix B:   * Removal of the below entries from the table of Section “*2.3 CN Codes*”:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Code** | **Description** | | ... | .... | | 22082027 | Brandy de Jerez in containers holding 2 litres or less | | 22082029 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape wine or grape marc in containers holding 2 litres or less other than Cognac, Armagnac, Grappa and Brandy de Jerez | | 22082040 | Raw distillate spirits in containers holding more than 2 litres | | 22082064 | Not raw distillate Armagnac in containers holding more than 2 litres | | 22082087 | Not raw distillate Brandy de Jerez in containers holding more than 2 litres | | 22082089 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape wine or grape marc in containers holding more than 2 litres other than Cognac, Armagnac, Grappa and Brandy de Jerez | | 27101964 | Heavy fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.1% by weight but not exceeding 1%, not containing biodiesel | | 27101968 | Heavy fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 1% by weight, not containing biodiesel | | 27102015 | Gas oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.001% by weight but not exceeding 0.002%, containing biodiesel | | 27102017 | Gas oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.002% by weight but not exceeding 0.1%, containing biodiesel | | 27102031 | Fuel oil with a sulphur content not exceeding 0.1% by weight, containing biodiesel | | 27102035 | Fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.1% by weight but not exceeding 1%, containing biodiesel | | 27102039 | Fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 1% by weight, containing biodiesel | | ... | .... |  * Addition/updates of the below entries in the table of Section “*2.3 CN Codes*”:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Code** | **Description** | | ... | .... | | 22082012 | Cognac obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding 2 litres or less | | 22082014 | Armagnac obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding 2 litres or less | | 22082016 | Brandy de Jerez obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding 2 litres or less | | 22082018 | Brandy or Weinbrand obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding 2 litres or less other than Brandy de Jerez | | 22082019 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding 2 litres or less other than Cognac, Armagnac and Brandy or Weinbrand | | 22082026 | Grappa obtained by distilling grape marc in containers holding 2 litres or less | | 22082028 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape marc in containers holding 2 litres or less other than Grappa | | 22082062 | Cognac obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding more than 2 litres | | 22082066 | Brandy or Weinbrand obtained by distilling grape wine in containers holding more than 2 litres | | 22082069 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape wine in contains holding more than 2 litres other than Cognac or Brandy or Weinbrand | | 22082086 | Grappa obtained by distilling grape marc in contains holding more than 2 litres | | 22082088 | Spirits obtained by distilling grape marc in contains holding more than 2 litres other than Grappa | | 27101966 | Heavy fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.1% by weight but not exceeding 0.5%, not containing biodiesel | | 27101967 | Heavy fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.5% by weight, not containing biodiesel | | 27102016 | Gas oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.001% by weight but not exceeding 0.1%, containing biodiesel | | 27102032 | Fuel oil with a sulphur content not exceeding 0.5% by weight, containing biodiesel | | 27102038 | Fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 0.5% by weight, containing biodiesel | | ... | .... |  * Removal of the below entries from the table of Section “*2.4 Correspondence CN Codes-Excise Product*”:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Code** | **Description** | | ... | .... | | S200 | 22082027 | | S200 | 22082029 | | S200 | 22082040 | | S200 | 22082064 | | S200 | 22082087 | | S200 | 22082089 | | E470 | 27101964 | | E470 | 27101968 | | E430 | 27102015 | | E440 | 27102015 | | E430 | 27102017 | | E440 | 27102017 | | E470 | 27102031 | | E470 | 27102035 | | E470 | 27102039 | | ... | .... |  * Addition of the below entries in the table of Section “*2.4 Correspondence CN Codes-Excise Product*”:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Code** | **Description** | | ... | .... | | S200 | 22082016 | | S200 | 22082018 | | S200 | 22082019 | | S200 | 22082028 | | S200 | 22082069 | | S200 | 22082066 | | S200 | 22082069 | | S200 | 22082088 | | E470 | 27102032 | | E470 | 27102038 | | E470 | 27101966 | | E470 | 27101967 | | E430 | 27102016 | | E440 | 27102016 | | ... | .... |  * Updates of the below product descriptions in the table of Section “*2.2 Excise Product*”:  | **EPC** | **CAT** | **UNIT** | **Description** | **A** | **P** | **D** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | … | … | … | … | … | … | … | | E470 | E | 1 | Heavy fuel oil falling within CN codes 2710 19 62, 2710 19 66, 2710 19 67, 2710 20 32 and 2710 20 38 ~~2710 19 64, 2710 19 68,~~ ~~2710 20 31, 2710 20 35 and 2710 20 39~~ (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC) | N | N | N | | E430 | E | 2 | Gasoil, unmarked falling within CN codes 2710 19 43, 2710 19 46, 2710 19 47, 2710 19 48, 2710 20 11, 2710 20 16~~2710 20 15, 2710 20 17~~ and 2710 20 19 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC) | N | N | Y | | E440 | E | 2 | Gasoil, marked falling within CN codes 2710 19 43, 2710 19 46, 2710 19 47, 2710 19 48, 2710 20 11, 2710 20 16 ~~2710 20 15, 2710 20 17~~ and 2710 20 19 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC) | N | N | Y | | … | …. | … | … | … | … | … | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   Note: The described changes in this carried-over RFC will be implemented in the corresponding ARIS BPMs. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Medium).   Excise BPM (Medium):   * The ‘CN Codes’ included in the ‘CL CN Codes’ matrix model will be updated as per the [Proposed Solution] section; * The descriptions of the applicable Excise Products included in the ‘CL Excise Product’ matrix model will be updated as per the [Proposed Solution] section. | | Effect of not implementing the Change | The effect of not performing the updates in FESS will be the misalignment between “ANNEX I COMBINED NOMENCLATURE” and FESS Appendix B. | | Risk assessment | See downstream RFC IE734-038. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream IE734 RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs: -** * **Children RFCs:** IE734-038 * **Other RFCs:** - | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 23/10/2019. | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### ~~FESS-251 – Clarifications regarding the applicability of Temporary Authorisations~~

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **~~RFC Information~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~RFC number~~ | ~~FESS-251~~ | | ~~RFC status~~ | ~~Accepted~~ | | ~~Reason for Change~~ | ~~Specification Defect~~ | | ~~Incidents~~ | ~~IM244005~~ | | ~~Known Error~~ | ~~KE18108~~ | | ~~Date at which the Change was proposed~~ | ~~04/06/2018~~ | | ~~Requester~~ | ~~MSA-BG~~ | |
| **~~Change Assessment~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Change priority~~ | ~~Low~~ | | ~~Change Description~~ | **~~Problem Statement~~**  ~~It has been identified that further clarifications are needed in relation to the validity of temporary authorisations and based on which business event, MSAs should check the validity of a temporary authorisation specified in a movement.~~  ~~In further details, the existing rule ‘R045’ specifies that in case a Trader Identification of a temporary authorisation is specified, then this identifier should be ‘~~*~~An existing <Temporary Authorisation Reference> in the set of <TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION>~~*~~’. However, it is not clarified if this means that the temporary authorisation should be valid at the time where the consignment received or when the corresponding information exchange is processed etc.~~  **~~Proposed Solution~~**  ~~As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the existing rule ‘R045’ will be updated to highlight that in relation to the validity of authorisations (i.e. temporary and non-temporary authorisations) used in a movement, MSAs should actually check if the authorisation is valid at the time of e-AD validation and ARC allocation, even if these messages are created after the authorisation’s end date.~~  ~~In details, the following update shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:~~   * ~~A clarification will be added in the end of the existing class 'R045' description, as described below:~~   ~~"\*\*An existing identifier of an economic operator implies an authorisation which is valid at the time of e-AD validation and ARC allocation even if these messages are created after the authorisation’s end date. "~~ | | ~~Impact assessment~~ | ~~Specification Documents:~~   * ~~FESS Excise BPMs (Low);~~ * ~~DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low).~~ | | ~~Effect of not implementing the Change~~ | ~~If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities may be raised in relation to the validity of temporary authorisations specified in movements of excise goods.~~ | | ~~Risk assessment~~ | ~~There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC.~~ | | ~~Deployment approach~~ | ~~The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC.~~ | | ~~Reference to other RFCs~~ | * **~~Parent RFCs:~~** ~~-;~~ * **~~Children RFCs:~~** ~~DDNEA-P4-279;~~ * **~~Other RFCs:~~** ~~-.~~ | |
| **~~Indicative changes to legislation~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Draft recital for information~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Location of change in Legislation~~ | ~~N/A~~ | |
| **~~Approval Process~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~CAB recommendation~~ | * **~~Category of the Change: Review;~~** * **~~Approval process:~~**   + **~~The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.~~** | | ~~ECWP position~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Authorisation date and process~~ | ~~EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020~~ | |
| **~~Release information~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Release number~~ | ~~TBD~~ | | ~~Release date~~ | ~~13/02/2023~~ | | ~~Deadline for alignment in Production~~ | ~~TBD~~ | |
| **~~Change Review~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Review date~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Review results~~ | ~~N/A~~ | |

#### FESS-252 – Update description of BR024 and BR025

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-252 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM319001 | | Known Error | KE19004 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 14/05/2019 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  During the development of EMCS Phase 3.4, it was identified that even though the existing business rules ‘BR024’ and ‘BR025’ were correctly applied on the newly introduced IE880 and IE881 messages in the DDNEA, these assignments were not updated in FESS and also the corresponding descriptions of these business rules were not updated accordingly.  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.2.2) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs (highlighted in bold/italics):   * The description of the class ‘BR024’ will be updated as per below:   BR ID:BR024  BR Category: Relation    BR Description:  It is obligatory that the body record unique reference of each body report of receipt/**manual closure** that is included in the draft report of receipt/***manual closure*** corresponds to the same excise product code as in the e-AD.    FESS Validation Rule:  •For each record referring to a body record of the e-AD, the referred sequential number concerns the right product code.    IE:  •Draft IE818(draft report of receipt)  ***•IE881 (Manual closure response)***    Data Item:  (BODY) REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Body Record Unique Reference  ***(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference***   Optionality: Mandatory   Comments: N/A   * The description of the class ‘BR025’ will be updated as per below:   BR ID:BR025  BR Category: Relation    BR Description:  It is obligatory that the sum of the observed shortage and the refused quantity of each body report of receipt/***manual closure*** that is included in the draft report of receipt/***manual closure*** is less or equal to the quantity of the body e-AD with the same body record unique reference that is included in the last e-AD or the refused quantity of the body report of receipt/***manual closure*** with the same body record unique reference that is included in the last, if any, report of receipt/***manual closure*** that indicated partial refusal.    FESS Validation Rule:  • For each record referring to a body record of the e-AD, the sum of the observed shortage and of the refused quantity does not exceed the current quantity for the e-AD; these current quantities are those refused in the latest partially refused report of receipt/***manual closure***, if any; if there is no such partially refused report of receipt/***manual closure***, they are copied from the original e-AD.    IE:  Draft IE818 (draft report of receipt)  ***IE881 (Manual closure response)***  Data Item:  (BODY) REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Refused Quantity  ***(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused*** ***Quantity***    Optionality: Mandatory  Comments: N/A   * In the data group diagram ‘MANUAL CLOSURE Body’, the existing class ‘BR024’ will be associated with the technical term <Body Record Unique Reference>; * In the data group diagram ‘MANUAL CLOSURE Body’, the existing class ‘BR025’ will be associated with the technical term <Refused Quantity>. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Low); * DDNEA (No Impact). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the Excise BPMs will not be aligned with the DDNEA specifications, in relation to the applicability of business rules ‘BR024’ and ‘BR025’ on the IE881 message. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | This RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-281; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-253 – Clarifications on the applicability of rule ‘R251’

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-253 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM359061 | | Known Error | KE19559 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 24/01/2020 | | Requester | MSA-IE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The introduction of the <Shipping Marks> data item with the corresponding condition 'C203' and rule 'R251' were introduced as part of RFC ‘FESS-225’, in order to handle cases where the excise goods of two or more body records in an 'e-AD' are included in the same package. In such cases it should be possible that the first body record can mention the actual number of the packages and the rest of the body records can mention a zero number of packages to indicate this dependency.  As part of the RFC ‘FESS-225’, rule ‘R251’ was introduced according to which, in case the 'Number of Packages' is set to '0', then there should exist at least one 'PACKAGE' with the same 'Shipping Marks' and 'Number of Packages' with value greater than '0'.  However, during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4, it was identified that the wording of rule 'R251' raised some ambiguities in relation to whether the introduced logic should be applied on a per <E-AD> data group level, or on a per <(BODY) E-AD> level, i.e. it is not limited to a single 'e-AD' body, but it could be multiple 'e-AD' body records.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * The description of the existing class ‘R251’ will be updated with the following clarification as highlighted below (in bold/italics):   “In case the ‘Number of Packages’ is set to ‘0’, then there should exist at least one PACKAGE ***(i.e. either within the same <E-AD BODY> or within other <E-AD BODY> occurrences of the same message)*** with the same ‘Shipping Marks’ and ‘Number of Packages’ with value greater than ‘0’”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities may be raised in relation to the logic introduced by rule ‘R251’ and specifically, the level that this rule should be applied on. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-284; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-256 – Applicability of Degree Plato

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-256 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM304543 | | Known Error | KE19410 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 18/11/2019 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  In the common specifications, the applicability of ‘Degree Plato’ in taxing beer products is defined by condition ‘C048’, which only checks the applicability of Degree Plato at the Member State of Dispatch.  However, as described in COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 684/2009, the ‘Degree Plato’ should be a required data item depending on whether the Member State of Dispatch and/or the Member State of Destination tax beer on the basis of ‘Degree Plato’.  Hence, corresponding updates should be performed in the Common Specifications to clarify that the applicability of Degree Plato should be checked for either Member State of Dispatch or Member State of Destination.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates should be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * Update the description of the existing class ‘C048’ as described below:   **From:**  *IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is "Yes"*  *THEN <Degree Plato> is 'O' (\*)*  *ELSE <Degree Plato> does not apply*  *where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>.*  *(\*) Member States of Dispatch taxing beer according to the degree Plato may impose that <Degree Plato> has to be 'R'*  **To:**  *IF (<EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is "Yes") AND (MS of Dispatch OR MS of Destination tax beer according to the Degree Plato) THEN <Degree Plato> is 'R' ELSE <Degree Plato> does not apply where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT> AND Degree Plato applicability per Member State is retrieved from the list of <Member State-Degree Plato>.)*   * A new business codelist, named ‘CL Member State-Degree Plato’ will be created; * The newly created codelist will be associated with ‘SEED’ as an application system and ~~will be linked with 27 new code list values, each of these created with the following details:~~ will include a codelist value for each Member State that taxes beer according to the Degree Plato (i.e. the codelist will only include Member States taxing beer according to Degree Plato). Therefore, the codelist could eventually have up to 27 code list values if all Member States tax beer according to Degree Plato. Each of the new values created will have the following details: * Reference ID: BC109 * Name: [*Member State*] ~~– Degree Plato applicability:~~ *~~Y/N~~* * Remark/Example: [*Member State Code*]   *~~Note~~*~~: Member States shall provide the appropriate value i.e. Y/N, so that the corresponding codelist values for each Member State is updated accordingly.~~  *Note*: Member States shall clarify if they tax beer according to Degree Plato, so that the corresponding codelist values for each Member State is added accordingly, if needed. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, the common specifications (i.e. FESS in relation to this RFC will not be aligned with corresponding legislation in relation to the Degree Plato applicability. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-289; * **Other RFCs:** IE734-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-259 – Updates regarding the use of economic operators in ACO requests

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-259 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM256274 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 30/10/2018 | | Requester | MSA-FR | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  In the common specifications, a misalignment between the legislation and the common specifications has been identified in relation to the use of economic operators as criteria in submitted administrative cooperation requests.  In details, as per the Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/323 Article 6(2), each request made in accordance with paragraph 1 may concern zero or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority in accordance with Article 19(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 389/2012. It shall concern no more than one economic operator registered in the Member State of the requested authority.  However, the above clarification was not correctly transposed into the common specifications, allowing a Member State to potentially submit an administrative cooperation request which would concern more than one economic operator registered in the requested Member State.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates should be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * A new business rule ‘BR042’ will be created with the following description:   *BR ID:* BR042    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:*  An administrative cooperation request may concern zero or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority and may not concern more than one economic operator registered in the Member State of the requested authority.    *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If Trader Excise Number or VAT Number or Trader Name are used, these should concern one or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority and no more than one economic operator registered in the Member State of the requested authority    *IE:* IE721 (administrative cooperation request)  *Data Item:* TRADER Person.Trader Excise Number/ TRADER Person.VAT Number/ TRADER Person.Trader Name  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   * The newly created business rule will be added in the <TRADER Person> data group diagram under the IE721 message allocation diagram and associated with the following technical terms:   + Trader Excise Number   + VAT Number   + Trader Name | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, the common specifications will not be aligned with the corresponding legislation in relation to administrative cooperation requests. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-292; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-260 – Update naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-260 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM278408 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/11/2018 | | Requester | MSA-LV | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The current format used in EMCS functional specifications for both <Net Weight> and <Gross Weight> is ‘n..15,2’. It has been highlighted by MSA-LV, that this format may potentially lead to inconsistencies in the corresponding values added in an e-AD, as well as possible rounding issues. This is because according to the 'UNITS OF MEASURE' business codelist (BC52), the goods included in an e-AD can be measured (amongst others) in 'kg' or 'litres'. This would imply that the net or gross weight of the goods included in an e-AD would potentially need to be measured using 3 decimals (e.g. 10,555 kg or 1,375 litres).  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement] and in alignment with the Customs domain data model, the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * The existing technical term <Gross Weight> will be renamed to <Gross Mass>; * The format of the updated <Gross Mass> technical term will be updated to ‘n..16,6’; * The existing technical term <Net Weight> will be renamed to <Net Mass>; * The format of the updated <Net Mass> technical term will be updated to ‘n..16,6’. * The 'Remark/Example' field of the <Net Mass> technical term will be updated with the below text: "Enter the net mass of the concerned goods, expressed in kilograms. The net mass is the mass of the goods without any packaging.   Where a net mass greater than 1 kg includes a fraction of a unit (kg), it may be rounded off in the following manner:  — from 0.001 to 0.499: rounding down to the nearest kg;  — from 0.5 to 0.999: rounding up to the nearest kg.  A net mass of less than 1 kg should be entered as '0.' followed by a number of decimals up to 6, discarding all "0" at the end of the quantity (e.g. 0.123 for a package of 123 grams, 0.00304 for a package of 3 grams and 40 milligrams or 0.000654 for a package of 654 milligrams)."   * The 'Remark/Example' field of the <Gross Mass> technical term will be updated with the below text: "Enter the gross mass of the concerned goods, expressed in kilograms. The gross mass is the aggregate mass of the goods with all their packaging, excluding containers and other transport equipment.   Where a gross mass greater than 1 kg includes a fraction of a unit (kg), it may be rounded off in the following manner:  — from 0.001 to 0.499: rounding down to the nearest kg;  — from 0.5 to 0.999: rounding up to the nearest kg.   * A gross mass of less than 1 kg should be entered as '0.' followed by a number of decimals up to 6, discarding all "0" at the end of the quantity (e.g. 0.123 for a package of 123 grams, 0.00304 for a package of 3 grams and 40 milligrams or 0.000654 for a package of 654 milligrams)." | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then potential inconsistencies in relation to the values used in the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items would remain. Additionally, the proposed change aligns the Excise data model with the corresponding Customs one, in relation to the <Gross Mass> and <Net Mass> data items. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-293; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-261 – Clarifications regarding the expected Quantity for e-ADs created after rejection of consignments

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-261 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM295317 | | Known Error | KE19826 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 04/03/2019 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As described in the corresponding FESS process (i.e. UC2.06), in cases of changes of destination triggered from rejected quantities of an e-AD (e.g. from the submission of an IE818 message with rejected quantities), then the consignor is expected to change the destination for the part of the consignment that has been refused. Therefore, the newly generated e-ADs should be related to the part of the consignment that had been initially rejected (i.e. the corresponding rejected quantity).  However, it has been identified that this expected behaviour is not clearly defined at an information exchange level, but only described in the corresponding process instead. Therefore, it is proposed that the common specifications are updated accordingly, so that this behaviour is also clearly defined in the applicable information exchanges.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates should be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * A new business rule ‘BR043’ will be created with the following description:   *BR ID:* BR043    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:*  It is obligatory for an e-AD created as a result of a change of destination triggered from a rejected consignment, that the quantity of excise goods included in the new e-AD is equal to the refused quantity of the original consignment.    *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If a new e-AD is created for as a result of a rejected consignment, then the quantity included in the e-AD should be equal to the rejected quantity in the original consignment.    *IE:* IE801 (e-AD)  *Data Item:* E-AD Body.Quantity  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   * The newly created business rule will be added in the <E-AD Body for IE801> data group diagram under the IE801 message allocation diagram and associated with the <Quantity> technical term | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities in the common specifications will remain, in relation to the actual quantity that should be included in new e-ADs, created as a result of a rejected consignment. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-294; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-262 – Clarifications regarding the Explanation on Delay for Delivery process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-262 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM355632 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/04/2020 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Concerning the process of ‘Reminder at expiry of time limit for report of receipt’, it is clarified in the functional specifications [R02] that the logical sequence of this scenario is that the IE837 message should be sent after the 'TIM\_EAD' timer has expired and the consequent IE802 message has been transmitted. This is also depicted in the FESS main document 'UC-233-110' where the trigger for an eventual sending of an explanation message (IE837:C\_DEL\_EXP) is actually the reception of the reminder message.  However, as raised by the Member States, there is a potentially valid use case, where exceptionally the IE837 message could be proactively sent in advance (i.e. before the sending of the IE802 message), to notify the Member State of Dispatch of an expected delay in the submission of the Report of Receipt (e.g. in case of public holidays, strikes, etc.)  It shall also be noted that in the current version of the common specifications, there is actually no technical limitation to forbid a Member State not to send an IE837 message (i.e. state transition, rule, or condition) before the sending of the IE802 message.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates should be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * A new start event will be created with the following details:   + Name: Proactively send Explanation on Delay for Delivery;   + Description/Definition: The current process starts when the competent authorities at the Member State exceptionally wishes to proactively provide explanations on a potential delay for delivery. * The newly created business start event will be associated with the existing IE837 data object for both ‘Consignee’ and ‘Consignor’ lanes. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities in relation to whether the IE837 message could be exceptionally sent prior to the IE802 message will remain in the common specifications. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-295; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-263 – Update of legal references

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-263 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM370221 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 02/04/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The recast horizontal directive (EU) 2020/262 includes updates for both the Duty Suspension and Duty Paid B2B business domains. The existing Excise BPMs and related artefacts for Duty Suspension are based on Council Directive 2008/118/EC, which is now superseded by Council Directive (EU) 2020/262. Hence, any legal reference to Council Directive 2008/118/EC should be updated accordingly to the corresponding article of the new directive.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the existing Excise BPMs and related artefacts would need to be updated, by changing the legal references from Council Directive 2008/118/EC to Council Directive (EU) 2020/262. This includes mainly L1/L2/L3 artefacts and BPMs, but also any descriptions where the Directive 2008/118/EC is mentioned.  This activity shall be based on the following legal texts:  - Council Regulation (EU) 2020/261;  - Council Directive (EU) 2020/262;  - Decision (EU) 2020/263.  Where available, the corresponding correlation tables listing the applicable updates related to each legal text will be used, e.g. 'Annex II' of the Council Directive (EU) 2020/262 where a corresponding correlation table between Directive 2008/118/EC and 2020/262 is provided. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low) * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, the common specifications (i.e. FESS in relation to this RFC) will not be aligned with the latest Excise Legislation. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-296; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-264 – Computerisation of Duty Paid B2B

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-264 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM372196 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/11/2019 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The major evolution of EMCS Phase 4 is the computerisation of Duty Paid Business-to-Business (B2B) procedures. Based on the legal package[[2]](#footnote-2) that received a political agreement on 8/11/2019 at the Council, this evolution will be handled by the extension of EMCS to cover the movements of excise goods released for consumption and moved intra-EU cross-border for commercial purposes. This evolution will have a significant impact across the Excise Common Specifications which need to be updated accordingly to cater for the computerisation of the Duty Paid B2B business domain.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the Excise BPMs will be updated, in order to accommodate all the required updates for the computerisation of Duty Paid B2B.  The updated BPMs and related artefacts have been produced based on an iterative approach, where each excise domain (e.g. Core, RADM etc.) was analysed and discussed in detail with DG TAXUD and Member States.  Additionally, the overall approach taken was to re-use existing (i.e. Duty Suspension) processes and data as much as possible, in an attempt to minimise the required development effort and mitigate any potential risks.  The outcome of this activity is consolidated in an MSP publication, where all required updates for Duty Paid B2B are included:  [EXC\_559\_Aris\_BPMs\_and\_related\_artefacts\_for\_Duty\_Paid\_B2B\_MSP.Excise MS (Entire method)](https://aris9.itsmtaxud.eu/businesspublisher/login.do)  The aforementioned publication includes only the BPMs and artefacts that are impacted by the computerisation of the Duty Paid B2B business domain. Given that specific objects are re-used in several processes/artefacts, some of the updates may be applicable to other artefacts that are actually not impacted as such, by the introduction of Duty Paid B2B. As an example, the IE801 message is updated by the introduction of Duty Paid B2B, with one of the applicable updates being the update of the ARC structure (i.e. Rule 'R030'). This does not imply though that any other message, which is not impacted by the introduction of Duty Paid B2B as such, but only associated with rule 'R030' will be included in this publication.  For clarity purposes, ‘update markers’ along with corresponding ‘update descriptions’ have been used to indicate the actual updates in the BPMs and/or related artefacts. Green markers are added to any ‘additions’ (e.g. new rule added), yellow markers are added to any ‘updates/changes’ (e.g. existing task modified), while red markers are added to any deletions (e.g. deletion of a data item). The ‘update markers’ are added by the modeller when a specific update/change should be highlighted and/or traced. This approach has been followed for any model/artefact/object that is updated by the introduction of the Duty Paid B2B business domain (e.g. update of a task's name or renaming of a data group/item, addition of a data group etc.)  It shall be highlighted that the updates modelled in the aforementioned publication will be consolidated to the existing ‘EMCS’ directories in ARIS, leading to a single directory for both Duty Suspension and Duty Paid B2B BPMs and artefacts. This will be performed as part of the delivery of the complete EMCS Phase 4 Common Specifications package.  Moreover, the below updates related to the draft Duty Paid B2B will be also included in the publication of the EMCS Phase 4 Common Specifications:   1. Rule ‘R030’ will be updated by adding a clarification regarding ‘Field 4’ of the ARC structure, stating that the introduced logic is applicable for ARCs generated after 01/01/2023. Any ARCs generated before 01/01/2023, are associated with a Duty Suspension movement, regardless of the alphanumeric character specified in ‘Field 4’ of the ARC; 2. In ‘TC Reminder Message Type’, the description of value ‘3’ will be updated to ‘Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22 of Directive 2020/262)’. This is also applicable for rule ‘R262’; 3. The corresponding text in the description of rule ‘R265’ will be updated to ‘2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive 2020/262’; 4. A clarification will be added in the description of rules R258-R263, stating that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure; 5. The typo in the description of rule ‘R261’ will be updated, by changing ‘Origin Type Codes’ to ‘Submission Type Codes’; 6. The typo in the description of process L4-ACO-01-17 will be updated, i.e. ‘...a control officer decides to submit a complementary Control Report’; 7. The description of ‘S600’ in rule ‘R263’ will be updated to ‘Completely denatured alcohol, falling within Article 20 of Directive 92/83/EEC, being alcohol which has been denatured and fulfils the conditions to benefit from the exemption provided for in Article 27(1)(a) of that Directive.’; 8. The description of rule ‘R044’ will be updated to include ‘Temporary Certified Consignor’ as an applicable <Operator Type Code> of the referred <TRADER>; 9. The description of process L3-CORE-01-01’ will be updated to indicate the ‘Certified Consignor’ authorisation applicability for Duty Paid B2B movements. Additionally, the legal reference in process ‘L3-CORE-01-06’ will be updated to the recast Council Directive 2020/262.   Note: The ARIS Reports associated to the published ARIS BPMs are available on CIRCABC: <https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/115a8b06-ac04-41b4-9194-e8e732988371/details> | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (High); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (High). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the EMCS functional specifications will not be aligned with the Implementing Acts, Delegated Acts and Implementing Regulations related to Recast Council Directive 2020/262 and Amended Council Regulation 2020/261. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-299, IE734-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Recast Directive 2020/262 | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-265 – Maintenance of FESS-specific artefacts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-265 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM372195 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 15/04/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The agreed approach to be followed for EMCS Phase 4 is that Excise BPMs and related artefacts will replace the existing FESS documentation. However, it has been identified that certain FESS artefacts are not currently mapped to corresponding BPM ones. Therefore, a decision needs to be taken regarding how or if these artefacts should be handled within the Excise BPMs. The artefacts that are examined under this RFC are:   * FESS Appendix E; * CN codes/EPC correspondence mapping; * FESS Appendix A; * FESS Appendix H.   **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a list of existing artefacts has been identified, for which the way of maintaining those from EMCS Phase 4 onwards needs to be clarified.  *In relation to FESS ‘Appendix E’*:  The details included in FESS’s ‘Appendix E’ cannot be considered as strictly non-functional requirements (e.g. Access Rights). This appendix basically maps each process/use case to a corresponding role, while this is already covered in the existing BPMs, where each applicable actor is modelled in a separate lane/pool by design. Based on the above, FESS 'Appendix E' will be phased out, since the details included in this appendix are already defined in the existing BPMs with the use of the corresponding lanes/pools as actors.  *In relation to the CN Codes/EPC correspondence mapping:*  This mapping is currently included in FESS’s Appendix B, where all business codelists are consolidated, and is also included in the disseminated IE734. Essentially, the provided mapping, even though it is used by the Member States, cannot be considered strictly as codelist (e.g. not used in any message). Instead, this mapping is providing additional information to the Member States in relation to the mapping of the applicable CN codes to each applicable Excise Product Code as derived from the corresponding Excise Product Codes’ description.  From EMCS Phase 4.0 onwards and based on the transition to the Excise BPMs and artefacts, the CN Codes/EPC correspondence mapping will be maintained outside of ARIS, as a stand-alone document. However, this stand-alone document will be part of the supporting documentation delivered along with any Excise publication, such as ARIS BPM Reports.  *In relation to FESS ‘Appendix A’:*  FESS’s ‘Appendix A’ lists the availability and performance requirements for the corresponding EMCS processes. These non-functional requirements will be modelled in ARIS in alignment with the EU Customs BPM methodology.  Regarding the ‘availability’ non-functional requirements, the following will be modelled:   * In the existing requirement maps for CORE, ACO, RADM, RADM, and CS/MISE, a structural element ‘Availability Requirements’ will be added under ‘Non-Functional Requirements’; * A new requirement tree for ‘Availability Requirements’ will be created, including one non-functional requirement for each of the existing classes with the corresponding details (i.e. Permanent Availability, High Availability, General Availability, Office Availability, Scheduled Availability, Disconnected Availability); * The existing requirement trees of all applicable processes will be updated by adding the corresponding non-functional requirements, from the list of non-functional requirements described above. Indicatively, in the ‘Submit Report of Receipt/Export’ requirement tree, the ‘General’ Availability’ non-functional requirement will be added.   Regarding the ‘performance’ non-functional requirements, the following will be modelled:   * In the existing requirement maps for CORE, ACO, RADM, RADM, and CS/MISE, a structural element ‘Performance Requirements’ will be added under ‘Non-Functional Requirements’; * A new requirement tree for ‘Availability Requirements’ will be created, including one non-functional requirement for each class of response time and place combination with the corresponding details (e.g. Interactive (for Place ‘Consignor’)); * The existing requirement trees of all applicable processes will be updated by adding the corresponding non-functional requirements from the list of non-functional requirements described above. Indicatively, in the ‘Submit Report of Receipt/Export’ requirement tree, the ‘Interactive (for place ‘Consignee’)’, ‘Asynchronous (for place ‘Any MSA’)’ and ‘Asynchronous (for place ‘Consignor’)’ non-functional requirements will be added.   *In relation to FESS ‘Appendix H’:*  FESS’s ‘Appendix H’ lists the applicable timers used in EMCS. It shall be highlighted that the timers are already part of the Excise BPMs and artefacts, as these are included in the corresponding BPMs. However, for clarity purposes, the following updates will be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * The description of task ‘Start Timer TIM\_EAD’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_EAD is a Timer associated with the life cycle of each submitted e-AD. Its Expiry Date is Date of dispatch + journey time and cannot exceed three months (Note: The period of three months corresponds to a maximum of ~~92~~45 days.)”; * The description of task ‘Start Timer TIM\_FDF’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_FDF is a timer associated with the filling in of destination fields (Article 22(1) of Directive ~~2008/118/EC~~2020/262). Its Expiry Date is Date of dispatch + national parameter and cannot be more than the expiry date of TIM\_EAD.”; * The description of task ‘Start Timer TIM\_CHS’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_FDF is a timer associated with the submission of a change of destination or of a splitting when the delivery is refused or the consignment is rejected. Its Expiry Date is Date of refusal/rejection + national parameter limited by a common system parameter”; * The description of the task ‘Initiate Timer TIM\_ACO’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_ACO is a timer associated with the results of an administrative cooperation request. Its Expiry Date is given by the sender, limited by a common system parameter”; * The description of the task ‘Initiate Timer TIM\_HIS’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_HIS is a timer associated with the results of a history request. Its Expiry Date is given by the sender, limited by a common system parameter”; * The description of the task ‘Initiate Timer TIM\_MVS’ will be extended with the following details: “TIM\_MVS is a timer associated with the results of a movement verification request. Its Expiry Date is given by the sender, limited by a common system parameter”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the aforementioned FESS artefacts will not be maintained from EMCS Phase 4 onwards and the transition from FESS documentation to the Excise BPMs. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to any other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-266 – Removal of technical messages from BPMs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-266 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM377459 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 20/05/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  It has been identified that technical messages are actually modelled in the Excise BPMs and artefacts. In alignment with FESS’ scope, any such details should not be included in the Excise BPMs, so that the scope of those is aligned with the existing FESS scope.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the Excise BPMs will need to be updated as described below:   * The following message allocation diagrams will be removed:   + IE904 STATUS REQUEST (C\_STD\_REQ);   + IE905 STATUS RESPONSE (C\_STD\_RSP);   + IE906 FUNCTIONAL NACK (C\_FUN\_NCK);   + IE917 NEGATIVE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF XML RECEIPT (C\_XML\_NCK);   + IE934 DATA PACKAGING (C\_PAC\_DAT). * The ‘Perform Syntactic validation of Common Domain message’ Function Allocation Diagram (FAD) will be updated by removing the data objects for ‘IE904’, ‘IE905’ and ‘IE934’; * The ‘Perform Coordination Protocol validation of Common Domain message’ Function Allocation Diagram (FAD) will be updated by removing the data objects for ‘IE904’, ‘IE905’ and ‘IE934’; * The existing process ‘L4-CORE-01-05-Handle validation Results of Common Domain message’ will still include a reference to the IE906 and IE917 messages, but it will be highlighted that it is only a reference for clarity purposes, while the details of such messages are described in the DDNEA documentation. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (High); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the scope of FESS will keep including the detailed data model of technical messages, such as IE904, IE905, IE906, IE917, and IE934. Instead, these messages should be detailed in the corresponding DDNEA sections. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to any other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-267 – Remove references to FESS appendices

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-267 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM373790 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/04/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The agreed approach to be followed from EMCS Phase 4 onwards is that Excise BPMs and related artefacts will replace the existing FESS documentation. The current version of the Excise BPMs includes references to specific FESS appendices, which will not be further maintained from EMCS Phase 4 onward. Therefore, any such references must be replaced accordingly.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a list of references to FESS appendices has been identified, which will need to be replaced accordingly. In detail, the list of updates which shall be performed are detailed in the attached [Annex](#_Annex_1:_FESS-267). It shall be clarified that the list included in the annex aims to be exhaustive. However, in any case, any reference to FESS appendices in the BPMs will have to be adjusted accordingly. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the aforementioned reference to obsolete FESS artefacts will be maintained and the Excise BPMs will include erroneous references. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-300; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-268 – Deprecation of the IE820 message

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-268 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM375589 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/05/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Due to the low usage volume of the IE820 message in the EMCS production environment (i.e. 1 IE820 exchanged over the common domain in year 2019), it has been decided that the IE820 message should actually be phased out from EMCS.  The necessary actions need to be taken at the Common Specifications so that the IE820 message is correctly deprecated.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates are required in order to phase-out the IE820 message:   * In the ‘L4-ACO-00-00-Administrative Cooperation’ BPM, the call-activity ‘Request for History Information (Request)’ and the corresponding flow will be removed; * The ‘L4-ACO-01-05-Request for history information (Request)’ BPM will be removed; * The ‘L4-ACO-01-06-History-Deadline for results’ BPM will be removed; * The ‘L4-ACO-01-07-Request for history information (Results)’ BPM will be removed; * The ‘IE820 history results C\_HIM\_RES’ message allocation diagram will be removed from the ‘Excise Business Processes’ directory; * The technical term ‘HISTORY REQUEST’ (i.e. data group) will be removed from the ‘IE721 administrative cooperation common request C\_COO\_SUB‘ message allocation diagram, including all the included technical terms (i.e. data items); * Conditions ‘C035’ and ‘C056’ will be removed; * Rule ‘R090’ will be removed; * The codelist value ‘Request for History’ from codelist ‘TC ACO Request Type’ will be renamed to ‘reserved’; * The codelist value ‘History Answer Message’ from codelist ‘TC Answer Message Type’ will be renamed to ‘reserved’; * The codelist value ‘History Results Reminder Message’ from codelist ‘TC ACO Reminder Message Type’ will be renamed to ‘reserved’. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then FESS will not be aligned with the phase-out of the IE820 message and the impact that this phase-out has in the functional specifications. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-301; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-269 – Handling of Timers for manually closed movements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-269 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM377465 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 21/05/2020 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As part of the new Manual Closure process introduced in EMCS Phase 3.4, it was identified that there are no specific clarifications about the handling of the timers for movements that have been manually closed.  For completeness purposes and in order to avoid any similar ambiguities in the future, the common specifications will be updated to clarify that once a movement has been manually closed, then any corresponding timers related to the manually closed movement should be stopped (if running already).  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the Excise BPMs will need to be updated as described below:   * A new subprocess task named ‘Handle Timers associated with a Manually Closed movement’; * The newly created subprocess task will be added in the existing ‘L4-ACO-01-30 Manual Closure of a Movement’ process and will follow the existing task ‘Notify Consignor of Manual Closure’; * A new process diagram named ‘Handle Timers associated with a Manually Closed Movement’ will be created and assigned to the new task mentioned above; * The newly created process diagram will describe the handling of the applicable timers (i.e. TIM\_EAD, TIM\_FDF and TIM\_CHS) in such processes, using the existing process ‘Handle Timers associated with an Interrupted Movement’ as a baseline (i.e. wording to be adjusted accordingly for the cases of manual closures). | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the scope of FESS will not clearly specify how timers should be handled in cases of manually closed movements. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-302; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-270 – SEED compliance with GDPR/Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-270 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | N/A | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/05/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  In the current version of SEED, there is no functionality to support a physical deletion of Economic Operators’ data. Any such request from a National Administration could only be supported through the execution of SQL scripts in the database directly. Instead, only a ‘logical’ deletion is provided with the ‘invalidation’ action, which is then disseminated to all Member States (i.e. the ones registered to receive SEED disseminations).  In order to comply with the GDPR requirements, SEED must be updated in order to allow National Administrations to delete Economic Operators data from SEED under legitimate conditions.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], FESS will be updated so that a ‘Delete’ operation is introduced for SEED, allowing a National Administration to request the deletion of its economic operators’ data from SEED in a structured manner. The ‘Delete’ operation should be aligned to the principles of the existing SEED operations (i.e. Create/Update/Invalidate). This means that a National Administration would be allowed to submit an IE713 message including ‘delete’ operations for existing SEED records. In alignment with the other existing operations, multiple delete operations may also be included in the same IE713 message, e.g. a delete operation for an ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’, together with the corresponding delete operations for its tax warehouses. After the successful processing of the IE713 message and its validation against the defined ‘terms of collaboration’ by central SEED, then this ‘Delete’ operation will be disseminated to other Member States, where as per the existing process, Member States are committed to use the state of information received back from the Common Domain to update their National SEED register. Specifically, for 'Delete' operations, it shall be clarified that all occurrences of the corresponding SEED records should be deleted, including the disseminated IE713 message and the corresponding 'Delete' operations. It shall be noted that no further operations in relation to GDPR on corresponding e-AD/e-SAD(s) are proposed to be executed, e.g. deletion of other attributes of an e-AD/e-SAD. However, it shall be noted that due to the deletion of specific SEED data, it is possible that errors may occur in cases of information exchange over the common domain on any movement the deleted SEED authorisation is used in, due to the fact that SEED authorisations are being checked in common domain messages (e.g.  <Trader Excise Number> in the IE821 message).  In details, the following updates shall be performed:   1. In the ‘L4-RADM-01-01-Maintenance of Registration Data’ BPM, the following clarification will be added in the ‘Description’ attribute:   *“It shall be clarified that in cases the received IE713 message includes ‘Delete’ operations, then central SEED will:*  Validate delete operation against the applicable IE713 rules and conditions (as per the existing process for Create/Update/Invalidate operations);  Validate that the entities are deleted only by the owner MSA (as per the existing process for Create/Update/Invalidate operations);  Validate that the entities are deleted in alignment to the agreed ‘terms of collaboration’ for deletion of SEED records:  The delete operation is related to an economic operator who is not involved in any movement at all  or;  The delete operation is related to an economic operator who is not involved in an open movement and;  the activation date of the ‘delete’ operation must be at least five years after the end of the calendar year of the start of any movement (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD) the economic operator is involved in.”   1. A new codelist value will be added in ‘TC Modification Type’ with the following details:  * Name: *Delete* * Remark/Example: *D*  1. A new business rule ‘BRxxx’ will be created and associated to the <Operation> data item of the IE713 message with the following details:   *BR ID:* BRxxx    *BR Category:* SEED – Registration Data    *BR Description:*  It is obligatory that the delete operation must be related to an economic operator who is not involved in any movement or who is not involved in an open movement and that the activation date of the ‘delete’ operation ‘must be at least five years after the end of the calendar year of the start of any movement (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD) the economic operator is involved in.    *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If a ‘delete’ operation is submitted, then this should be related to:   * An economic operator who is not involved in any movement;   OR   * An economic operator not involved to any open movement and; * An economic operator involved in movements, but the activation date of the deletion is at least five years from the end of the calendar year in which the corresponding movement began (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD).   *IE:* IE713  *Data Item:* ACTION.Operation  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   1. Furthermore, as additional constraints to maintain the data integrity of SEED data, the following rules will be created and associated to the <Operation> technical term (i.e. data item) of the IE713 message:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Rule** | **Description** | | ~~RXX1~~  R267 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Tax Warehouse’ records, the deleted ‘tax warehouse’ must not be linked to an ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’. | | ~~RXX2~~  R268 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ records, the deleted ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ must not be the sole keeper of a tax warehouse, i.e. the deletion of the ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ must not result to an ‘orphan’ tax warehouse. | | ~~RXX3~~  R269 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Registered Consignors’ or ‘Authorised Warehouse Keepers’, there should be no ‘Temporary Registered Consignees’ associated to the deleted economic operators.  Similarly, for ‘delete’ operations of ‘Certified Consignors’ or ‘Certified Consignees’, there should be no ‘Temporary Certified Consignees’ or ‘Temporary Certified Consignors’ respectively associated to the deleted economic operators. |   It shall be noted that potential discrepancies in SEED after records deletion are expected not to have an impact on the core business, because the existence and validity of all authorisations are validated during the e-AD/e-SAD validation. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then FESS will not be updated to provide a concrete functionality for deleting Economic Operators’ data and consequently being compliant to the GDPR principles. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-305; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 30/06/2020. | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### FESS-271 – Inclusion of CN Code ‘15180095’ in EMCS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-271 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM382502 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/06/2020 | | Requester | MSA-ES | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  It has been identified that CN code ‘15180095’ is not included in the current version of the EMCS common specifications. However, products falling under the CN code ‘15180095’ may be used as heating or motor fuel, which implies that the aforementioned CN code should be included in the EMCS common specifications.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * A new technical term will be created and added in the ‘CL CN Codes’ matrix model. The newly created technical term will have the following details: * Reference ID: *BC37* * Name: *Inedible mixtures or preparations of animal or of animal and vegetable fats and oils and their fractions* * Remark/Example: *15180095* * Addition of the below entry in the mapping of “*Correspondence CN Codes-Excise Product*”:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Code** | **Description** | | ... | .... | | E200 | 15179093 | | E200 | 15179099 | | E200 | 15180010 | | E200 | 15180031 | | E200 | 15180039 | | ***E200*** | ***15180095*** | | E300 | 27071000 | | E300 | 27072000 | | ... | .... | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | The effect of not performing the described updates in FESS will be the exclusion of products falling under the ‘15180095’ CN code, which may actually be used as heating or motor fuel, i.e. applicable for EMCS. | | Risk assessment | See downstream RFC IE734-043. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream IE734 RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs: -**; * **Children RFCs:** IE734-043; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 01/07/2020. | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

## DDNEA Change Requests

#### DDNEA-P3-275 – Update the optionality of <Body Record Unique Reference> in Manual Closure messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P3-275 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM319391 | | Known Error | KE19025 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/05/2019 | | Requester | MSA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates described in RFC FESS-247.  Specifically, it has been identified that the data item <Body Record Unique Reference> in the <(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE> data group of the IE880 and IE881 messages, should be updated to ‘Required’.  In DDNEA v2.02, the <Body Record Unique Reference> is already marked as ‘Required’ in the IE880 message. Therefore, the change described is only applicable for the IE881 message.  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.1.1) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  ***Note****: The .xsd changes described below will be applied to the Phase 3.4 .xsd files (i.e. v2.02) as a ‘Quick Fix’ approach for the specification issues identified.*  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE   The optionality of the <Body Record Unique Reference> in the IE881 message should be updated to ‘Required’ as shown below in bold:  **---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE**  Body Record Unique Reference **R** n..3 BR024  R058  R232   * Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES   The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Body Record Unique Reference’ will be updated by setting the optionality to ‘R’ for the IE881 message.   * APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   The ie881.xsd file will be updated as highlighted below in red:  *From:*  <xs:complexType name="BodyManualClosureType">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  <doc:description value="(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE" />  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:sequence>  *<xs:element name="BodyRecordUniqueReference" type="emcs:BodyRecordUniqueReferenceType" minOccurs="0" />*  <xs:element name="IndicatorOfShortageOrExcess" type="tcl:IndicatorOfShortageOrExcess" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ObservedShortageOrExcess" type="emcs:ObservedShortageOrExcessType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ExciseProductCode" type="emcs:ExciseProductCodeType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="RefusedQuantity" type="emcs:RefusedQuantityType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ComplementaryInformation" type="ie:LSDComplementaryInformationType" minOccurs="0" />  </xs:sequence>  </xs:complexType>  *To:*  <xs:complexType name="BodyManualClosureType">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  <doc:description value="(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE" />  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:sequence>  <xs:element name="BodyRecordUniqueReference" type="emcs:BodyRecordUniqueReferenceType" />  <xs:element name="IndicatorOfShortageOrExcess" type="tcl:IndicatorOfShortageOrExcess" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ObservedShortageOrExcess" type="emcs:ObservedShortageOrExcessType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ExciseProductCode" type="emcs:ExciseProductCodeType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="RefusedQuantity" type="emcs:RefusedQuantityType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="ComplementaryInformation" type="ie:LSDComplementaryInformationType" minOccurs="0" />  </xs:sequence>  </xs:complexType>   * APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the tcl.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) * CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low)   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None) * CTA (None) * CS/MISE (None)   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low) | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-247 RFC.  The fact that the <Body Record Unique Reference> data item is marked as optional could eventually lead a Member State submitting a IE881 message including multiple occurrences of the <(BODY) Manual Closure> data group with no <Body Record Unique Reference> specified. Even though, no syntactic issues are expected, this would lead to a misuse of the message. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  More specifically, concerning the .xsd changes, namely the update of the optionality of the <Body Record Unique Reference> to ‘Required’ in the ie881.xsd, it is considered to have no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically:   * If the sending application is aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates while the receiving application is not, the respective messages will be validated successfully by the receiving application. The reason is that the <Body Record Unique Reference> data item was marked as optional; hence no syntactic validation error should occur when the value is actually present in a received IE881 message. * If the sending application is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates, while the receiving application has already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiving application. The reason is that the receiving application will expect a value for the <Body Record Unique Reference>, since it is marked as ‘Required’. As a workaround, it is proposed that the sending application includes a ‘Body Record Unique Reference’ value in cases the ‘(BODY) Manual Closure’ data group is used, as each ‘(BODY) Manual Closure’ should map to a corresponding e-AD body.   **Note**: Considering that the updated ie881.xsd file has already been deployed within EMCS Phase 3.4, there is only a documentation update pending from this RFC. Therefore, this RFC entails no business continuity risk. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-247 * **Children RFCs:** - * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-085 | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #185 on 09/07/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P3-276 – Include entry for ‘IE905’ in TC60 and TC64

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P3-276 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM321118 | | Known Error | KE19044 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 03/06/2019 | | Requester | MSA-FR | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  In the ‘Download of an e-AD’ scenario, following the reception of an IE904 message, the MSA Dispatch application is expected to respond with a IE905 message and a IE934 message that includes all business messages comprising the movement history.  It was identified that following the implementation of the DDNEA-P3-270 RFC, TC60 and TC64 codelists which are applied on the IE934 and IE905 messages respectively, were updated by replacing the value ‘IE905’ with the new introduced ‘IE880’ and ‘IE881’ messages.  However, in cases where a movement was manually closed in Phase 3.3 (i.e. with an IE905 message), it shall be expected that this message should be included in the corresponding IE905 and IE934 messages.  This RFC proposes the necessary updates in TC60 and TC64 in order to allow the handling of historical manual closures (i.e. using a IE905 message) in the aforementioned scenario.  **Proposed Solution**  ***Note****: The .xsd changes described below will be applied to the Phase 3.4 .xsd files (i.e. v2.02) as a ‘Quick Fix’ approach for the specification issues identified.*  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * APPENDIX B: CODELISTS   In the ‘TC64-Requested Message Type’ codelist, the ‘STATUS RESPONSE’ entry (highlighted) will be added with the corresponding clarification, as shown below:   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | IE801 | E-AD |  | | IE803 | NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD |  | | IE807 | INTERRUPTION OF MOVEMENT |  | | IE810 | CANCELLATION OF AN E-AD |  | | IE813 | CHANGE OF DESTINATION |  | | IE818 | ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT |  | | IE819 | ALERT OR REJECTION OF AN E-AD |  | | IE829 | NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT |  | | IE839 | REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT |  | | IE880 | MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST |  | | IE881 | MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE |  | | ***IE905*** | ***STATUS RESPONSE*** | ***The IE905 should be included only for historical movements, which were manually closed with a IE905 message.*** | | None | NONE |  |   In the ‘TC60-Technical Message Type’ codelist, the ‘STATUS RESPONSE’ entry will be added with the corresponding clarification, as shown below:   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | IE717 | CONTROL REPORT |  | | IE801 | E-AD |  | | IE802 | REMINDER MESSAGE FOR EXCISE MOVEMENT |  | | IE803 | NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD |  | | IE807 | INTERRUPTION OF MOVEMENT |  | | IE810 | CANCELLATION OF E-AD |  | | IE813 | CHANGE OF DESTINATION |  | | IE818 | ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT |  | | IE819 | ALERT OR REJECTION OF AN E-AD |  | | IE829 | NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT |  | | IE837 | EXPLANATION ON DELAY FOR DELIVERY |  | | IE839 | REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT |  | | IE840 | EVENT REPORT |  | | IE871 | EXPLANATION ON REASON FOR SHORTAGE |  | | IE880 | MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST |  | | IE881 | MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE |  | | ***IE905*** | ***STATUS RESPONSE*** | ***The IE905 should be included only for historical movements, which were manually closed with a IE905 message.*** |  * APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   The following entries will be added in tcl.xsd file as highlighted below:  Under the ‘Technical Message Type’ codelist:  ….  <xs:enumeration value="IE880">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  <xs:enumeration value="IE881">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  ***<xs:enumeration value="IE905">***  ***<xs:annotation>***  ***<xs:documentation>STATUS RESPONSE</xs:documentation>***  ***</xs:annotation>***  ***</xs:enumeration>***  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>  Under the ‘Requested Message Type’ codelist:  ….  <xs:enumeration value="IE880">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  <xs:enumeration value="IE881">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  ***<xs:enumeration value="IE905">***  ***<xs:annotation>***  ***<xs:documentation>STATUS RESPONSE</xs:documentation>***  ***</xs:annotation>***  ***</xs:enumeration>***  <xs:enumeration value="None">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>NONE</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>   * APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the tcl.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (Low); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then in cases where a movement was manually closed in Phase 3.3 (i.e. with a IE905 message), it shall not be possible for a Member State to include an entry for the related IE905 in the sent IE934 message, i.e. ‘Download of an e-AD’ scenario. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns updates on the tcl.xsd, in order to add the missing value for ‘IE905 in the technical codelists TC60 and TC64.  This change has no impact on business continuity and can, therefore, be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically:   * If the sender has already deployed this RFC in production while the receiver has not, the respective IE906 messages may include the value for ‘IE905’; hence they will be not successfully validated by the receiver. To avoid such rejections, it is proposed that such cases are handled by including the value 'IE881' in the <Technical Message Type> data item of the IE934 message, but including the binary version of the relevant IE905 message in the <Message Data> data item. * If the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned change when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the respective IE905 and IE934 messages will not include the code for ‘IE905’. However, it will be validated successfully by the receiver.   **Note:** Considering that the updated tcl.xsd file has already been deployed within EMCS Phase 3.4, there are only documentation updates pending from this RFC. Therefore, this RFC entails no business continuity risk. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** SEED-158 * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-086 | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #185 on 09/07/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P3-277 – Include the Manual Closure codelists in TC25

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P3-277 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM325679 | | Known Error | KE19086 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/06/2019 | | Requester | EMCS-CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Member States may use the IE701 message against SEED in order to retrieve the values of a codelist. For this purpose, the data item <Requested List of Codes Code> data item is used, which is linked to ‘TC25’.  As part of the SEED development activity, it was identified that TC25 is not updated to include the newly added ‘Manual Closure Request Reason’ and ‘Manual Closure Rejection Reason’ codelists.  This RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to update TC25 with the newly added codelists related to Manual Closure.  **Proposed Solution**  ***Note****: The .xsd changes described below will be applied to the Phase 3.4 .xsd files (i.e. v2.02) as a ‘Quick Fix’ approach for the specification issues identified.*  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * APPENDIX B: CODELISTS   In the ‘TC25-Requested List of Codes (full)’ codelist, the ‘Manual Closure Request Reason’ and ‘Manual Closure Rejection Reason’ entries will be added, as highlighted below:   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | .. | … | … | | 34 | Administrative cooperation action not possible reasons |  | | 35 | (reserved) |  | | 36 | Type of document |  | | 37 | (reserved) |  | | 38 | (reserved) |  | | ***39*** | ***Manual Closure Request Reasons*** |  | | ***40*** | ***Manual Closure Rejection Reasons*** |  |  * APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   The following entries will be added in tcl.xsd file as highlighted below:  Under the ‘Requested List of Codes (full)’ codelist:  ….  <xs:enumeration value="9">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>Packaging codes</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:enumeration>  **<xs:enumeration value="39">**  **<xs:annotation>**  **<xs:documentation>Manual Closure Request Reasons</xs:documentation>**  **</xs:annotation>**  **</xs:enumeration>**  **<xs:enumeration value="40">**  **<xs:annotation>**  **<xs:documentation>Manual Closure Rejection Reasons</xs:documentation>**  **</xs:annotation>**  **</xs:enumeration>**  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>     * APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the tcl.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (Low); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then Member States will not be able to request from central SEED (i.e. via sending a corresponding IE701 message) the values of the newly added Manual Closure codelists (i.e. ‘Manual Closure Request Reason’ and ‘Manual Closure Rejection Reason’). | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns updates on the tcl.xsd, in order to add the missing codelists related to Manual Closure in the technical codelist TC25.  This change has no impact on business continuity and can, therefore, be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically:   * If an MSA has deployed this RFC in production, the IE701.xml generated will be validated successfully by Central SEED, since the updates introduced by the specific RFC will already be implemented in Central SEED (i.e. at the start of the Migration Period); * If an MSA has not deployed this RFC in production, the IE701.xml will be able to include a code value related to the Manual Closure codelists, hence it shall not be possible for an MSA to retrieve these codelists from central SEED. However, as an operational workaround solution until the update is performed in the next common specification release, MSAs are advised to use either the IE701 messages requesting to extract/retrieve all the code lists, including the Manual Closure codelists, or to use the Web Interface of CA SEED, in order to retrieve the required code list.   **Note**: Considering that the updated tcl.xsd file has already been deployed within EMCS Phase 3.4, there are only documentation updates pending from this RFC. Therefore, this RFC entails no business continuity risk. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** - * **Children RFCs:** SEED-158 * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-086 | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #185 on 09/07/2019 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P3-278 – Update the format of ‘Supporting Document Type’ to allow TARIC codes inclusion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P3-278 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM327096 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 07/08/2019 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As described in RFC DDNEA-P3-269, the ‘Type of Document’ business codelist was updated to include TARIC codes having a ‘an..4’ format, which should be included in the <Document Type> data item in the IE815 and IE801 messages.  However, based on the latest communication with MSAs, it has been agreed that the use of TARIC codes should be extended to <Supporting Document Type> in related administrative cooperation messages (IE721, IE722, IE820, IE867, IE880 and IE881).  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.1.3) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  ***Note****: The .xsd change described below will be applied to the Phase 3.4 .xsd files (i.e. v2.02) as a ‘Quick Fix’ approach for the specification enhancements described.*  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE   The format of the data item <Supporting Document Type> should be updated from ‘n..2’ to ‘an..4’.  The aforementioned update is applicable in all instances of the <Supporting Document Type> data item under the <SUPPORTING DOCUMENT> data group. Specifically, the update is applicable to the following messages:   * IE721 * IE722 * IE820 * IE867 * IE880 * IE881 * APPENDIX G: DATA ITEMS   The existing entry for the <Supporting Document Type> data item will be updated as highlighted below:   | **Data item** | **Format** | | --- | --- | | … | …. | | Supporting Document Type | ***an..4*** | | … | …. |  * APPENDIX C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES   The following existing entries for the <Supporting Document Type> data item will be updated as highlighted below:   | **Message Element** | **Data Type** | | --- | --- | | … | …. | | MESSAGE - (ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION) REQUEST - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type | ***an..4*** | | MESSAGE - C\_COO\_SUB - (ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION) REQUEST - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type | ***an..4*** | | MESSAGE - C\_COO\_RES - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type | ***an..4*** | | MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type | ***an..4*** | | … | …. |  * APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   In the ‘types.xsd’ file, the pattern for the simple type ‘SupportingDocumentTypeType’ will be updated as shown below:  ***From:***  <!--========================================================-->    <!--=== Supporting Document Type ===-->    <!--=======================================================-->    <xs:simpleType name="SupportingDocumentTypeType">      <xs:annotation>        <xs:documentation>          <doc:description value="Supporting Document Type" />        </xs:documentation>      </xs:annotation>      <xs:restriction base="xs:token">   ***<xs:maxLength value="2" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="[0-9]{1,2}" />***     </xs:restriction>    </xs:simpleType>    ***To:***  <!--========================================================-->    <!--=== Supporting Document Type ===-->    <!--=======================================================-->    <xs:simpleType name="SupportingDocumentTypeType">      <xs:annotation>        <xs:documentation>          <doc:description value="Supporting Document Type" />        </xs:documentation>      </xs:annotation>      <xs:restriction base="xs:token">  ***<xs:maxLength value="4" />        <xs:pattern value=".{1,4}" />***      </xs:restriction>    </xs:simpleType>   * APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the ‘types.xsd’ file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (Low); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-249 RFC. Therefore, TARIC codes would only be allowed in the IE815 and IE801 messages, but not in the related administrative cooperation messages (IE721, IE722, IE820, IE867, IE880 and IE881). | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns updates on the types.xsd, in order to allow TARIC codes to be included in the <Supporting Document Type> data item.  More specifically, the current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to update the pattern of the simple type “SupportingDocumentTypeType” in the ‘types.xsd’, in order to allow values of ‘an..4’ format in the corresponding <Supporting Document Type> data item.  The present RFC can be deployed in production in a Migration Period. More specifically:   * If the sender is aligned with the new .xsd with respect to the aforementioned update while the receiver is not, then the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver in cases that they include a value of ‘an..4’ format in the <Supporting Document Type> data item. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application only uses the existing EMCS-specific document type codes (i.e. having a ‘n..2’ format). From a business perspective, TARIC codes are not expected to be significantly used in the respective ACO messages, therefore the proposed bypass solution does not entail any significant business continuity risks. * If the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned change, when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the respective messages will be validated successfully by the receiver, since the existing values of ‘n..2’ format should be validated successfully by the receiver.   *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the messages including the <Supporting Document Type> data item are also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*  **Note:** Considering that the updated types.xsd file has already been deployed within EMCS Phase 3.4, there are only documentation updates pending from this RFC. Therefore, this RFC entails no business continuity risk. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-249 * **Children RFCs:** - * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-090 | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 12/08/2019. | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### ~~DDNEA-P4-279 – Clarifications regarding the applicability of Temporary Authorisations~~

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **~~RFC Information~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~RFC number~~ | ~~DDNEA-P4-279~~ | | ~~RFC status~~ | ~~Accepted~~ | | ~~Reason for Change~~ | ~~Specification Defect~~ | | ~~Incidents~~ | ~~IM244005~~ | | ~~Known Error~~ | ~~KE18108~~ | | ~~Date at which the Change was proposed~~ | ~~04/06/2018~~ | | ~~Requester~~ | ~~MSA-BG~~ | |
| **~~Change Assessment~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Change priority~~ | ~~Low~~ | | ~~Change Description~~ | **~~Problem Statement~~**  ~~The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-251 RFC.~~  ~~More specifically, the description of ‘R045’ in DDNEA Appendix D needs to be aligned with the corresponding description of the class ‘R045’ in the Excise BPMs (i.e. adding clarification related to temporary authorisations used in a movement that MSAs should check their validity against the declared data of dispatch and maximum journey time).~~  **~~Proposed Solution~~**  ~~As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:~~   * ~~Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE.~~   ~~The following update should be performed in the description of ‘R045’ (highlighted in bold/italics):~~   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~“R045~~ | ~~The possible values of <Trader Identification> are described in the following table:~~    ~~…~~  ~~(4) An existing <Temporary Authorisation Reference> in the list of <TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION>~~ ***~~which is valid at the declared date of dispatch + maximum journey time for that mode of transport~~***~~.~~  ~~…~~ | | | ~~Impact assessment~~ | ~~Specification Documents:~~   * ~~DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low);~~ * ~~CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None);~~ * ~~TRP for EMCS Phase (None).~~   ~~CDEAs:~~   * ~~Central SEED v1 application (None);~~ * ~~CTA (None);~~ * ~~CS/MISE (None).~~   ~~NEAs:~~   * ~~Impact on NEAs (None).~~ | | ~~Effect of not implementing the Change~~ | ~~If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with FESS in relation to the description of rule ‘R045’.~~ | | ~~Risk assessment~~ | ~~This RFC entails no business continuity risk, since it concerns a documentation update related to the description of rule ‘R045’.~~ | | ~~Deployment approach~~ | ~~The RFC can be deployed in a~~ **~~Migration Period~~** ~~with no business continuity risks.~~ | | ~~Reference to other RFCs~~ | * **~~Parent RFCs:~~** ~~FESS-251;~~ * **~~Children RFCs:~~** ~~-;~~ * **~~Other RFCs:~~** ~~-.~~ | |
| **~~Indicative changes to legislation~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Draft recital for information~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Location of change in Legislation~~ | ~~N/A~~ | |
| **~~Approval Process~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~CAB recommendation~~ | * **~~Category of the Change: Review;~~** * **~~Approval process:~~**   + **~~The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.~~** | | ~~ECWP position~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Authorisation date and process~~ | ~~EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020~~ | |
| **~~Release information~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Release number~~ | ~~v2.04~~ | | ~~Release date~~ | ~~13/02/2023~~ | | ~~Deadline for alignment in Production~~ | ~~TBD~~ | |
| **~~Change Review~~**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | ~~Review date~~ | ~~N/A~~ | | ~~Review results~~ | ~~N/A~~ | |

#### DDNEA-P4-280 – Applicability of ‘C095’ on the IE880 message

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-280 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM319155 | | Known Error | KE19003 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 15/05/19 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As per DDNEA Appendix D v2.02, condition ‘C095’ applies to the <Refused Quantity> data item of the IE880 and IE881 messages. However, condition ‘C095’ entails the <Global Conclusion of Receipt> data item, which does not exist in the IE880 message, but only in the IE881 message instead. Therefore, the applicability of condition ‘C095’ in the IE880 message is deemed non-implementable and the common specifications should be updated accordingly.  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.2.1) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis presented in the [Problem Statement] section, the condition ‘C095’ will be removed from the <Refused Quantity> data item in the IE880 message. Due to the removal of condition 'C095', the <Refused Quantity> data item will be updated to ‘O: Optional’. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then condition ‘C095’ would still be applied on the <Global Conclusion of Receipt> data item of the IE880 message, even though it cannot be actually implemented in this message. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the semantic level, namely the removal of ‘C095’ from the <Global Conclusion of Receipt> data item in the IE880 message. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the removed condition will be validated only at the sending side of the IE880 message, in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over CD. Hence, any such semantic violation related to the removal of the condition by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-281 – Update description of BR024 and BR025

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-281 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM319001 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 14/05/2019 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  During the development of EMCS Phase 3.4, it was identified that even though the existing business rules ‘BR024’ and ‘BR025’ were correctly applied on the newly introduced IE880 and IE881 messages in the DDNEA, the corresponding descriptions of the aforementioned business rules were not correctly updated in DDNEA Appendix J.  Note: Clarifications on this issue have been provided to NAs through [Webinars](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/44e464ed-073b-400b-acaf-ab40961bc484?p=1&n=10&sort=modified_DESC), as well as through the [FAQ](https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/5d0c005e-c8e5-4193-900b-53c21899fd31/library/90922ccd-b35a-402c-a421-3d1828fbf8df/details) document (sec. 4.2.2.2) during the development of EMCS Phase 3.4.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates (i.e. as highlighted below) shall be performed in DDNEA Appendix J:  **BR024**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BR024 | | **BR Category** | Relation | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory that the body record unique reference of each body report of receipt/**manual closure** that is included in the draft report of receipt**/manual closure** corresponds to the same excise product code as in the e-AD. | | **Source FESS EBP** | UC-206-210 | | **FESS Validation Rule** | •For each record referring to a body record of the e-AD, the referred sequential number concerns the right product code. | | **IE** | * Draft IE818(draft report of receipt); * **IE881 (manual closure response).** | | **Data Item** | * (BODY) REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Body Record Unique Reference; * **(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference.** | | **Optionality** | Mandatory | | **Comments** | N/A |   **BR025**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BR025 | | **BR Category** | Relation | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory that the sum of the observed shortage and the refused quantity of each body report of receipt/**manual closure** that is included in the draft report of receipt**/manual closure** is less or equal to the quantity of the body e-AD with the same body record unique reference that is included in the last e-AD or the refused quantity of the body report of receipt/**manual closure** with the same body record unique reference that is included in the last, if any, report of receipt**/manual closure** that indicated partial refusal. | | **Source FESS EBP** | UC-206-210 | | **FESS Validation Rule** | • For each record referring to a body record of the e-AD, the sum of the observed shortage and of the refused quantity does not exceed the current quantity for the e-AD; these current quantities are those refused in the latest partially refused report of receipt/**manual closure**, if any; if there is no such partially refused report of receipt/**manual closure**, they are copied from the original e-AD. | | **IE** | * Draft IE818(draft report of receipt); * **IE881 (manual closure response).** | | **Data Item** | * (BODY) REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.~~Body Record Unique Reference~~Refused Quantity; * **(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.~~Body Record Unique Reference~~Refused Quantity.** | | **Optionality** | Mandatory | | **Comments** | N/A | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the updates described in the parent RFC ‘FESS-252’. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns documentation updates of the DDNEA document, in relation to the description of business rules ‘BR024’ and ‘BR025’. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-252; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-282 – Documentation update in Manual Closure process description

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-282 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM325106 | | Known Error | KE19072 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 21/06/2019 | | Requester | MSA-BG | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  During the development of Phase 3.4, a misalignment between DDNEA Appendix D and DDNEA main document was identified, in relation to the manual closure request message (i.e. IE880). More specifically, in the DDNEA main document it is stated that ‘the submitting person code’ should be specified in the IE880 message, while in the actual structure of the IE880 message there is no such data item.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following documentation update shall be implemented in DDNEA main document. In section ‘IV.I.4.1 Manual Closing is initiated by an Excise Officer of MSA Dispatch’, the corresponding bullet point 'The submitting person code (e.g. Excise Officer)’ should be deleted, from the text, i.e. the actual extract is highlighted below:  The Excise Officer of MSA Dispatch initiates the manual closure process by submitting the corresponding request (IE880: C\_MNC\_SUB) that includes:   * The ARC of the movement requested to be manually closed; * The sequence number of the ARC; * ~~The submitting person code (e.g. Excise Officer);~~ * The reason for the manual closure request. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA main document and the corresponding message structure of IE880 message will not be aligned. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update in DDNEA main document only. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to any other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-283 – Applicability of ‘R059’ on Sequence Number in the IE819 message

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-283 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM362575 | | Known Error | KE19622 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 12/02/20 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  A misalignment between the DDNEA documentation and the corresponding FESS and legislation (i.e. technical annexes) occurs concerning rule ‘R059’ and its applicability on the <Sequence Number> data item in the IE819 message.  In details, it has been identified that the <Sequence Number> data item in the <EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD> data group of IE819 should not be linked to the rule ‘R059’.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement] and in alignment with corresponding FESS Appendix D message structure, the <Sequence Number> data item in the <EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD> data group of IE819 should not be linked to the rule ‘R059’, thus the link between ‘R059’ and <Sequence Number> shall be removed.  The actual extract from DDNEA\_APP\_D is shown below:    Additionally, DDNEA Appendix K shall be updated with the removal of the link between R059 and the Sequence Number of the IE819 message as shown below: | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the legislation and FESS concerning the applicability of rule ‘R059’ in the <Sequence Number> data item of the IE819 message | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the semantic level, namely the removal of rule ‘R059’ from the <Sequence Number> data item in the <EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD> data group of IE819. This change can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, will be validated only at the sending side of the IE819 message (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection shall be triggered by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | This change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in production in a **Migration Period.** | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to any other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review.** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB#187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-284 – Clarifications on the applicability of rule ‘R251’

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-284 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM359061 | | Known Error | KE19559 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 24/01/2020 | | Requester | MSA-IE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Rule ‘R251’ produces difficulty in the interpretation of DDNEA-P3-252 RFC, allowing zero values in the “Number of Packages” Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages. More specifically there is a conflict concerning if the RFC refers to one Single Body with Multiple Packages or Multiple Bodies wherein all the Packages are accounted for in a Body.  **Proposed Solution**  The wording of rule ‘R251’ will be updated to clarify that the logic refers to multiple body records and not only to multiple packages within the same body record. The outcome will be to clarify that in case the number of packages is set to ‘0’, then there should exist at least one ‘PACKAGE’ with the same ‘Shipping Marks’ and ‘Number of Packages’ with value greater than ‘0’, on a per <E-AD> data group level rather than per <(BODY) E-AD> level as such:  *From*: “In case the ‘Number of Packages’ is set to ‘0’, then there should exist at least one ‘PACKAGE’ with the same ‘Shipping Marks’ and ‘Number of Packages’ with value greater than ‘0’.  *To*: “In case the ‘Number of Packages’ is set to ‘0’, then there should exist at least one PACKAGE ***(i.e. either within the same <E-AD BODY> or within other <E-AD BODY> occurrences of the same message)*** with the same ‘Shipping Marks’ and ‘Number of Packages’ with value greater than ‘0’”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then rule ‘R251’ will continue to produce ambiguity in interpretation, and specifically, the data group level that this rule should be applied on the corresponding messages. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the semantic level, namely the update of rule’s ‘R251’ description in order to clarify that the logic refers to multiple body records and not only to multiple packages within the same body record.  The change implemented can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, will be validated only at the sending side of the IE801, IE815 & IE825 messages (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection shall be triggered by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | This change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in production in a **Migration Period.** | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-253; * **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-095. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB#187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-289 - Applicability of Degree Plato

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-289 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Incompliance with Specification | | Incidents | IM304543 | | Known Error | KE19410 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 18/11/19 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS phase 4 with the current legislation concerning the Degree Plato taxation for beer. According to COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 684/2009, the following is regulated in accordance to field 17 h) Degree Plato: “In principle the field is depended and required if the Member State of dispatch and / or the Member State of destination tax beer on the basis of Degree Plato.”  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], condition ‘C048’ will be updated in order for the <Degree Plato> data item to be dependent on either the MSA of Dispatch or MSA of Destination. More specifically, the following changes shall be performed in DDNEA:   * Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE   The following update will be performed in the description of condition ‘C048’ (highlighted in bold/italic):  *From:*  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is "Yes"  THEN <Degree Plato> is 'O' (\*)  ELSE <Degree Plato> does not apply  where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>.  *To:*  IF (<EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is "Yes") ***AND (MS of Dispatch OR MS of Destination tax beer according to the Degree Plato)***  THEN <Degree Plato> is '***R***'  ELSE <Degree Plato> does not apply  where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>. AND Degree Plato applicability per Member State is retrieved from the list of <Member State-Degree Plato>.) | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with the legislation concerning the excise duties on beer products on the basis of Degree Plato. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the semantic level, namely, the update of the condition ‘C048’. This update can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, will be validated only at the sending side of the IE801 messages in which C048 is applied (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-256; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #187 on 15/04/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-292 – Updates regarding the use of economic operators in ACO requests

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-292 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM256274 | | Known Error | KE18502 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 30/10/2018 | | Requester | MSA-FR | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  A misalignment between the legislation and the common specifications concerning the message IE721 (ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION COMMON REQUEST) has been identified, as stated in FESS-259 RFC. More specifically, according to the current legislation, each data group <(PERSON) TRADER> may refer to zero or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority. However, the IE721, allows a Member State to potentially submit a request that concerns more than one economic operator registered in the requested Member State.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement] and the corresponding FESS-259 RFC, the following updates will be implemented:   * A new business rule ‘BR042’ will be created in APPENDIX J with the following description:   *BR ID:* BR042    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:*  An administrative cooperation request may concern zero or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority and may not concern more than one economic operator registered in the Member State of the requested authority  *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If Trader Excise Number or VAT Number or Trader Name are used, these should concern one or more economic operators registered in the Member State of the requesting authority and no more than one economic operator registered in the Member State of the requested authority    *IE:* IE721 (administrative cooperation request)  *Data Item:* TRADER Person. Trader Excise Number/ TRADER Person. VAT Number/ TRADER Person. Trader Name  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   * The newly created business rule ‘BR042’ will be added in Appendix D associated with the following data items of the <(PERSON) TRADER> data group in the IE721 message: | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, the common specifications will not be aligned with the corresponding legislation in relation to administrative cooperation requests. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the semantic level, namely, the introduction of the business rule BR042. This update can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, the corresponding message will be validated only at the sending side of the IE721 message. Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-259; * **Children RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx**;** * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx**.** | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-293 – Update naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-293 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM278408 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/11/2018 | | Requester | MSA-LV | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-260 RFC.  More specifically, the naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> data items need to be aligned with the corresponding naming and format of the <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> technical terms in the Excise BPMs.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES.   The following updates should be performed (highlighted in bold/italics):   * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Gross Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Gross Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Net Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * The existing message element ‘MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Net Weight’ will be updated:   + by modifying its naming to ‘MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass***’;   + by modifying its data type to ‘***n..16,6***’. * Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE   The following updates should be performed (highlighted in bold/italics):   * The existing data items <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> will be modified under the data group <GOODS ITEM> in the IE717, IE722, and IE840 messages. Hence, the data group <GOODS ITEM> will be updated as shown below in the corresponding messages:   **IE717 - CONTROL REPORT (C\_CCR\_DAT)**  **------GOODS ITEM**  Description of the Goods O an..55  CN Code D n8 C201  R232  Commercial Description of the Goods O an..999  Additional code O an..35  Quantity D n..15,3 C201  R232  Unit of Measure Code D n..2 BC52 C201  ***Gross Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  **IE722 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST (C\_MVS\_SUB)**  **------GOODS ITEM**  Description of the Goods O an..55  CN Code D n8 C201  R232  Commercial Description of the Goods O an..999  Additional code O an..35  Quantity D n..15,3 C201  R232  Unit of Measure Code D n..2 BC52 C201  ***Gross Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  **IE840 - EVENT REPORT (C\_EVT\_DAT)**  **------GOODS ITEM**  Description of the Goods O an..55  CN Code D n8 C201  R232  Commercial Description of the Goods O an..999  Additional code O an..35  Quantity D n..15,3 C201  R232  Unit of Measure Code D n..2 BC52 C201  ***Gross Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** O ***n..16,6*** R219  R232   * The existing data items <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight> will be modified under the data group <(BODY) E-AD> in the IE801, IE815, and IE825 messages. Hence, the data group <(BODY) E-AD> will be updated as shown below in the corresponding messages:   **IE801 - E-AD (C\_EAD\_VAL)**  **---(BODY) E-AD**  Body Record Unique Reference R n..3 BR037  BR040  R232  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R215  CN Code R n8 BR039  R211  R232  Quantity R n..15,3 R232  ***Gross Mass*** R ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** R ***n..16,6*** BR038  R219  R232  Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage D n..5,2 C047  C152  R237  Degree Plato D n..5,2 C048  C152  R232  Fiscal Mark O an..350  Fiscal Mark\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Fiscal Mark Used flag O n1 TC27  Designation of Origin O an..350  Designation of Origin\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Size of Producer O n..15 R232  Density D n..5,2 C049  R232  Commercial Description O an..350  Commercial Description\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Brand Name of Products O an..350  Brand Name of Products\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  **IE815 - SUBMITTED DRAFT OF E-AD (N\_EAD\_SUB)**  **---(BODY) E-AD**  Body Record Unique Reference R n..3 BR037  BR040  R232  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R215  CN Code R n8 BR039  R211  R232  Quantity R n..15,3 R232  ***Gross Mass***  R ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** R ***n..16,6*** BR038  R219  R232  Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage D n..5,2 C047  C152  R237  Degree Plato D n..5,2 C048  C152  R232  Fiscal Mark O an..350  Fiscal Mark\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Fiscal Mark Used flag O n1 TC27  Designation of Origin O an..350  Designation of Origin\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Size of Producer O n..15 R232  Density D n..5,2 C049  R232  Commercial Description O an..350  Commercial Description\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Brand Name of Products O an..350  Brand Name of Products\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  **IE825 - SUBMITTED DRAFT OF SPLITTING OPERATION (E\_SPL\_SUB)**  **---(BODY) E-AD**  Body Record Unique Reference R n..3 BR037  BR040  R232  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R215  CN Code R n8 BR039  R211  R232  Quantity R n..15,3 R232  ***Gross Mass*** R ***n..16,6*** R219  R232  ***Net Mass*** R ***n..16,6*** BR038  R219  R232  Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage D n..5,2 C047  C152  R237  Degree Plato D n..5,2 C048  C152  R232  Fiscal Mark O an..350  Fiscal Mark\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Fiscal Mark Used flag O n1 TC27  Designation of Origin O an..350  Designation of Origin\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Size of Producer O n..15 R232  Density D n..5,2 C049  R232  Commercial Description O an..350  Commercial Description\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  Brand Name of Products O an..350  Brand Name of Products\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002   * The following update should be performed in the description of rule ‘R219’:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | R219 | The <Gross *Mass*> must be equal or higher than <Net *Mass*> |  * Appendix E: XML MAPPING   The following entries should be updated (highlighted in bold/italics):   | **Data-group or Data-item** | **Data Type** | **XML-Tag** | | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Gross***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Net***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Gross***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Net***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Gross***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Net***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Gross***Mass*** | | MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | Net***Mass*** |  * Appendix G: DATA ITEMS   The following entries should be updated (highlighted in bold/italics):   | **Data item** | **Format** | | --- | --- | | Gross ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** | | Net ***Mass*** | ***n..16,6*** |  * Appendix K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING   The following entries for ‘R219’ and ‘R232’ should be updated (highlighted in bold/italics):   | **C/R** | **IE path** | | --- | --- | | R219 | IE717.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE717.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE722.MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE722.MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE825.MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE825.MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE840.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R219 | IE840.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE717.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE717.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE722.MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE722.MESSAGE - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE825.MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE825.MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD.Net ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE840.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Gross ***Mass*** | | R232 | IE840.MESSAGE - OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT - GOODS ITEM.Net ***Mass*** |  * Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   The following updates should be performed (highlighted in bold/italics):   * The “GrossWeightType” in types.xsd file should be updated as follows:   <!--===================================================-->  <!--=== ***GrossMassType*** ===-->  <!--===================================================-->  ***<xs:simpleType name="GrossMassType">***  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  ***<doc:description value="Gross Mass" />***  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:restriction base="xs:decimal">  ***<xs:totalDigits value="16" />***  ***<xs:fractionDigits value="6" />***  <xs:minExclusive value="0" />  ***<xs:pattern value="[1-9]\d{0,15}" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,14}|0)\.[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,13}|0)\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,12}|0)\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,11}|0)\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,10}|0)\.\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,9}|0)\.\.\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>   * The “NetWeightType” in types.xsd file should be updated as follows:   <!--===================================================-->  <!--=== ***NetMassType*** ===-->  <!--===================================================-->  ***<xs:simpleType name="NetMassType">***  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  ***<doc:description value="Net Mass" />***  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:restriction base="xs:decimal">  ***<xs:totalDigits value="16" />***  ***<xs:fractionDigits value="6" />***  <xs:minExclusive value="0" />  ***<xs:pattern value="[1-9]\d{0,15}" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,14}|0)\.[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,13}|0)\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,12}|0)\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,11}|0)\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,10}|0)\.\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  ***<xs:pattern value="([1-9]\d{0,9}|0)\.\.\.\.\.\d[0-9]" />***  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>   * The “GrossWeight” and “NetWeight” elements in ie717.xsd, ie722.xsd and ie840.xsd files should be updated as follows:   <xs:complexType name="GoodsItemType">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  <doc:description value="GOODS ITEM" />  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:sequence>  <xs:element name="DescriptionOfTheGoods" type="emcs:DescriptionOfTheGoodsType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="CnCode" type="emcs:CnCodeType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="CommercialDescriptionOfTheGoods" type="emcs:CommercialDescriptionOfTheGoodsType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="AdditionalCode" type="emcs:AdditionalCodeType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="Quantity" type="emcs:QuantityType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="UnitOfMeasureCode" type="emcs:UnitOfMeasureCodeType" minOccurs="0" />  ***<xs:element name="GrossMass" type="emcs:GrossMassType" minOccurs="0" />***  ***<xs:element name="NetMass" type="emcs:NetMassType" minOccurs="0" />***  </xs:sequence>  </xs:complexType>   * The “GrossWeight” and “NetWeight” elements in ie801.xsd, ie815.xsd and ie825.xsd files should be updated as follows:   <xs:complexType name="BodyEadType">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>  <doc:description value="(BODY) E-AD" />  </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:sequence>  <xs:element name="BodyRecordUniqueReference" type="emcs:BodyRecordUniqueReferenceType" />  <xs:element name="ExciseProductCode" type="emcs:ExciseProductCodeType" />  <xs:element name="CnCode" type="emcs:CnCodeType" />  <xs:element name="Quantity" type="emcs:QuantityType" />  ***<xs:element name="GrossMass" type="emcs:GrossMassType" />***  ***<xs:element name="NetMass" type="emcs:NetMassType" />***  <xs:element name="FiscalMark" type="ie:LSDFiscalMarkType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="FiscalMarkUsedFlag" type="tcl:Flag" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="Density" type="emcs:DensityType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="CommercialDescription" type="ie:LSDCommercialDescriptionType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="BrandNameOfProducts" type="ie:LSDBrandNameOfProductsType" minOccurs="0" />  <xs:element name="Package" type="ie:PackageType" maxOccurs="99" />  </xs:sequence>  </xs:complexType>   * APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the types.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Medium).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (Low); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-260 RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the XML tags and the types.xsd file in relation to the <Gross Mass> and <Net Mass> data items.  It is considered that the aforementioned change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically:   * If the sender is aligned with the new .xsd files, while the receiver is not, any corresponding message sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. Therefore, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application replaces any occurrence of the <GrossMass> and <NetMass> XML tags with the <GrossWeight> and <NetWeight> XML tags respectively. Additionally, the sending side should be advised to only specify values which are compatible with the old format of <Gross Weight> and <Net Weight>, i.e. having a format of ‘n..15,2’; * In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new .xsd files when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. To avoid such rejections, it is proposed that the receiving application replaces any occurrence of the <GrossWeight> and <NetWeight> XML tags with the <GrossMass> and <NetMass> XML tags respectively in the received messages. In relation to the updated format, any values specified in the respective data items according to the previous format (i.e. n..15,2) should also be compatible with the updated format (i.e. n..16,6), so no further transformation actions are suggested in this case.     *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain since the IE801, IE815, and IE825 messages are also exchanged over the ED. Therefore, the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at a national level by the MSAs.* | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risk. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-260; * **Children RFCs:** SEED-xxx, CTP-P4-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-294 – Clarifications regarding the expected Quantity for e-ADs created after the rejection of consignments

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-294 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM295317 | | Known Error | KE19826 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 04/03/2019 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As stated in the corresponding FESS-261 RFC, in cases of change of destination triggered from rejected quantities of an e-AD (e.g. from the submission of an IE818 message with rejected quantities), then the consignor is expected to change the destination for the part of the consignment that has been refused, thus, the newly generated e-ADs should be related to the part of the consignment that had been initially rejected. However, concerning the new IE801 message that will be created, there is no specific rule stating the relationship between the quantities on such e-ADs, creating possible ambiguities in the process.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following business rule ‘BR043’ will be created and added in APPENDIX J of DDNEA, in order to clarify the relationship between the refused quantity of the original e-AD and the quantity that has to be specified in the new IE801 message:   * *BR ID:* BR043*.*     *BR ID:* BR043    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:*  It is obligatory for an e-AD created as a result of a change of destination triggered from a rejected consignment (i.e. from the submission of an IE818 message with rejected quantities), then the quantity of excise goods included in the new e-AD is equal to the refused quantity of the original consignment.    *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If a new e-AD is created for as a result of a rejected consignment, then the quantity included in the e-AD should be equal to the rejected quantity in the original consignment.    *IE:* IE801 (e-AD)  *Data Item:* E-AD Body.Quantity  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   * The newly created business rule ‘BR043’ will be added to Appendix D, associated to the <Quantity> data item of the <(BODY) e-AD> data group of the IE801 message, as shown below: | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities in the common specifications will remain, in relation to the actual quantity that should be included in new e-ADs, created as a result of a rejected consignment. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the semantic level, namely, the introduction of the business rule BR043. The update can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, the corresponding message will be validated only at the sending side of the IE801 message. Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-261; * **Children RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-295 – Clarifications regarding the Explanation on Delay for Delivery process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-295 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM355632 | | Known Error | KE19827 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/04/2020 | | Requester | MSA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As described in the corresponding FESS-262 RFC, there is an ambiguity concerning the generation of the IE837 message. More specifically, the scenario states that the IE837 message should be sent after the TIM\_EAD' timer has expired and the consequent IE802 message has been transmitted.  However, as raised by the Member States, there is a potentially valid use case, where exceptionally the IE837 message could be proactively sent in advance (i.e. before the sending of the IE802 message), to notify the Member State of Dispatch of an expected delay in the submission of the Report of Receipt (e.g. in case of public holidays, strikes, etc.)  Additionally, currently, there is no technical limitation in place, in order to forbid a Member State not to send an IE837 message before the IE802 message has been transmitted.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a documentation update in section “**III.I.7.2 Submission of explanations on delay for delivery**” will be implemented (in bold and italics written below) in order to specify that the IE837 message could be exceptionally sent before the IE802 message: | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities in relation to whether the IE837 message could be exceptionally sent before the IE802 message will remain. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes in the documentation, thus, no risk of rejection for any message concerned will occur. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-262; * **Children RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-296 – Update of legal references

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-296 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Incompliance with Specifications | | Incidents | IM370221 | | Known Error | KE19828 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 02/04/20 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  A recast horizontal Council Directive (EU) 2020/262 was introduced, which creates the need to update all corresponding legal references included in the DDNEA document.  **Proposed Solution**  It shall be clarified that any legal references to Directive 2008/118/EC, will be updated to the recast Directive 2020/262. This is applicable to the DDNEA main document and all appendices.  More specifically, all references of the DDNEA document to Council Directive 2008/118/EC will be updated to the corresponding references of recast Council Directive 2020/262 of 19 December 2019 as follows:   * ***III.I.1.1.2*** *Origin is tax warehouse and the destination is unknown*   **From**:  According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA dispatch application. The origin of the movement is a tax warehouse and the destination of the movement is unknown in accordance with ***~~Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC~~.***  **To**:  According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA dispatch application. The origin of the movement is a tax warehouse and the destination of the movement is unknown in accordance with ***Article 22 of*** ***Directive 2020/262.***   * ***III.I.1.2.3*** *Origin is import and the destination is unknown*   **From:**  According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA dispatch application. The origin of the movement is import and the destination of the movement is unknown in accordance with ***~~Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC.~~***  **To:**  According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA dispatch application. The origin of the movement is a tax warehouse and the destination of the movement is unknown in accordance with ***Article 22 of Directive 2020/262.***   * ***III.IV.2.2.2*** *When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export*   *Table 16: TIM\_FDF functional timer:*  **From:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | TIM\_FDF | | | Started: | **UC-201-230 - Start Follow up**  In case an e-AD has been accepted and the destination fields have been left empty according to ***~~Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC~~***, the TIM\_FDF timer is initiated by the MSA dispatch application to expire at the limit date for filling in the destination fields. | | Stopped: | **UC-205-230 - Start follow up**  After the change of destination and if the concerned e-AD has been accepted without destination details (***~~Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC~~***), the MSA dispatch application stops the TIM\_FDF timer, since the destination has been specified. |   **To:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | TIM\_FDF | | | Started: | **UC-201-230 - Start Follow up**  In case an e-AD has been accepted and the destination fields have been left empty according to ***Article of 22 of Directive 2020/262~~EC~~.***, the TIM\_FDF timer is initiated by the MSA dispatch application to expire at the limit date for filling in the destination fields. | | Stopped: | **UC-205-230 - Start follow up**  After the change of destination and if the concerned e-AD has been accepted without destination details (***Article 22 of Directive 2020/262***), the MSA dispatch application stops the TIM\_FDF timer, since the destination has been specified. |  * ***V.I.3.1.1. The Role of SEED data.***   **From:**  SEED information includes all items that are described in ***~~Article 22 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2073/2004~~***, namely:  • authorised warehouse keepers (*as defined in* ***~~Directive 2008/118/EC~~***);  • registered Consignees (as defined in ***~~Directive 2008/118/EC~~***);  • other registered operators that a MSA may allow to provide a movement guarantee in place of the Consignor; they may be considered as "persons who have assumed the obligations within the meaning of ***~~Article 18(1) of Directive 2008/118/EC~~***";  • Temporary authorisations (as defined in ***~~Directive 2008/118/EC~~***).  **And:**  In addition to the above-mentioned information, which is part of the SEED register, it should be mentioned that other relevant information such as specific authorisations (i.e. the allowance to practise direct delivery or to send energy products without identified destination under ***~~Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC~~***) is contained in the register as well  Last but not least, temporary authorisations granted by a MSA of Destination to a non-registered Consignee (as defined in ***~~Directive 2008/118/EC~~***) are also part of the SEED information.  **To:**  SEED information includes all items that are described in ***Article 22 of Directive 2020/262 ~~EC~~***, namely:  • authorised warehouse keepers (***~~Article 22 of~~as defined in Directive 2020/262***);  • registered Consignees (as defined in ***Directive 2020/262 ~~EC~~***);  • other registered operators that a MSA may allow to provide a movement guarantee in place of the Consignor; they may be considered as "persons who have assumed the obligations within the meaning of ***Article 17(1) of Directive 2020/262*** ";  • Temporary authorisations (as defined in ***Directive 2020/262***).  **And:**  In addition to the above-mentioned information, which is part of the SEED register, it should be mentioned that other relevant information such as specific authorisations (i.e. the allowance to practise direct delivery or to send energy products without identified destination under ***Article 22 of Directive 2020/262 ~~EC~~***) is contained in the register as well  Last but not least, temporary authorisations granted by a MSA of Destination to a non-registered Consignee (as defined in ***Directive 2020/262 ~~EC~~***) are also part of the SEED information.  Additionally, the DDNEA Appendix B shall be updated as shown below:   * ***TC29, value 5***   **From:**  No guarantee is provided according to Article 18.4(b) of 2008/118/EC  **To:**  No guarantee is provided according to Article 17.5 of Directive 2020/262'   * ***TC48, value 3***   **From:**  Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC)  **To:**  Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22 of Directive 2020/262)   * ***TC69, value 2***   **From:**  Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC  **To:**  Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive 2020/262   * ***TC83, value 4***   **From:**  Intention to make claim under Article 10 of Council Directive 2008/118/EC  **To:**  Intention to make claim under Article 9 of Council Directive 2020/262   * ***TC83, value 5***   **From:**  Allowable loss detected, in relation to Article 7(4) of Council Directive 2008/118/EC  **To:**  Allowable loss detected, in relation to Article 6 of Council Directive 2020/262 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the change is not implemented, the DDNEA document will be incongruent with the Council Directive (EU) 2020/262. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-263; * **Children RFCs:** -. * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-297 – Removal of ‘TA’ references

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-297 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM309560 | | Known Error | KE19829 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 15/03/19 | | Requester | ITSM3 TES | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  According to DDNEA-P3-231 RFC, documentation updates in DDNEA main document were added due to the parallel maintenance of TA and CTA applications. The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align and amend the DDNEA with the decommission of the “TA” application.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the DDNEA v2.02 will be updated to remove any reference to the ‘TA’ application. More specifically the following changes will be implemented:   * Table I.I.2.3 Acronyms and Abbreviations      * X.I.3 Environment   + **Common Domain Testing Environment** used to exchange messages for testing purposes on the Common Domain. This environment is used for National Compliance Testing (*Mode-1*) and Conformance Testing (*Mode-2*) with the testing application ~~(TA or~~ CTA). This environment is also used for International Testing (*Mode-3* and *Mode-3+*) between two or more countries.   + Footnote: *NETA is a nationally developed application and it should not be confused with the testing application (~~TA or~~ CTA), which is a centrally developed application. The testing application (~~TA or~~ CTA) is deployed only centrally and it cannot be deployed at the premises of MSAs* * X.I.3.1 National Gateways   Queues ~~for both TA and~~ CTA are defined for Mode-1 and Mode-2, in order to support the Common Domain Testing activities.   * X.I.3.2.1 Queue Name   In the above table:  “xx” is a value for use by the testing application (~~TA or~~ CTA) in Common Domain Testing environment defined in the above table.  Queues ~~for both TA and~~ CTA are defined for Mode-1 and Mode-2, in order to support the Common Domain Testing activities.   * Figure 253: Conformance Testing with TA will be removed:      * X.I.5.3.1.6 ccnUserProfileId   + The names of the UserProfileId per queue are defined as shown in Table 6 (for more information regarding queues please refer to Section 0.o From X.I.3 “Environment). For detailed implementation of the UserProfileIds for SEED, ~~TA and~~ CTA, please refer to the corresponding CTODs (Conformance Test Organisation Documents).   + In table 58: List of user profiles the following entries will be removed:  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | TA2-NEA-CORE-XML-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-READ-RCT-PRF.EMCS | R | | TA2-NEA-CORE-XML-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-CORE1-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-CORE2-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-CORE3-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-NEA-ADMIN-XML-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-READ-RCT-PRF.EMCS | R | | TA2-NEA-ADMIN-XML-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-ADMIN1-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-ADMIN2-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-ADMIN3-XML-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-NEA-REPORT-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-READ-RCT-PRF.EMCS | R | | TA2-NEA-REPORT-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-REPORT-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-NEA-ED-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-READ-RCT-PRF.EMCS | R | | TA2-NEA-ED-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-ED-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-REPORT-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-NEA-ED-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-READ-RCT-PRF.EMCS | R | | TA2-NEA-ED-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-NEA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W | | TA2-ED-xx-RCT-QUE.EMCS | TA-WRITE-RCT-PRF.EMCS | W |   Table 6: List of user profiles  In the above table “yy” can take the value 01 - 10 to indicate 10 different queues while “xx” is a value for use by testing application (~~TA or~~ CTA) in Common Domain Testing environment defined in table 54. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed statement is not implemented, the DDNEA document will be misaligned with the discontinuation of the “TA” tool. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns only documentation updates on the DDNEA document. More specifically, all “TA” references will be removed, with no business continuity risks. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-231. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-298 – Clarifications regarding the structure of the IE917 message

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-298 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM351266 | | Known Error | KE19467 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/12/2019 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  During the analysis of a CT issue raised by MSA-NL, it was observed that the “VIII.I.3.2.2 Syntactic layer” section of DDNEA v2.02 describes only the case of invalid Administrative Reference Code as a prerequisite for the <HEADER> Data Group not be present in the IE917 message. The existing description should be updated to include also the syntactically invalid Sequence Number as an alternative prerequisite for the removal of the <HEADER> Data Group from IE917.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * Main document : Section “VIII.I.3.2.2 Syntactic layer”.   The following paragraph will be updated as described below (highlighted in bold/italics):  “For cases where the received message contains Administrative Reference Code and Sequence Number and the information is syntactically valid (i.e. the XML content can be parsed), then the information should be included in the Negative Acknowledgement (IE917: C\_XML\_NCK) message to support correlation at the message sender’s side. Therefore, the <HEADER> Data Group should be present. ***If the received message contains either syntactically invalid Administrative Reference Code or syntactically invalid Sequence Number,*** the <HEADER> Data Group should not be present.” | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not cover all cases when the <HEADER> Data Group should not be present in the IE917 message. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risk since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #190 on 06/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-299 – Computerisation of Duty Paid B2B

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-299 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM372196 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/11/2019 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The major evolution of EMCS Phase 4 is the computerisation of the Duty Paid Business-to-Business (B2B) procedures. Based on the legal package[[3]](#footnote-3) that received a political agreement on 8/11/2019 at the Council, this evolution will be handled by the extension of EMCS to cover the movements of excise goods released for consumption and moved intra-EU cross-border for commercial purposes.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * **Main Document**   Detailed description of the changes in the DDNEA main document are described in the accompanying Annexes, i.e. designated annexes for updates in the ‘Core Business’ (‘[Annex 1](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-299_–)’), ‘Follow-up and Collaboration’ (‘[Annex 2](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-299_–)’) and ‘Central Services’ (‘[Annex 3](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-299_–)’) sections.   * **Appendix B: CODELISTS** * A new value ‘Origin -Duty Paid’ will be added in the existing ‘TC30 – Origin Type Code’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Origin - Tax warehouse |  | | 2 | Origin - Import |  | | ***3*** | ***Origin – Duty Paid*** |  |  * New values will be added in the existing ‘TC32– Destination Type Code’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | … | … |  | | 6 | Destination - Export |  | | 7 | (reserved) |  | | 8 | Unknown destination (consignee unknown) |  | | ***9*** | ***Destination – Certified Consignee*** |  | | ***10*** | ***Destination – Temporary Certified Consignee*** |  |  * New values will be added in the existing ‘TC77 – Changed Destination Type Code’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | … | … |  | | 6 | Destination - Export |  | | 7 | (reserved) |  | | 8 | (reserved) |  | | ***9*** | ***Destination – Certified Consignee*** |  | | ***10*** | ***Destination – Temporary Certified Consignee*** |  |  * Existing values will be updated in the existing ‘TC04 – Common Request Type’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | … | … |  | | 5 | Request for re-synchronisation of the register of economic operators |  | | 6 | Request for retrieval of a list of ***e-ADs/e-SADs*** |  | | 7 | Request for SEED statistics |  |  * The existing codelist ‘TC48 – Reminder Message Type’ will be updated, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Reminder message at expiry of time to change destination |  | | 2 | Reminder message at expiry of time to send the report of receipt/export |  | | 3 | Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22 of Directive ~~2008/118/EC~~2020/262) | ***Not applicable for Duty Paid B2B*** |  * New values will be added in the existing ‘TC65 – Operator Type Code’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Authorised warehouse keeper |  | | 2 | Registered consignee |  | | 3 | Registered consignor |  | | ***4*** | ***Certified Consignor*** |  | | ***5*** | ***Certified Consignee*** |  |  * New value will be added in the existing ‘TC71 – Submission Type’, as shown below:  | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Standard submission |  | | 2 | Submission for export (local clearance) |  | | ***3*** | ***Submission for Duty Paid B2B*** |  |  * **Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE**   ***Introduction of <Global Excise Trader Identifier> on the IE713 message***   * A new data item <Global Excise Trader Identifier> will be added under the <Trader Authorisation> data group as shown below:      * The existing data group <(CONSIGNOR) TRADER> under the <TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION> data group will be renamed to <(LINKED TO TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION)TRADER)> as shown below:     ***Renaming of Data Groups/Data Items***  The naming of existing data groups and data items will be updated, so that they are applicable for the Duty Paid B2B business domain, as well as the introduction of ‘e-SAD’. The following table outlines the list of the identified updates for each impacted message.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Type | IE | From | To | | Data Group | IE701 | E-AD LIST REQUEST | E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST | | Data Group | IE717 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE821 | E-AD LIST ITEM | E-AD/E-SAD LIST ITEM | | Data Group | IE821 | EXCISE MOVEMVENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Item | IE821 | Date and Time of Validation of e-AD | Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD | | Data Group | IE840 | EXCISE MOVEMVENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE801 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE801 | E-AD | E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Group | IE801 | (HEADER) E-AD | (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Group | IE801 | (BODY) E-AD | (BODY) E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Item | IE801 | Date and Time of Validation of e-AD | Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD | | Data Group | IE815 | (HEADER) E-AD | (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Group | IE815 | (BODY) E-AD | (BODY) E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Group | IE815 | E-AD Draft | E-AD/E-SAD Draft | | Data Group | IE813 | (UPDATE) E-AD | (UPDATE) E-AD/E-SAD | | Data Group | IE802 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE818 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE819 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE819 | ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD REASON | ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD/E-SAD REASON | | Data Item | IE819 | E-AD Rejected Flag | E-AD/E-SAD Rejected Flag | | Data Item | IE819 | Alert or Rejection of E-AD Reason Code | Alert or Rejection of Movement Reason Code | | Data Group | IE861 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT | | Data Group | IE871 | EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | EXCISE MOVEMENT |  * **Appendix D: RULES**   The following rules will be updated/created as described below:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ID | Description | IEs | | R030 | The format of <ARC> is defined as per the below structure:[[4]](#footnote-4)    Field / Content / Field type / Examples  1 / Year / Numeric 2 / "05"  2 / Identifier of the MS where the e-AD/e-SAD was initially submitted / Alphabetic 2 / "ES"  3 / Nationally assigned, unique code / Alphanumeric 15 (digits and capital letters) / "7R19YTE17UIC8J4"  4 / Type of Movement / Alphanumeric 1 / "P"  5 / Check Digit / Numeric 1 / "9"    Field 1 is last two digits of year of formal acceptance of movement.  Field 2 is taken from the list of <MEMBER STATES>  Field 3 must be filled with a unique identifier per EMCS movement. The way this field is used is under MSAs’ responsibility, but each EMCS movement must have a unique number.  Field 4 gives an identifier for the type of the movement. If <Submission Message Type> is ‘3’, then value ‘P’ must be used (note: the introduced logic is applicable for ARCs generated after 01/01/2023. Any ARCs generated before 01/01/2023, are associated with a Duty Suspension movement, regardless of the alphanumeric character specified in 'Field 4' of the ARC).  Field 5 gives the Check Digit for the whole ARC (see section ‘Design Principles’ of the DDNEA main document), that will help detect an error when keying the ARC. | Any IE which includes ‘ARC’ as a data item (e.g. IE801, IE818, IE721, IE881, etc.) | | R070 | The <Trader Excise Number> must be unique in the list of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>.  The <Tax Warehouse Reference> must be unique in the list of <TAX WAREHOUSE>".    The format of <Trader Excise Number> or <Tax Warehouse Reference> is defined as per the below structure:    Field / Content / Field type / Examples  1 / Identifier of the MS where the economic operator or tax warehouse is registered / Alphabetic 2 / "PL"  2 / Nationally assigned, unique code / Alphanumeric 11 / "2005764CL78"    Field 1 is taken from the list of <MEMBER STATES>.  Field 2 must be filled with a unique identifier for the Excise registered operator (authorised warehouse keeper, registered consignee, registered consignor, certified consignor, and certified consignee) or for the tax warehouse. The way this value is assigned falls under the MSAs’ responsibility, but each Excise registered operator (authorised warehouse keeper, registered consignee, registered consignor, certified consignor, and certified consignee) and each tax warehouse must have a unique number. | IE713 | | R233 | An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>  The <Operator Type Code> of the referred <TRADER> must be:  - "Authorised warehouse keeper" OR "Registered consignor" for <Temporary Registered Consignee> authorisations OR;  - "Certified Consignor" for <Temporary Certified Consignee> authorisations OR;  - "Certified Consignee" for <Temporary Certified Consignor> authorisations.    In addition the Member State of the <TRADER AUTHORISATION> must be different from the Member State the <TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION> is registered for. | IE713 | | R044 | For TRADER Consignor  An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>  The <Operator Type Code> of the referred <TRADER> must be:  - "Authorised warehouse keeper"; OR  - "Registered consignor"; OR  - "Certified consignor"; OR  - "Temporary Certified Consignor".  For TRADER Place of dispatch  An existing identifier <Tax Warehouse Reference> (Excise Number in SEED). | IE801,  IE815,  IE821,  IE871. | | R045 | The possible values of <Trader Identification> are described in the following table:  If Destination Type Code==1 - Destination - Tax warehouse  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> Excise number (1)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> Tax Warehouse Reference (Excise Number) (5)  If Destination Type Code==2 - Destination - Registered consignee  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> Excise number (2)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> Any identification (\*)  If Destination Type Code==3 - Destination - Temporary registered consignee  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification ->Temporary authorisation reference (4)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification ->Any identification (\*)  If Destination Type Code==4 - Destination - Direct delivery  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> Excise number (3)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> (Does not apply)  If Destination Type Code==5 - Destination - Exempted consignee  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> (Does not apply)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> Any identification (\*)  If Destination Type Code==6 - Destination – Export  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> VAT number (optional)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> (The data group <TRADER Place of Delivery> does not exist)    If Destination Type Code==9 - Destination – Certified Consignee  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> Excise Number (6)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> Any identification (\*)    If Destination Type Code==10 - Destination – Temporary Certified Consignee  Then  TRADER CONSIGNEE. Trader Identification -> Temporary Authorisation Reference (4)  TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification -> Any identification (\*)  (1) The operator type of the consignee is "Authorised warehouse keeper". An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>;  (2) The operator type of the consignee is "Registered consignee". An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>;  (3) The operator type of the consignee is either "Authorised warehouse keeper" or "Registered consignee" An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>;  (4) An existing <Temporary Authorisation Reference> in the set of <TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION>;  (5) An existing identifier <Tax Warehouse Reference> in the set of <TAX WAREHOUSE>;  (6) The operator type of the consignee is "Certified consignee". An existing identifier <Trader Excise Number> in the set of <TRADER AUTHORISATION>;  (\*) For the place of delivery, "Any identification" means: a VAT number or any other identifier; it is optional.  When the value of the “TRADER CONSIGNEE.Trader Identification” and “TRADER Place of Delivery. Trader Identification” is any of the following: “Excise Number” or “Tax Warehouse Reference” or “Temporary Authorisation Reference”, then the structure of the value should comply with the structure of the “Trader Excise Number/Tax Warehouse Reference”'. | IE801,  IE813,  IE815,  IE818,  IE819  IE821,  IE871. | | R058 | Refers to <Body Record Unique Reference> of the e-AD/e-SAD Body of the associated e-AD/e-SAD AND  must be unique within the message. | IE717,  IE818,  IE840. | | R059 | The <Sequence Number> is an automatically generated sequential number, set to 1 at initial submission of the e-AD/e-SAD, and then incremented of 1 upon each change of destination. | IE801,  IE813,  IE819 | | R196 | In case of standard submission (i.e. <Message Type> is "Standard submission"), the possible values of <Destination Type Code> are:  - 1 = Destination - Tax warehouse  - 2 = Destination - Registered consignee  - 3 = Destination - Temporary registered consignee  - 4 = Destination - Direct delivery  - 5 = Destination - Exempted consignee  - 6 = Destination - Export  - 8 = Unknown destination (consignee unknown)  In case of 'Duty Paid' submission (i.e. <Message Type> is "Duty Paid B2B"), the possible values of <Destination Type Code> are:  - 9 = Destination - Certified consignee  - 10 = Destination - Temporary certified consignee  In the particular case of submission for export (local clearance) (i.e. <Message type> is "Submission for export (local clearance)"), the value of <Destination Type Code> must be set to:  - 6 = Destination – Export | IE815 | | R231 | The <Body Record Unique Reference> must be unique within the message and must refer to a <Body Record Unique Reference> of the e-AD/e-SAD Body of the associated e-AD/e-SAD for which shortages or excesses have been declared. | IE871 | | R255 | Provide the latest sequence number of the related e-AD/e-SAD. | IE818 | | ~~R991~~  R258 | The applicable 'Destination Type Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  '1 - Destination-Tax Warehouse'  '2 - Destination-Registered Consignee'  '3 - Destination-Temporary Registered Consignee'  '4 - Destination-Direct Delivery'  '5 - Destination-Exempted Consignee'  '6 - Destination-Export'  '8 - Unknown destination (consignee unknown)'  The applicable 'Destination Type Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  '9 - Destination-Certified Consignee'  '10 - Destination-Temporary Certified Consignee'  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE801 | | ~~R992~~  R259 | The applicable 'Destination Type Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  '1 - Destination-Tax Warehouse'  '2 - Destination-Registered Consignee'  '3 - Destination-Temporary Registered Consignee'  '4 - Destination-Direct Delivery'  '6 - Destination-Export'  The applicable 'Destination Type Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  '9 - Destination-Certified Consignee'  '10 - Destination-Temporary Certified Consignee'  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE813 | | ~~R993~~  R260 | The applicable 'Origin Type Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  '1 - Origin-Tax Warehouse'  '2 - Origin-Import'  The applicable 'Origin Type Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  '3 - Origin-Duty Paid'  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE815,  IE801 | | ~~R994~~  R261 | The applicable 'Submission Type Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  '1 - Standard Submission'  '2 - Submission for export (local clearance)'  The applicable 'OriginSubmission Type Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  '3 - Submission for Duty Paid B2B'  R994 is applied on IE815, where based on the specified ‘submission message type’ and upon successful validation, the corresponding ARC will be constructed accordingly (as detailed in rule ‘R030’).  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE815 | | ~~R995~~  R262 | The applicable 'Reminder Message Type Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  '1 - Reminder message at expiry of time to change destination'  '2 - Reminder message at expiry of time to send the report of receipt/export'  '3 - Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22 of Directive ~~2008/118/EC~~2020/262)'  The applicable 'Reminder Message Type Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  '1 - Reminder message at expiry of time to change destination'  '2 - Reminder message at expiry of time to send the report of receipt/export'  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE802 | | ~~R996~~  R263 | The applicable 'Excise Product Codes' for Duty Suspension movements are:  - all codes listed in the 'CL - Excise Product' codelist, except from 'S600 - Completely denatured alcohol, falling within Article 20 of Directive 92/83/EEC ~~and article 5 of (EEC) 3649/92~~, being alcohol which has been denatured ~~but which does not yet fulfill~~and fulfils the conditions to benefit from the exemption provided for in Article 27(1)(a) of that Directive'.  The applicable 'Excise Product Codes' for Duty Paid B2B movements are:  - all codes listed in the 'CL - Excise Product' codelist'  It shall be clarified that the distinction between Duty Paid B2B and Duty Suspension movements should be derived from the ARC structure or based on the <Submission Message Type> in case of IE815, where the ARC is not available. | IE815,  IE801,  IE818 | | ~~R997~~  R264 | The Excise Product Code 'S600' is only applicable to the 'Certified Consignor' and 'Certified Consignee' authorisation types. | IE713 | | ~~R998~~  R265 | The possible values of <Operator Role Code> are:  - 1 = Allowed to practise direct delivery  - 2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive ~~2008/118/EC~~2020/262  The couplings <Operator Type / Operator Role Code> are as follows:  - 1 = Allowed to practise direct delivery--> Applicable for 'Authorised Warehouse Keeper' and 'Registered Consignee'  - 2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC --> Applicable for 'Authorised Warehouse Keeper' and 'Registered Consignor' | IE713 | | ~~R990~~  R266 | The format of <Global Excise Trader Identifier> is defined as per the below structure:  Field / Content / Field type / Examples1 / Identifier of the MS where the economic operator or tax warehouse is registered / Alphabetic 2 / "PL"2 / Nationally assigned, unique code / Alphanumeric 20 / "2005764CL78232ERW123"  Field 1 is taken from the list of <MEMBER STATES>.  Field 2 must be filled with a unique identifier that will allow linking of the different authorisation types (authorised warehouse keeper, registered consignee, registered consignor, certified consignor, and certified consignee) of a single Excise economic operator. | IE713 |  * **Appendix D: CONDITIONS**   The following conditions will be updated/created as described below:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ID | Description | IEs | | C010 | IF <Destination Type Code> is in:  - "Destination - Tax warehouse"  - "Destination - Registered consignee"  - "Destination - Temporary registered consignee"  - "Destination - Direct delivery"  - "Destination - Certified Consignee"  - "Destination - Temporary Certified Consignee"  THEN <TRADER Consignee.Trader Identification> is 'R'  ELSE  IF <Destination Type Code> is:  - "Destination – Export"  THEN <TRADER Consignee.Trader Identification> is 'O'  ELSE <TRADER Consignee.Trader Identification> does not apply | IE801,  IE813,  IE815,  IE818,  IE819,  IE821. | | C012 | IF <E-AD/E-SAD.Origin Type Code> is "Origin - Tax warehouse" OR <E-AD/E-SAD.Origin Type Code> is "Duty Paid"  THEN  <TRADER Place of Dispatch> is 'R'  <OFFICE of Dispatch - Import> does not apply  ELSE  <TRADER Place of Dispatch> does not apply  <OFFICE of Dispatch - Import> is 'R' | IE801,  IE815,  IE821. | | C013 | The optionality of the data groups <TRADER Place of Delivery> and <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> are described in the table below, according to the <Destination Type Code>:  If Destination Type Code ==1 - Destination - Tax warehouse  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==2 - Destination - Registered consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==3 - Destination - Temporary registered consignee  Then   <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply  If Destination Type Code==4 - Destination - Direct delivery  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply  If Destination Type Code==5 - Destination - Exempted consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply  If Destination Type Code==6 - Destination – Export  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery>Does not apply  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->'R'    If Destination Type Code==8 - Unknown destination (consignee unknown)  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery>Does not apply  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==9 - Certified Consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply     If Destination Type Code==10 - Temporary Certified Consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> ->Does not apply | IE801,  IE821. | | C052 | IF <Request Type> is "Request for retrieval of a list of e-ADs/e-SADs"    THEN <E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST> is 'R'    ELSE <E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST> does not apply | IE701 | | C066 | IF <Sequence Number> is 1  THEN <Date and Time of Validation of Update> is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD/e-SAD.Date and Time of Validation>  ELSE <Date and Time of Validation of Update> is equal to the date and time of the change of destination | IE801 | | C074 | IF <Destination Type Code> is "Destination - Tax warehouse" or "Destination - Certified Consignee" or "Destination – Temporary Certified Consignee"  THEN <TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification> is 'R'  ELSE  IF <Destination Type Code> is "Destination - Direct delivery"  THEN <TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification> does not apply  ELSE <TRADER Place of Delivery.Trader Identification> is 'O' | IE801,  IE813,  IE815,  IE818,  IE821. | | C102 | IF <E-AD/E-SAD Header.Transport Arrangement>(IE801) (or <E-AD/E-SAD Header.Transport Arrangement>(IE815)) is "Consignor" or "consignee"  THEN <TRADER Transport Arranger> does not apply  ELSE <TRADER Transport Arranger> is 'R' | IE801,  IE815,  IE821. | | C118 | The optionality of the data group <TRADER Place of Delivery> is described in the table below, according to the <Destination Type Code>:    If Destination Type Code==1 - Destination - Tax warehouse  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->R    If Destination Type Code==2 - Destination - Registered consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O    If Destination Type Code==3 - Destination - Temporary registered consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O    If Destination Type Code==4 - Destination - Direct delivery  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> R    If Destination Type Code==5 - Destination - Exempted consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O    If Destination Type Code==6 - Destination – Export  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->Does not apply     If Destination Type Code==9 - Destination - Certified consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O    If Destination Type Code==10 - Destination - Temporary certified consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->O | IE818 | | C161 | IF <Alert or Rejection of E-AD/E-SAD Reason Code> is "Other"  THEN  <Complementary Information> is 'R'  ELSE  <Complementary Information> is 'O' | IE819 | | C165 | The optionality of the data groups <TRADER Place of Delivery> and <OFFICE Place of Delivery – Customs> are described in the table below, according to the <Destination Type Code>:    If Destination Type Code==1 - Destination - Tax warehouse  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==2 - Destination - Registered consignee  Then  the <TRADER Place of Delivery> Data Group is optional after successful validation, otherwise it is not applicable  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==3 - Destination - Temporary registered consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==4 - Destination - Direct delivery  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> R  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==5 - Destination - Exempted consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==6 - Destination – Export  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> ->Does not apply  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> -> R    If Destination Type Code==8 - Unknown destination (consignee unknown)  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> Does not apply  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> -> Does not apply     If Destination Type Code==9 - Destination - Certified consignee  Then  the <TRADER Place of Delivery> Data Group is optional after successful validation, otherwise it is not applicable  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply    If Destination Type Code==10 - Destination - Temporary certified consignee  Then  <TRADER Place of Delivery> -> O  <OFFICE Place of Delivery –Customs> ->Does not apply | IE813 | | C191 | One of the <EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD/e-SAD> or <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data groups must be present | IE717 | | C192 | IF the <EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD/e-SAD> data group is present    THEN      <Body Record Unique Reference> is 'R'    ELSE      <Body Record Unique Reference> does not apply | IE717 | | C196 | One of the <EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD/e-SAD> or <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data groups must be present | IE840 | | ~~C996~~  C207 | IF <ARC> is related to a Duty Paid B2B movement (as derived from its structure defined in 'R030')  THEN  < Trader Name > is 'R'  < Street Name > is 'R'  < Post Code > is 'R'  < City > is 'R'  ELSE  < Trader Name > is 'O'  < Street Name > is 'O'  < Post Code > is 'O'  < City > is 'O' | IE801[[5]](#footnote-5) | | ~~C997~~  C208 | IF <ARC> is related to a Duty Paid B2B movement (as derived from its structure defined in 'R030')  THEN  <Tax Warehouse Reference> is N/A  ELSE  <Tax Warehouse Reference> is 'R' | IE801[[6]](#footnote-6) |  * **Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES**   All data groups/data items which have been renamed or newly introduced (i.e. as detailed in the previous section of this RFC regarding the impact on Appendix D) will be included in the updated ‘Appendix C’.   * **Appendix E: XML MAPPING**   All data groups/data items which have been renamed or newly introduced (i.e. as detailed in the previous section of this RFC regarding the impact on Appendix D) will be included in the updated ‘Appendix E’.   * **Appendix G: DATA ITEMS**   All data items which have been renamed or newly introduced (i.e. as detailed in the previous section of this RFC regarding the impact on Appendix D) will be included in the updated ‘Appendix G’.   * **Appendix K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING**   The newly created rules and conditions (i.e. as detailed in the previous section of this RFC regarding the impact on Appendix D) will be included in the updated ‘Appendix K’.   * **Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)**   Based on the updated message structure, detailed in the previous section of this RFC regarding the impact on Appendix D, new .xsd files will be created in alignment with the previously described updates.  The .xsd files that will be directly impacted by the aforementioned updates are ie801.xsd, ie815.xsd, ie813.xsd, ie818.xsd, ie713.xsd, ie717.xsd, ie840.xsd, ie821.xsd, ie819.xsd, ie871.xsd, types.xsd and tcl.xsd   * **APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)**   The changes applicable to the types.xsd, tcl.xsd and ie713.xsd files in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (High); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (High); * TRP for EMCS Phase (High).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (High); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (High).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (High). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with the legislation and FESS regarding the computerisation of the Duty Paid B2B business domain. | | Risk assessment | *Disclaimer*: *This ‘Risk Assessment’ analysis focuses on the proposed functionality updates and how these could be introduced during a migration period. However, specific elements of the described updates may be deployed in a phased approach in alignment with any corresponding planning decisions taken (e.g. early SEED release). Such decisions are not taken into consideration in this RFC, which purely focuses on the introduced functional enhancements.*  This RFC includes a significant amount of changes at both syntactic and semantic level. Essentially, all required updates for the computerisation of Duty Paid B2B business domain are listed in this RFC, including, but not limited to:   * Updates on the messages structure of existing messages; * introduction of new data items; * updates of rules, conditions, and codelists   If not all MSAs deploy this RFC in production at the same time when the sender is aligned with the new .xsd files while the receiver is not, the respective messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver.  It shall be noted that a transformation solution is not suggested in this case, due to the large amount and the corresponding complexity of the introduced changes.  Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before Mm, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that it behaves as today when communicating with Phase 3.4 MSAs (i.e. MSAs that have not deployed the Duty Paid B2B functionality), whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4 MSAs (only) (i.e. MSAs that have deployed the Duty Paid B2B functionality), a simultaneous deployment by all MSAs is proposed to be followed for the roll-out of this RFC so that no syntactic violations and business continuity issues occur.  *It should be noted that the changes introduced by this specific RFC affect both the External and Common Domain since the impacted messages are exchanged over both domains.* | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be **simultaneously deployed** by all MSAs at Mm due to the entailed business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-264; * **Children RFCs:** SEED-xxx, SEED CTP-xxx, CTP-P4-xxx, CS/MISE-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx, IE734-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-300 – Remove references to FESS appendices

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-300 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM373790 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/04/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Change priority | | High | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The agreed approach to be followed from EMCS Phase 4 onwards is that Excise BPMs and related artefacts will replace the existing FESS documentation. In this scope, in the EMCS Phase 4, FESS documentation will be replaced by the ARIS BPMs, thus making any references in all DDNEA documents and appendixes to the existing FESS document obsolete.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], all references to the existing FESS documents in the DDNEA documents must be replaced, since the FESS documentation will no longer be valid in EMCS Phase 4. In detail, the list of updates that shall be performed are detailed in the attached [Annex](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-300_–). It shall be clarified that the list included in the annex aims to be exhaustive. However, in any case, any reference to FESS appendices in the BPMs will have to be adjusted accordingly. | | | Impact assessment | | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | | If the changes are not implemented, the DDNEA documentation will be misaligned as far as references to the FESS documentation are concerned. | | Risk assessment | | This RFC entails no business continuity risk since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | | The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-267; * **Children RFCs:** CSMISE-xxx, SEED-xxx**-;** * **Other RFCs: -.** | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-301 – Deprecation of the IE820 message

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-301 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Incompliance with specification | | Incidents | IM375589 | | Known Error | KE19885 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/05/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The present RFC incorporates the necessary changes in order to align the DDNEA specifications with the changes proposed for FESS by RFC FESS-268.  More specifically, the FESS-268 RFC proposes the phasing-out of the IE820 message, due to the low usage of the “Access to the history of movements” functionality. The necessary updates need to take place in the DDNEA specifications, so that the deprecation of the IE820 message is done correctly.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   1. DDNEA Main Document:    * From section III.I.12 “Download of an e-AD (UC3.31)” the first paragraph will be reworded to remove references to the “Request for history information” and will become:   *“This use case describes the message exchange protocol for requesting to download an e-AD. It describes the case where the e-AD is available on-line in which case the MSA of Dispatch responds with a data packaging message (IE934: C\_PAC\_DAT) that includes all business messages comprising the movement history.”.*   * + From section III.I.12.2 “Download of an e-AD failed” the following phrase shall be deleted “*When deemed necessary a MSA may request archived/historical data to be retrieved by following the scenarios described in IV.III.1 Request for history information”.*   + From section III.I.13 “General query to retrieve an e-AD (UC3.32)” the following phrase shall be removed: *“If the e-AD is archived and the MSA Official still wants to retrieve this e-AD, then Section IV.III.1 “Request for history information” that includes use case UC3.29 should be considered.”.*   + Sub-Section IV.III “Access to the history of movements” shall be removed.   + References to the IE820 message shall be removed from the following parts of DDNEA Section X “Transport of messages via CCN/CSI”:     - From X.I.2.2.5 “Encoding the CSIDD for EMCS”, the entry of IE820 History Results will be removed from Table 45: “MsgTypId used for an Information Exchange of EMCS”.     - From X.I.3 “Environment”, the entry of IE820 History Results will be removed from Table 50: “Information Exchanges exchanged via the ‘Core flow’ queue”.     - From X.I.5 “Configuration”’:       * In X.I.5.3.1.4 “ccnMessageId”, the entry “CD820A-MSG.emcs” will be removed       * In X.I.5.3.2 “Message configuration procedure for EMCS” the following will be removed from Table 59: “IDL definition of CCN messages for EMCS”   interface CD820A-MSG.emcs  {  typedef byte RawBuffer ;  }   1. Appendix D: Technical Message Structure:    * The message IE820 - HISTORY RESULTS shall be removed.    * The <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group with all included data items will be removed from the IE721 message, as shown below:   IE721 - ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION COMMON REQUEST (C\_COO\_SUB)   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE | 1x | R |  | | ---HEADER | 1x | R |  | | ---FOLLOW UP | 1x | R |  | | ---(ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION) REQUEST | 1x | D | C055 | | ------REQUEST REASON | 99x | R |  | | ---------RISK ASSESSMENT REFERENCE | 99x | O |  | | ------ARC LIST | 99x | O |  | | ------(PERSON) TRADER | 99x | O |  | | ------SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS | 9x | O |  | | ------ACTIONS REQUESTED | 99x | O |  | | ~~---HISTORY REQUEST~~ | ~~1x~~ | ~~D~~ | ~~C056~~ | | ---CONTACT | 1x | O |  |  * + Condition C056 shall be deleted, as it is applied only to the <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group in messages IE721 and IE820.   + Condition C035 shall be deleted as it is applied only to the “Scope Date” Data Item, which along with the <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group in message IE721 and message IE820, shall be deleted.   + The description of rule R213 will be reworded from *“A Control Report IE717 exists in the system (including the case that it is encapsulated in a received IE934/IE820) having the same <Control Report Reference>with that of the submitted message. In addition if the ARC is provided in the submitted message then it coincides with the ARC of the referenced Control Report IE717”,* to   *“A Control Report IE717 exists in the system (including the case that it is encapsulated in a received IE934) having the same <Control Report Reference>with that of the submitted message. In addition if the ARC is provided in the submitted message then it coincides with the ARC of the referenced Control Report IE717”.*   * + The description of Technical Rule TR9120 will be reworded from *“The value of this field shall be ‘1’ in case a Status Synchronisation Request is requested. The value of this attribute shall be ‘2’ in case a Movement History Request is requested. If it is not used a Status Request/Response will be performed”,* to   *“The value of this field shall be ‘1’ in case a Status Synchronisation Request is requested. If it is not used a Status Request/Response will be performed”.*  Note: in alignment to the aforementioned changes in Appendix D, the following Appendices will be updated accordingly: Appendix A: Message Scope, Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Table, Appendix E: XML Mapping, Appendix F: Data Groups & Transaction Hierarchy, Appendix G: Data Items, Appendix K: Rules and Conditions   1. Appendix B: Codelists:    * In Technical Codelist TC86 - “Answer Message Type”, the description of code ‘2’ will be updated from ‘History answer message’ to ‘(reserved)’In Technical Codelist TC90 - “ACO Request Type”, the description of code ‘2’ will be updated from ‘Request for history’ to ‘(reserved)’    * In Technical Codelist TC93 - “ACO Reminder Message Type” , the description of code ‘2’ will be updated from ‘History results reminder message’ to ‘(reserved)’    * The Technical Codelist TC91 – “History Request Scope Type” will be deleted 2. Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)    * The "HistoryRequestType" complex type shall be deleted from the ie721.xsd:   *“…*  *~~<xs:complexType name="HistoryRequestType">~~*  *~~<xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:documentation>~~*  *~~<doc:description value="HISTORY REQUEST" />~~*  *~~</xs:documentation>~~*  *~~</xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:sequence>~~*  *~~<xs:element name="AdministrativeReferenceCode" type="emcs:AdministrativeReferenceCodeType" />~~*  *~~<xs:element name="HistoryRequestScopeType" type="tcl:HistoryRequestScopeType" />~~*  *~~<xs:element name="ScopeDate" type="emcs:DateType" minOccurs="0" />~~*  *~~<xs:element name="HistoryRequestReason" type="ie:LSDHistoryRequestReasonType" />~~*  *~~</xs:sequence>~~*  *~~</xs:complexType>”~~*  *…”*   * + The ie820.xsd will be removed   + The following updates will take place in tcl.xsd:     - TC86 will be updated as follows:   *“…*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<!--===== Answer Message Type =====-->*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *…..*  *<xs:enumeration value="2">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *</xs:restriction>*  *</xs:simpleType>*  *…”*   * + - TC90 will be updated as follows:   *“…*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<!--===== ACO Request Type=====-->*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *…..*  *<xs:enumeration value="2">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *</xs:restriction>*  *</xs:simpleType>*  *…”*   * + - TC93 will be updated as follows:   *“…*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<!--===== ACO Reminder Message Type=====-->*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *…..*  *<xs:enumeration value="2">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *</xs:restriction>*  *</xs:simpleType>*  *…”*   * + - TC91 will be deleted:   *“…*  *~~<!--=========================================-->~~*  *~~<!--===== History Request Scope Type =====-->~~*  *~~<!--=========================================-->~~*  *~~<xs:simpleType name="HistoryRequestScopeType">~~*  *~~<xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:documentation>History Request Scope Type</xs:documentation>~~*  *~~</xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:restriction base="xs:nonNegativeInteger">~~*  *~~<xs:enumeration value="1">~~*  *~~<xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:documentation>Applicable data at a given date set by the &lt;Scope Date&gt;</xs:documentation>~~*  *~~</xs:annotation>~~*  *~~</xs:enumeration>~~*  *~~<xs:enumeration value="2">~~*  *~~<xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:documentation>History of data since a given date set by the &lt;Scope Date&gt;</xs:documentation>~~*  *~~</xs:annotation>~~*  *~~</xs:enumeration>~~*  *~~<xs:enumeration value="3">~~*  *~~<xs:annotation>~~*  *~~<xs:documentation>Complete history of data</xs:documentation>~~*  *~~</xs:annotation>~~*  *~~</xs:enumeration>~~*  *~~</xs:restriction>~~*  *~~</xs:simpleType>~~*  *…”* | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (Low); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (High).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-268 RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level regarding the removal of the <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group in the IE721 message and the deprecation of the IE820 message. Concerning the .xsd changes, it is considered that they pose no impact on business continuity, thus, this RFC can be deployed in a Migration period, providing that sending applications which have not implemented this RFC, do not request for history information from receiving applications that are aligned to Phase 4 regarding this RFC.  More specifically:   * Assuming that the sending application has implemented the change whereas the receiving application has not, the IE721 message that will be sent will not contain the Data Group <HISTORY REQUEST>. The received message will be validated successfully by the receiving application since the <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group is not currently a Required one; * Assuming that the receiving application has implemented the change whereas the sending application has not, in case an IE721 message is sent containing the <HISTORY REQUEST> Data Group, this will not be validated successfully by the receiving application. For this scenario, a transformation solution is not proposed, on the basis that the History Request functionality has a very low usage volume (i.e. 1 registered History Request case in 2019). It proposed that the sending applications which will not be aligned to this RFC, shall not request for history information from receiving applications that have implemented this RFC for Phase 4. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-268; * **Children RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx, CTP-P4-xxx, CSMISE-xxx, SEED-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-302 – Handling of Timers for manually closed movements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-302 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM377465 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 21/05/2020 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  The present RFC incorporates the necessary changes in order to align the DDNEA specifications with the changes proposed for FESS by RFC FESS-269.  More specifically, it describes the necessary updates in the DDNEA documentation so that the handling of timers for manually closed movements is clearly illustrated.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA, Main Document:  In sub-section “IV.I.4.1 Manual Closing is initiated by an Excise Officer of MSA Dispatch”, the following paragraph:  *“The MSA dispatch application after validating the received message structure, registers the manual closure and the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to ‘e-AD Manually Closed’. Additionally, the MSA dispatch application transfers the manual closure response message (IE881: C\_MNC\_RES), including the status of the movement (i.e. e-AD Manually Closed) to the MSA destination application and notifies the requesting Excise Officer and the relevant Consignor.”*  will be updated as follows:  *“The MSA dispatch application after validating the received message structure, registers the manual closure and the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to ‘e-AD Manually Closed’. Additionally, the MSA dispatch application transfers the manual closure response message (IE881: C\_MNC\_RES), including the status of the movement (i.e. e-AD Manually Closed) to the MSA destination application and notifies the requesting Excise Officer and the relevant Consignor.* ***If ~~any timers associated with the manually closed movement~~ TIM\_EAD, TIM\_FDF and TIM\_CHS have already expired at the limit date, the MSA dispatch application resets their flag that has been raised locally at the expiration time. If any timers associated with the manually closed movement are still running, the MSA dispatch application stops them****”.*  In sub-section “IV.I.4.2 Manual Closing is initiated by an Excise Officer of MSA Dispatch”, the following paragraph:  *“Upon successful validation, the MSA destination application transfers the manual closure request to the MSA dispatch application which in turn, after validating the received message structure, registers the manual closure and the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to ‘e-AD Manually Closed’.”*  will be updated as follows:  *“Upon successful validation, the MSA destination application transfers the manual closure request to the MSA dispatch application which in turn, after validating the received message structure, registers the manual closure and the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to ‘e-AD Manually Closed’.* ***If ~~any timers associated with the manually closed movement~~ TIM\_EAD, TIM\_FDF and TIM\_CHS have already expired at the limit date, the MSA dispatch application resets their flag that has been raised locally at the expiration time. If any timers associated with the manually closed movement are still running, the MSA dispatch application stops them****”.*  Additionally, the Time Sequence Diagrams (TSD) of ‘Manual closure initiated by an Excise Officer of MSA Dispatch’ and ‘Manual closure initiated by an Excise Officer of MSA Destination’ will be updated to include a ‘Stop Running Timers’ step associated to ‘MSA Dispatch Application’ actor, in alignment with other processes described in the DDNEA. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Low). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-269 RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns documentation updates of the DDNEA document, in relation to the handling of timers for manually closed movements.  It should be highlighted that at a national administration level, even in cases where the TIM\_EAD would expire for a movement that is actually manually closed, then according to the DDNEA specifications, an automatic Status Request/Response should be triggered by the MSA dispatch application to examine why the TIM\_EAD timer expired; prior to the MSA of Dispatch proceeding with further actions, such as the sending of an IE802 message. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-269; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-303 – Modification of figures in DDNEA “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” section

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-303 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM369729 | | Known Error | KE19760 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 09/04/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  During the EMCS Phase 3.4 CT Campaign, it was proven confusing for NAs to refer to Figure 254 in DDNEA v2.02 in order to understand the CCN/CSI infrastructure and, more specifically, the role of their national queues and gateways within it. Figure 254 should be modified to represent conformance testing with CTA in a more accurate way. Moreover, in order to keep a unified format among figures under the “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” section of DDNEA v2.02, also the Figures 249-252 should be modified. Figure 253 should be removed as it refers to the TA application.  In addition, considering that the text of the “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” section refers to the figures that should be modified, this textual description should also be modified.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * Main document: Section “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview”   The textual description and Figures of the DDNEA section “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” should be modified. A detailed description of the changes in DDNEA Section X.I.3.3 is described in the accompanying [Annex](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-303_–). | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not represent the infrastructure of the operational and conformance environment in a comprehensible way. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risk since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-304 – Correction in DDNEA “III.VI.2.3.4 e-AD Manual Closure and the e-AD is under the 'Accepted' state at the MSA of Destination” section

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-304 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM368753, IM371663 | | Known Error | KE19734 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 24/03/2020 | | Requester | MSA-NL | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  Based on an observation by MSA-NL, the “III.VI.2.3.4 e-AD Manual Closure and the e-AD is under the 'Accepted' state at the MSA of Destination” section of DDNEA v2.02 should be updated by taking into consideration that, for manual closures from Phase 3.4 onwards, the message IE905 has been replaced by the newly introduced message IE881.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * Main document: Section “III.VI.2.3.4 e-AD Manual Closure and the e-AD is under the 'Accepted' state at the MSA of Destination”   The message IE905, when used for manual closure, will be replaced by the message IE881. The figures for DDNEA Section III.VI.2.3.4 will also be updated accordingly.  A detailed description of the changes in DDNEA Section III.VI.2.3.4 is described in the accompanying [Annex](#_Annex:_DDNEA-P4-304_–). | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the aforementioned section of the DDNEA main document will not be correctly updated with the introduction of the IE881 message which replaced the previously used IE905 message. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risk since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | There is no reference to other RFCs. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:**   + **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | EMCS CAB #191 on 26/05/2020 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v2.04 | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

#### DDNEA-P4-305 – SEED compliance with GDPR/Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RFC Information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-305 | | RFC status | Accepted | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | N/A | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/05/2020 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem Statement**  As described in the parent FESS-270 RFC, in the current version of SEED, there is no functionality to support a physical deletion of Economic Operators’ data. Any such request from a National Administration could only be supported through the execution of SQL scripts in the database directly. Instead, only a ‘logical’ deletion is provided with the ‘invalidation’ action, which is then disseminated to all Member States (i.e. the ones registered to receive SEED disseminations).  In order to comply with the GDPR requirements, SEED must be updated in order to allow National Administrations to delete Economic Operators data from SEED under legitimate conditions.  **Proposed Solution**  As per the analysis presented in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed:   * DDNEA Main document   The following clarifications will be added in section ‘V.I.3.1.2 Dissemination of SEED data (UC1.14)’:  “…  After receiving this message, SEED performs a formal validation in connection with pre-existing information.  In particular:  Validate message against the applicable DDNEA rules and conditions;  Validate that the entities are created/updated/invalidated**/deleted** only by the owner MSA;  Validate relationships between dates. The start date of an excise authorisation must precede the date when the authorisation expires. The activation date should be equal to or greater than the modification date. The end date of an excise authorisation can be left unspecified (‘until further notice’);  **In case of deletions, validate that the entities are deleted in alignment to the agreed ‘terms of collaboration’ for deletion of SEED records:**  **The delete operation is related to an economic operator who is not involved in any movement;**  **OR**  **The delete operation is related to an economic operator who is not involved in an open movement and;**  **the activation date of the ‘delete’ operation must be at least five years after the end of the calendar year of the start of any movement (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD) the economic operator is involved in.**  **It shall be noted that in alignment with the other existing operations, multiple delete operations may also be included in the same IE713 message, e.g. a delete operation for an ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’, together with the corresponding delete operations for its tax warehouses. After the successful processing of the IE713 message and its validation against the defined ‘terms of collaboration’ by central SEED, then this ‘Delete’ operation will be disseminated to other Member States, where as per the existing process, Member States are committed to use the state of information received back from the Common Domain to update their National SEED register. Specifically, for 'Delete' operations, it shall be clarified that all occurrences of the corresponding SEED records should be deleted, including the disseminated IE713 message and the corresponding 'Delete' operations. It shall also be noted that no further operations in relation to GDPR on corresponding e-AD/e-SAD(s) are proposed to be executed, e.g. deletion of other attributes of an e-AD/e-SAD. However, it shall be noted that due to the deletion of specific SEED data, it is possible that errors may occur in cases of information exchange over the common domain on any movement the deleted SEED authorisation is used in, due to the fact that SEED authorisations are being checked in common domain messages (e.g.  <Trader Excise Number> in the IE821 message).**   * Appendix B: CODELISTS   A new codelist value shall be added in ‘TC24 Modification Type’ as highlighted below:   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | C | Create |  | | I | Invalidate |  | | U | Update |  | | ***D*** | ***Delete*** |  |  * Appendix J: BUSINESS RULES   A new business rule ‘BRxxx’ will be with the following details:  *BR ID:* BRxxx    *BR Category:* SEED – Registration Data    *BR Description:*  It is obligatory that the delete operation must be related to an economic operator who is not involved in any movement or who is not involved in an open movement and that the activation date of the ‘delete’ operation ‘must be at least five years after the end of the calendar year of the start of any movement (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD) the economic operator is involved in.    *FESS Validation Rule:*  *•* If a ‘delete’ operation is submitted, then this should be related to:   * An economic operator who is not involved in any movement;   OR   * An economic operator not involved to any open movement and; * An economic operator involved in movements, but the activation date of the deletion is at least five years from the end of the calendar year in which the corresponding movement began (i.e. date and time of validation of the e-AD/e-SAD).     *IE:* IE713  *Data Item:* ACTION.Operation  *Optionality:* Mandatory  *Comments:* N/A   * Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE   The description of ‘R007’ should be updated as per below (highlighted in bold/italics):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | R007 | The IE consists of top level Data Groups. Each top level Data Group has its own Data Group ACTION which attributes apply to the top level Data Group and its subsequent sub Data Groups.  The sender of the IE will always (in case of Create, Update, Invalidate ***and Delete***) send all values of the occurrence.  The <Operation> attribute is used to indicate what action is applied to the occurrence in the IE. Its value is: ‘C’ (create), ‘U’ (update), ‘I’(Invalidate), ***‘D’ (delete)***.  The <Activation date> indicates when the operation will become applicable for the specific occurrence. |   Additionally, three new rules will be introduced to maintain the integrity of SEED data with the following description:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Rule** | **Description** | | ~~Rxx1~~  R267 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Tax Warehouse’ records, the deleted ‘tax warehouse’ must not be linked to an ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’. | | ~~Rxx2~~  R268 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ records, the deleted ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ must not be the sole keeper of a tax warehouse, i.e. the deletion of the ‘Authorised Warehouse Keeper’ must not result to an ‘orphan’ tax warehouse. | | ~~Rxx3~~  R269 | For ‘delete’ operations of ‘Registered Consignors’ or ‘Authorised Warehouse Keepers’, there should be no Temporary Registered Consignees associated to the deleted economic operators.  Similarly, for ‘delete’ operations of ‘Certified Consignors’ or ‘Certified Consignees’, there should be no ‘Temporary Certified Consignees’ or ‘Temporary Certified Consignors’ respectively associated to the deleted economic operators. |   The newly created business rule ‘BRxxx’ and rules ‘Rxx1’, ‘Rxx2’ and ‘Rxx3’ will be associated to the <Operation> data item of the IE713 message, as shown below: | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium); * CTP for SEEDv1 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (High); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (High). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with FESS regarding the introduction of a ‘Delete’ operation for SEED, allowing National Administrations to request the deletion of economic operators’ data, in order to comply with GDPR rules. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns a change in the tcl.xsd related to the insertion of value ‘D = Delete’ in TC24 as well as an update in the national SEED applications, so that economic operators’ data could be deleted.  If an MSA has deployed this RFC in production, the corresponding IE713.xml that will be generated will be validated successfully by Central SEED, since the updates introduced by the specific RFC will already be implemented in Central SEED at Mm (i.e. at the start of the Migration Period). It shall be clarified that central SEED is capable of supporting two phases in parallel, thus central SEED can communicate to each Member State according to the phase each Member State is on. However, in this case, a specific process shall be in place, allowing forerunners to submit ‘delete’ operations during the Phase 4 migration period, but also avoiding de-synchronisation issues between central and national SEED applications, as a result of submitted ‘delete’ operations. In details, if a forerunner submits an IE713 including deletions then:   1. Central SEED will disseminate the deletion only to Phase 4 MSAs; 2. Central SEED will exclude deletions from disseminations to Phase 3.4 MSAs; 3. Central SEED will extract a list of the deletion entries and forward them to a -configurable- CCN Mail 3 functional mailbox (e.g. ITSM TES); 4. An SMT incident will be raised (i.e. by ITSM TES) to inform Phase 3.4 MSAs about the deletions; 5. Based on the raised incident, Phase 3.4 MSAs would need to synchronise their national SEED, for example by:    1. Requesting an extraction to compare central SEED with national SEED to identify differences (i.e. deleted data) and then aligning their national SEED;    2. Requesting an extraction and then effectively dropping and re-building national SEED based on the extraction;    3. Running ad-hoc scripts to delete the corresponding entries (i.e. the ones communicated via SMT).   Therefore, it is considered that based on the described process, the aforementioned change can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks.  *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC do not affect the External Domain, since the IE713 message is not exchanged over the ED.* | | Deployment approach | Taking into account the process to be followed during the migration period of EMCS Phase 4, the RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-270; * **Children RFCs:** SEED-162, CTP-P4-xxx; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | N/A | |
| **Approval Process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | CAB recommendation | * **Category of the Change: Review;** * **Approval process:** * **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB.** | | ECWP position | N/A | | Authorisation date and process | Written approval procedure via e-mail on 30/06/2020. | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | TBD | | Release date | 13/02/2023 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | TBD | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | N/A | | Review results | N/A | |

# Annexes

## Annex: FESS-267 – Remove references to FESS appendices



## Annex: DDNEA-P4-299 – Computerisation of Duty Paid B2B

  

## Annex: DDNEA-P4-300 – Remove references to FESS appendices



## Annex: DDNEA-P4-303 – Modification of figures in DDNEA “X.I.3.3 Queues usage Overview” section



## Annex: DDNEA-P4-304 – Correction in DDNEA “III.VI.2.3.4 e-AD Manual Closure and the e-AD is under the 'Accepted' state at the MSA of Destination” section



1. Action: I=Insert R=Replace [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The politically agreed compromise text is available at <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13634-2019-INIT/en/pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The politically agreed compromise text is available at <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-13634-2019-INIT/en/pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It shall be highlighted that the updated ARC structure is defined in the updated rule ‘R030’. However, the corresponding pattern defined in ‘types.xsd’ will not be updated, ensuring backwards compatibility at the syntactic level, when validating any old ARCs. Therefore, based on the existing pattern defined in the ‘types.xsd’, field 20 of the ARC structure would still allow any alphanumeric character. However, based on the updated ARC structure defined in ‘R030’, value ‘P’ must be used for Duty Paid B2B movements, while any other alphanumeric value should be used for Duty Suspension movements. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The data items of IE801 to which C207 will be applied are: <Trader Name>, <Street Name>, <Postcode> and <City> under the <(PLACE OF DISPATCH) TRADER> data group. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The data item of IE801 to which C208 will be applied is: <Reference of Tax Warehouse> under the <(PLACE OF DISPATCH) TRADER> data group. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)