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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 4.2 corrective and evolutive release.

The EMCS Phase 4.2 corrective and evolutive release of FESS and of DDNEA, implements corrective and evolutive Request for Changes (RFCs) on the already agreed scope for changes that have been revealed during the central and national development activities and some documentation RFCs.

It shall be noted that the deployment of RFCs related to message exchanges between AES and EMCS Applications in the National Domain without any impact on the Common Domain (see Section 3.2) will take place as per each NA’s planning, whereas the deployment of all other RFCs (see Section 3.1) will take place as per the EMCS Master Plan [R06].

## Target audience

The target audience for this document includes:

* DG TAXUD IT and Business Units;
* National Administrations;
* Participating contractors, i.e. ITSM Operations, ITSM3-TES, Development and QAC.

## Scope

This document records the RFCs that are implemented in FESS and in DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 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].

From February 2024 to July 2024, six webinars took place to prepare the changes for Phase 4.2; three webinars only with NAs’ EMCS representatives invited and another three webinars also with NAs’ AES representatives invited and focusing on changes related to the AES-EMCS interface. Moreover, a Fiscalis workshop took place in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024, where NAs’ EMCS representatives were invited to discuss specific changes for Phase 4.2. Related presentations from these meetings can be found in [PICS](https://pics.ec.europa.eu/group/emcs-phase-42/files).

The Release Scope Document v1.00 was published to the Heads of Delegations to the Committee on Excise Duties. The deadline for comments was until 20/09/2024.

The RFCs are split into two Sections, whereby the Section 3.1 includes all RFCs that have to be deployed according to the EMCS Master Plan [R06] and the Section 3.2 lists the RFCs that can be deployed according to the national planning upon the readiness of the national AES and EMCS interface.

The submitted comments were discussed and agreed during the EMCS Phase 4.2 Webex meetings. The Release Scope Document v2.00 was created and the following color code is applied:

* Green font indicates the material that was added and red font & strike through stands for the removed text in comparison to the Release Scope Document v1.00;
* Inside the RFCs, the changes to be implemented on the existing text of the specifications (FESS and DDNEA) are highlighted in yellow, whereas the text of newly added scenarios is highlighted in green.

The full list of the RFCs that will be implemented in FESS and DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 corrective and evolutive release is the following.

1. **40 FESS RFCs:**

* FESS-307;
* FESS-309;
* FESS-310;
* FESS-311;
* FESS-312;
* FESS-313;
* FESS-314;
* FESS-315;
* FESS-316;
* FESS-317;
* FESS-318;
* FESS-319;
* FESS-320;
* FESS-321;
* FESS-322;
* FESS-323;
* FESS-324;
* FESS-325;
* FESS-326;
* FESS-327;
* FESS-328;
* FESS-329;
* FESS-330;
* FESS-331;
* FESS-332;
* FESS-333;
* FESS-334;
* FESS-335;
* FESS-337;
* FESS-338;
* FESS-339;
* FESS-341;
* FESS-342;
* FESS-343;
* FESS-345;
* FESS-346;
* FESS-347;
* FESS-348;
* FESS-349;
* FESS-350.

1. **28 DDNEA RFCs:**

* DDNEA-P4-359;
* DDNEA-P4-360;
* DDNEA-P4-361;
* DDNEA-P4-363;
* DDNEA-P4-364;
* DDNEA-P4-365;
* DDNEA-P4-366;
* DDNEA-P4-367;
* DDNEA-P4-368;
* DDNEA-P4-369;
* DDNEA-P4-370;
* DDNEA-P4-371;
* DDNEA-P4-372;
* DDNEA-P4-374;
* DDNEA-P4-375;
* DDNEA-P4-376;
* DDNEA-P4-378;
* DDNEA-P4-379;
* DDNEA-P4-380;
* DDNEA-P4-381;
* DDNEA-P4-383;
* DDNEA-P4-384;
* DDNEA-P4-385;
* DDNEA-P4-386;
* DDNEA-P4-387;
* DDNEA-P4-388;
* DDNEA-P4-389;
* DDNEA-P4-390.

## Applicability

This document is applicable to the previous versions of FESS and DDNEA for Phase 4, FESS v4.12 and DDNEA ~~v3.14~~v3.19.

## Structure

This document is organised as follows:

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

## Reference documents

The table below lists the documents that are referred to in the current document.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref.** | **Title** | **Originator** | **Version** | **Date** |
| R01 | Excise Glossary of Terms (GLT) | ITSM3-TES | 2.09 | 03/08/2016 |
| R02 | Functional Excise System Specifications (FESS) | SOFT-DEV | 4.12 | 01/03/2023 |
| R03 | Functional Excise System Specification (FESS) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations | ITSM3 TES | ~~7.28~~  7.29 | ~~31/07/2024~~  23/10/2024 |
| R04 | Design Document for National Excise Applications for EMCS Phase 4.2 (DDNEA for Phase 4.2) | SOFT-DEV | ~~3.14~~  3.19 | ~~22/05/2023~~  21/08/2024 |
| R05 | Design Document for National Excise Applications (DDNEA) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations | ITSM3-TES | ~~4.42~~  4.44 | ~~31/07/2024~~  23/10/2024 |
| R06 | EMCS Master Plan | DG TAXUD | 3.00 | 30/07/2021 |

Table 1: Reference documents

## Applicable documents

The table below lists the documents with which the current document must be compliant.

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

Table 2: 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** |
| --- | --- |
| AES | Automated Export System |
| ARC | AAD 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 |
| CS/MIS | Central Services – Management Information System |
| CS/MISE | Central Services – Management Information System for EMCS |
| 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 |
| EBP | Elementary Business Process |
| EcOp | Economic Operator |
| ECP | Excise Computerisation Project |
| ECS | Export Control System |
| ECWP | Excise Computerisation Working Party |
| ED | External Domain |
| EMCS | Excise Movement and Control System |
| EMCS CAB | EMCS Change Advisory Board |
| EOL | Excise Office List |
| EORI | Economic Operators Registration and Identification |
| FESS | Functional Excise System Specifications |
| GLT | Glossary of Terms |
| IE | Information Exchange |
| ITSM | Information Technology Service Management |
| ITSM TES | ITSM Trans-European Systems |
| LRN | Local Reference Number |
| MRN | Movement Reference Number |
| MS | Member State |
| MSA | Member State Administration |
| MVS | Movement Verification System |
| N/A | Not Applicable |
| ND | National Domain |
| NEA | National Excise Applications |
| QAC | Quality Assurance Contractor |
| RFC | Request for Change |
| RoR | Report of Receipt |
| SAD | Single Administrative Document |
| SEED | System for Exchange of Excise Data |
| STD | State Transition Diagram |
| TBD | To Be Determined |
| XML | eXtensible Mark-up Language |
| XSD | Directory With XML Schemas |

Table 3: Abbreviations and acronyms

## Definitions

Readers are referred 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 4.2

| **Release** | **RFC** | **RFC Label** | **Category of Change** | **Status** | **Release Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| v4.20 | FESS-307 | Change in the multiplicity of data groups in the export-related IEs so that they are aligned with the AES/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-309 | Update in the <Invalidation Date> data item of IE836/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-310 | Updates in relation to Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-311 | Update of business codelist CL Packaging Codes/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-312 | Removal of NA-NL from CL National Administration - Degree Plato/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-313 | Missing state transition from Figure 117: STD at Destination - Export Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1)/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-314 | Wording error in condition C051/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-315 | Update the wording of EMCS conditions/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-316 | Change the wording of condition C213/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-317 | Local clearance, removal of Business rules: BR036, BR037, BR038, BR039, BR040/~~Rev1~~Rev2 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-318 | Updates in relation to the Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage (ABV)/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-319 | Change of Destination with unchanged Consignee and changed Destination Type Code/~~Rev1~~Rev2 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-320 | Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832)/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-321 | Rejection of the Export Declaration message following a negative cross-check result (IE537)/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-322 | Export Declaration amendment; update of ARC(s)/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-323 | Addition of the new data item 'Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG' in the IE815/IE801 messages/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-324 | Update of rules R271 – R276 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-325 | Removal of ‘SAD’ from Common Specifications/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-326 | Minor Updates in the description of EMCS Codelists/~~Rev1~~Rev2 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-327 | Change the wording in FESS documentation | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-328 | Update the description of IE839 in TC60 and TC64 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-329 | Attach the business codelist BC11 to additional data item | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-330 | Inclusion of CN Code ‘24041100’ in the business codelist BC37/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-331 | Update format of the ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code’ data item | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-332 | Align the structure of IEs in FESS with DDNEA Appendix D | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-333 | Update of the multiplicity of the IE839 data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS from 99x to 999x | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-334 | Update of the wording of C147 in IE839 to use the term "Export Declaration Information" | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-335 | Change the Condition C066 to a Rule/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-337 | Update of the IE836 message for the removal of the GOODS SHIPMENT data group | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-338 | Update of C212 for an IE839 with Rejection Reason Code = ‘Negative Cross-check result’ that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-339 | Update of TC87 Business Process Code for registering the unavailability in CS/MIS2 and renaming of Data Items in IE770/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-341 | Filling of the Data Group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER in the IE829, IE839 messages | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-342 | Moving the Data Item "Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export" under the Data Group "EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE" of IE829/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-343 | New business validation on the "Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item of the IE818 - Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-345 | Validations regarding the usage of temporary authorisations in e-AD/e-SAD/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-346 | Use of IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch for a removed ARC from the Export Declaration Amendment | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-347 | Update of SEED RAD and RADM non-functional requirements in alignment with overall TAXUD targets/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-348 | Additional validation for business consistency between the UBR cross-check result information and the Diagnosis code data items of the IE839 message/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-349 | Deprecation of MVS messages | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |
| v4.20 | FESS-350 | Inclusion of the IE839 message in the scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration/Rev1 | Review | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | Q1/2025 |

Table 4: Overview of FESS Changes for this Release

## Changes related to the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2

| **Release** | **RFC** | **RFC Label** | **Category of Change** | **Status** | **Release Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-359 | Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832)/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-360 | Rejection of the Export Declaration message following a negative cross-check result (IE537)/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-361 | Export Declaration amendment; update of ARC(s)/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-363 | Update of rules R271 – R76 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-364 | Removal of ‘SAD’ from Common Specifications | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-365 | Minor Updates in the description of EMCS Codelists/~~Rev1~~Rev2 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-366 | Update the description of IE839 in TC60 and TC64 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-367 | Attach the business codelist BC11 to additional data item | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-368 | Update format of the ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code’ data item | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-369 | Update of the multiplicity of the IE839 data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS from 99x to 999x | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-370 | Update of the wording of C147 in IE839 to use the term "Export Declaration Information" | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-371 | Update of the wording of the technical rule TR0104/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-372 | Change the Condition C066 to a Rule/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-374 | Implementation of the control messages in the exchanges between EMCS and AES | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-375 | Update of C212 for an IE839 with Rejection Reason Code = ‘Negative Cross-check result’ that includes only positively cross-checked e-Ads | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-376 | Update of TC87 Business Process Code for registering the unavailability in CS/MIS2 and renaming of Data Items in IE770/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-378 | Filling of the Data Group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER in the IE829, IE839 messages/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-379 | Update of the DDNEA XSDs regarding the multiplicity defined as maxOccurs="unbounded"/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-380 | Moving the Data Item "Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export" under the Data Group "EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE" of IE829/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-381 | New business validation on the "Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item of the IE818 -Report of Receipt | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-383 | Validation of temporary certified consignee information at dispatch in e-SAD/e-AD/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-384 | Use of IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch for a removed ARC from the Export Declaration Amendment | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-385 | Additional validation for business consistency between the UBR cross-check result information and the Diagnosis code data items of the IE839 message/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-386 | Update of the IE836 message for the removal of the GOODS SHIPMENT data group | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-387 | Deprecation of MVS messages | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-388 | Misalignment in the structure of the IE537 and IE839 messages | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-389 | Inclusion of the IE839 message in the scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration/Rev1 | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |
| ~~v3.20~~  v3.25 | DDNEA-P4-390 | Figure 5: Information Exchange Map of EMCS Phase 4 – Figure update according to the current phase | Review | Accepted | Q1/2025 |

Table 5: Overview of DDNEA Changes for this Release

# Change Requests

## Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2

### FESS Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2

#### FESS–307 – Change in the multiplicity of data groups in the export-related IEs so that they are aligned with the AES/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-307 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM590537 | | Known Error | KE23380 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 21/04/2023 | | Requester | NA-LV | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  The current RFC describes the changes that have to be done in the FESS documentation. In the former, it is described that in three export-related IEs, namely ‘Notification of Accepted Export’ (IE829), ‘Export Declaration Invalidation Notification to MSA of Dispatch/Consignor’ (IE836) and ‘Customs Rejection of e-AD’ (IE839), the multiplicity of certain data groups concerning e-ADs as previous documents for Export declarations was erroneously 99x. The multiplicity shall be correctly updated to 999x, to be in alignment with the fact that the AES message ‘Export Declaration’ (IE515) can concern up to 999x e-ADs, as previous documents.  More specifically, for the ‘Notification of Accepted Export’ (IE829) message, it shall be modified so that up to 999x e-ADs can be depicted with the receipt of the related AES-P1 message ‘Export Declaration Acceptance notification to MSA of Export’ (IE539) or ‘Release for Export Notification to MSA of Export’ (IE535).  For the ‘Customs Rejection of e-AD’ (IE839) message, it shall be modified so that up to 999x e-ADs can be depicted with the receipt of the related AES-P1 message ‘e-AD Negative Cross-check Result’ (IE537) or the ‘Non-release for Export Notification to MSA of Export’ (IE534).  For the ‘Export Declaration Invalidation Notification to MSA of Dispatch/Consignor’ (IE836) it shall be modified so that up to 999x e-ADs can be depicted with the receipt of the related AES-P1 message ‘Invalidation notification of MSA of Export’ (IE536).  This analysis has found inconsistency in IE536 as well for which the AES project team has been informed.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis described in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed in the FESS documentation:   * The data set for IE829 - NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT (C\_EXP\_NOT) shall be changed as follows:   **FROM**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---HEADER 1x R  ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER 1x R  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD 99x R  ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE 1x O  ---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE 1x R  **TO**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---HEADER 1x R  ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER 1x R  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD 999x R  ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE 1x O  ---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE 1x R   * The data set for IE836 “Export Declaration Invalidation Notification to MSA of Dispatch/Consignor” (C\_INV\_DIS) shall be updated as follows:   **FROM**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT 99x R  ------EXPORT OPERATION 1x R  ------CUSTOMS OFFICE OF EXPORT 1x R  ------MSA OF EXPORT 1x R  ------GOODS SHIPMENT 1x R  ---------PREVIOUS DOCUMENT 99x O  **TO**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT 999x R  ------EXPORT OPERATION 1x R  ------CUSTOMS OFFICE OF EXPORT 1x R  ------MSA OF EXPORT 1x R  ------GOODS SHIPMENT 1x R  ---------PREVIOUS DOCUMENT 999x O   * The data set for IE839 “Customs Rejection of e-AD” (C\_CUS\_REJ) shall be changed as follows:   **FROM**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---HEADER 1x R  ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER 1x R  ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE 1x O  ---REJECTION 1x R  ---EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION 1x D C117  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99x D C212  ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  ------------COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT 1x D C213  ------------NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT 1x D C213  ------N\_NON\_DES 1x D C212  ---C\_EAD\_VAL 99x D C212  ---N\_EAD\_SUB 1x D C212  **TO**  MESSAGE 1x R  ---HEADER 1x R  ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER 1x R  ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE 1x O  ---REJECTION 1x R  ---EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION 1x D C117  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99x D C212  ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  ------------COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT 1x D C213  ------------NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT 1x D C213  ------N\_NON\_DES 1x D C212  ---C\_EAD\_VAL 999x D C212  ---N\_EAD\_SUB 1x D C212 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium because of the development stage of EMCS Phase 4.1); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the change is not implemented the messages IE829, IE836 and IE839 will not be in alignment with the AES messages, which may concern up to 999x e-ADs as previous documents for an Export declaration. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23380 is directly applicable in EMCS Phase 4.1. This RFC entails only an update in FESS/BPMs specification. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23380. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-345; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-053, TRP-P4-077. | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[2]](#footnote-3) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-309 – Update in the <Invalidation Date> data item of IE836/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-309 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM623659 | | Known Error | KE23805 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 04/09/2023 | | Requester | NA-HU | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As per NA-HU, there is a contradiction in the data item <Invalidation Date> of the IE836 message.  More specifically, the <Invalidation Date> refers to a date, but the data item currently has the format ‘an10’. In addition, the <Invalidation Date> data item is present in the IE836 message, which is generated based on the corresponding data item of the AES IE536 message, in which the respective <Invalidation Date> data item follows the YYYY-MM-DD pattern.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement] and to be in consistency with the specifications of EMCS, in which the related to date data items follow a certain format, class ‘Invalidation Date’ shall be updated as follows in the IE836 information exchange:  **FROM**  ------EXPORT OPERATION 1x R  MRN R an18  Invalidation date R an10  **TO**  ------EXPORT OPERATION 1x R  MRN R an18  Invalidation date R date | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium).   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 there shall be inconsistency in the format of the data item <Invalidation Date> of IE836. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23805 is directly applicable in EMCS Phase 4.1. This RFC entails only an update in FESS/BPMs specification. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23805. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:-;** * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-347; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-063, TRP-P4-089**.** | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[3]](#footnote-4) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-310 – Updates in relation to Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-310 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM632104 | | Known Error | KE23873 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/10/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  During the analysis of the issue IM620272 regarding how to fill the Data Item 'Diagnosis code' of IE839 – ‘Customs rejection of e-AD’ and in relation to the updates in the description of the condition C213 of IE839 resulting from IM612576, the codes of the codelist TC72 were re-assessed, and the following issues have been identified:   1. When in the IE839 message the UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result = ‘0’, AES reports back to EMCS “the case of a missing UBR”. AES does not explicitly distinguish whether the “missing UBR” corresponds to the case of Diagnosis Code 2: ‘Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD’, or Code 3: ‘No corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration’. Thus, Validation Result = ‘0’ could correspond to either of the codes; 2. Diagnosis Code ‘5’ is obsolete at that point of the flow when the IE839 message is sent, since at that step EMCS would have already provided the IE801 back to AES. When AES requests from EMCS for an e-AD that does not have destination type code ‘Export’, EMCS should respond negatively to such a request via the IE832 - E-AD REQUEST REJECTION message; 3. With the new wording of C213, it is possible to report discrepancies both in COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT, thus a new diagnosis code will be needed for this case too.   **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs, per corresponding numbered item in the [Problem Statement]:   * In relation to item [1] from the [Problem Statement]:   + In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code, the name of value ‘2’ shall be updated respectively from "Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD" to "Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD or no corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration";   + Ιn the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code, the name of value ‘3’ shall be updated respectively from "No corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration" to "(reserved)"; * In relation to item [2] from the [Problem Statement]:   + The following update shall be performed in the Excise BPMs, in the 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM folder:   The FESS specifications shall be enhanced with a clarification regarding the case when the e-AD requested from AES via IE532 does not have destination type code = Export. More specifically, the description of the Task “Task Identify if e-AD is available and at the correct state”, which is used in the Process L4-CORE-01-27-‘Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch same as the MSA of Export-Customs Formalities’ and Process L4-CORE-01-28-‘Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities’, will be updated to become: “The MSA identifies if the e-AD is available (that is, the ARC is correct and the destination type code of the e-AD is Export) and at the correct state”.   * + In addition, in the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code, the name of value ‘5’ shall be updated respectively from "The destination type code of the e-AD is not export" to ‘(reserved)’. * In relation to item [3] from the [Problem Statement]:   + In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC72 – Diagnosis Code, value ‘7’ - "Weight/mass do not match and CN codes do not match" shall be added. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (Medium).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then there shall not be a Diagnosis code available for the case of discrepancies reported in both COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT of the IE839 message. In addition, there shall not be available a corresponding Diagnosis code for the case of UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result = ‘0’. Lastly, there will not be in place an adequate validation in place for the case that AES requests from EMCS via the IE532 message for an e-AD that does not have destination type code = Export. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The Known Error KE23873 is directly applicable in EMCS Phase 4.1. This RFC entails only an update in FESS/BPMs documentation. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23873. This RFC is fixing only documentation issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-348; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-070, TRP-P4-096. | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[4]](#footnote-5) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-311 – Update of business codelist CL Packaging Codes/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-311 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM621170 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 19/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-CY | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  It was identified by NA-CY that there are some values missing from the business codelist BC17 – Packaging Codes. Consequently, the NEA of Cyprus rejected an IE801 message, sent by NA-PT, as out-of-sequence, due to the non-existence of the value “BW” in codelist BC17 – Packaging Codes. The values of said codelist are extracted from SEED and should be aligned with the corresponding ones originated from CS/RD2.  More specifically, the business codelist BC17 – Packaging Codes shall be updated in alignment with the codes of Annex VI of Recommendation No 21, adopted by the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business, as outlined in Regulation (EU) 2022/1636, ANNEX II, 8. PACKAGING CODES.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following values shall be added to the CL Packaging Codes (see also Annex 4.1):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 43 | Bag, super bulk | | 44 | Bag, polybag | | 1A | Drum, steel | | 1B | Drum, aluminium | | 1D | Drum, plywood | | 1F | Container, flexible | | 1G | Drum, fibre | | 1W | Drum, wooden | | 2C | Barrel, wooden | | 3A | Jerrican, steel | | 3H | Jerrican, plastic | | 4A | Box, steel | | 4B | Box, aluminium | | 4C | Box, natural wood | | 4D | Box, plywood | | 4F | Box, reconstituted wood | | 4G | Box, fibreboard | | 4H | Box, plastic | | 5H | Bag, woven plastic | | 5L | Bag, textile | | 5M | Bag, paper | | 6H | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle | | 6P | Composite packaging, glass receptacle | | 7A | Case, car | | 7B | Case, wooden | | 8A | Pallet, wooden | | 8B | Crate, wooden | | 8C | Bundle, wooden | | AA | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic | | AB | Receptacle, fibre | | AC | Receptacle, paper | | AD | Receptacle, wooden | | AF | Pallet, modular, collars 80cm \* 60cm | | AG | Pallet, shrinkwrapped | | AH | Pallet, 100cm \* 110cm | | AI | Clamshell | | AJ | Cone | | AL | Ball | | AV | Capsule | | B4 | Belt | | BM | Basin | | BW | Box, for liquids | | CD | Can, with handle and spout | | CM | Card | | CN | Container, not otherwise specified as transport equipment | | CQ | Cartridge | | CW | Cage, roll | | DA | Crate, multiple layer, plastic | | DB | Crate, multiple layer, wooden | | DC | Crate, multiple layer, cardboard | | DG | Cage, Commonwealth Handling Equipment Pool (CHEP) | | DH | Box, Commonwealth Handling Equipment Pool (CHEP), Eurobox | | DI | Drum, iron | | DK | Crate, bulk, cardboard | | DL | Crate, bulk, plastic | | DM | Crate, bulk, wooden | | DN | Dispenser | | DS | Tray, one layer no cover, plastic | | DT | Tray, one layer no cover, wooden | | DU | Tray, one layer no cover, polystyrene | | DV | Tray, one layer no cover, cardboard | | DW | Tray, two layers no cover, plastic tray | | DX | Tray, two layers no cover, wooden | | DY | Tray, two layers no cover, cardboard | | EC | Bag, plastic | | ED | Case, with pallet base | | EE | Case, with pallet base, wooden | | EF | Case, with pallet base, cardboard | | EG | Case, with pallet base, plastic | | EH | Case, with pallet base, metal | | EI | Case, isothermic | | FB | Flexibag | | FE | Flexitank | | FT | Foodtainer | | FW | Cart, flatbed | | FX | Bag, flexible container | | GL | Container, gallon | | GR | Receptacle, glass | | GU | Tray, containing horizontally stacked flat items | | GY | Bag, gunny | | HA | Basket, with handle, plastic | | HB | Basket, with handle, wooden | | HC | Basket, with handle, cardboard | | HN | Hanger | | IA | Package, display, wooden | | IB | Package, display, cardboard | | IC | Package, display, plastic | | ID | Package, display, metal | | IE | Package, show | | IF | Package, flow | | IG | Package, paper wrapped | | IH | Drum, plastic | | IK | Package, cardboard, with bottle grip-holes | | IL | Tray, rigid, lidded stackable (CEN TS 14482:2002) | | JB | Bag, jumbo | | KI | Kit | | LE | Luggage | | LT | Lot | | LU | Lug | | LV | Liftvan | | MA | Crate, metal | | ME | Container, metal | | JB | Bag, jumbo | | KI | Kit | | LE | Luggage | | LT | Lot | | LU | Lug | | LV | Liftvan | | MA | Crate, metal | | ME | Container, metal | | MR | Receptacle, metal | | MW | Receptacle, plastic wrapped | | NA | Not available | | NF | Unpacked or unpackaged, single unit | | NG | Unpacked or unpackaged, multiple units | | NU | Net, tube, plastic | | NV | Net, tube, textile | | O1 | Two sided cage on wheels with fixing strap | | O2 | Trolley | | O3 | Oneway pallet ISO 0 – ½ EURO Pallet | | O4 | Oneway pallet ISO 1 – 1/1 EURO Pallet | | O5 | Oneway pallet ISO 2 – 2/1 EURO Pallet | | O6 | Pallet with exceptional dimensions | | O7 | Wooden pallet 40 cm x 80 cm | | O8 | Plastic pallet SRS 60 cm x 80 cm | | O9 | Plastic pallet SRS 80 cm x 120 cm | | OA | Pallet, CHEP 40 cm x 60 cm | | OB | Pallet, CHEP 80 cm x 120 cm | | OC | Pallet, CHEP 100 cm x 120 cm | | OD | Pallet, AS 4068-1993 | | OE | Pallet, ISO T11 | | OF | Platform, unspecified weight or dimension | | OG | Pallet ISO 0 – ½ EURO Pallet | | OH | Pallet ISO 1 – 1/1 EURO Pallet | | OI | Pallet ISO 2 – 2/1 EURO Pallet | | OJ | ¼ EURO Pallet | | OK | Block | | OL | 1/8 EURO Pallet | | OM | Synthetic pallet ISO 1 | | ON | Synthetic pallet ISO 2 | | OP | Wholesaler pallet | | OQ | Pallet 80 X 100 cm | | OR | Pallet 60 X 100 cm | | OS | Oneway pallet | | OT | Octabin | | OU | Container, outer | | OV | Returnable pallet | | OW | Large bag, pallet sized | | OX | A wheeled pallet with raised rim (81 x 67 x 135) | | OY | A Wheeled pallet with raised rim (81 x 72 x 135) | | OZ | Wheeled pallet with raised rim (81 x 60 x 16) | | P1 | CHEP pallet 60 cm x 80 cm | | P2 | Pan | | P3 | LPR pallet 60 cm x 80 cm | | P4 | LPR pallet 80 cm x 120 cm | | PB | Pallet, box Combined open-ended box and pallet | | PD | Pallet, modular, collars 80cm \* 100cm | | PE | Pallet, modular, collars 80cm \* 120cm | | PF | Pen | | PJ | Punnet | | PP | Piece | | PR | Receptacle, plastic | | PV | Pipes, in bundle/bunch/truss | | QA | Drum, steel, non-removable head | | QB | Drum, steel, removable head | | QC | Drum, aluminium, non-removable head | | QD | Drum, aluminium, removable head | | QF | Drum, plastic, non-removable head | | QG | Drum, plastic, removable head | | QH | Barrel, wooden, bung type | | QJ | Barrel, wooden, removable head | | QC | Drum, aluminium, non-removable head | | QD | Drum, aluminium, removable head | | QF | Drum, plastic, non-removable head | | QG | Drum, plastic, removable head | | QP | Box, wooden, natural wood, ordinary | | QQ | Box, wooden, natural wood, with sift proof walls | | QR | Box, plastic, expanded | | QS | Box, plastic, solid | | RJ | Rack, clothing hanger | | RK | Rack | | SB | Slab | | SI | Skid | | SO | Spool | | SP | Sheet, plastic wrapping | | SS | Case, steel | | SV | Envelope, steel | | SX | Set | | SY | Sleeve | | T1 | Tablet | | TE | Tyre | | TG | Tank container, generic | | TI | Tierce | | TL | Tub, with lid | | TT | Bag, tote | | TV | Tube, with nozzle | | TW | Pallet, triwall | | UC | Uncaged | | UN | Unit | | VK | Vanpack | | VN | Vehicle | | VS | Bulk, scrap metal | | WA | Intermediate bulk container | | WC | Intermediate bulk container, steel | | WD | Intermediate bulk container, aluminium | | WF | Intermediate bulk container, metal | | WG | Intermediate bulk container, steel, pressurised > 10 kpa | | WH | Intermediate bulk container, aluminium, pressurised > 10 kpa | | WJ | Intermediate bulk container, metal, pressure 10 kpa | | WK | Intermediate bulk container, steel, liquid | | WL | Intermediate bulk container, aluminium, liquid | | WM | Intermediate bulk container, metal, liquid | | WN | Intermediate bulk container, woven plastic, without coat/liner | | WP | Intermediate bulk container, woven plastic, coated | | WQ | Intermediate bulk container, woven plastic, with liner | | WR | Intermediate bulk container, woven plastic, coated and liner | | WS | Intermediate bulk container, plastic film | | WT | Intermediate bulk container, textile without coat/liner | | WU | Intermediate bulk container, natural wood, with inner liner | | WV | Intermediate bulk container, textile, coated | | WW | Intermediate bulk container, textile, with liner | | WX | Intermediate bulk container, textile, coated and liner | | WY | Intermediate bulk container, plywood, with inner liner | | WZ | Intermediate bulk container, reconstituted wood, with inner liner | | XA | Bag, woven plastic, without inner coat/liner | | XB | Bag, woven plastic, sift proof | | XC | Bag, woven plastic, water resistant | | XD | Bag, plastics film | | XF | Bag, textile, without inner coat/liner | | XG | Bag, textile, sift proof | | XH | Bag, textile, water resistant | | XJ | Bag, paper, multi-wall | | XK | Bag, paper, multi-wall, water resistant | | YA | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in steel drum | | YB | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in steel crate box | | YC | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in aluminium drum | | YD | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in aluminium crate | | YF | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in wooden box | | YG | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in plywood drum | | YH | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in plywood box | | YJ | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in fibre drum | | YK | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in fibreboard box | | YL | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in plastic drum | | YM | Composite packaging, plastic receptacle in solid plastic box | | YN | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in steel drum | | YP | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in steel crate box | | YQ | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in aluminium drum | | YR | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in aluminium crate | | YS | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in wooden box | | YT | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in plywood drum | | YV | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in wickerwork hamper | | YW | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in fibre drum | | YX | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in fibreboard box | | YY | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in expandable plastic pack | | YZ | Composite packaging, glass receptacle in solid plastic pack | | ZA | Intermediate bulk container, paper, multi-wall | | ZB | Bag, large | | ZC | Intermediate bulk container, paper, multi-wall, water resistant | | ZD | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, with structural equipment, solids | | ZF | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, freestanding, solids | | ZG | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, with structural equipment, pressurised | | ZH | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, freestanding, pressurised | | ZJ | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, with structural equipment, liquids | | ZK | Intermediate bulk container, rigid plastic, freestanding, liquids | | ZL | Intermediate bulk container, composite, rigid plastic, solids | | ZM | Intermediate bulk container, composite, flexible plastic, solids | | ZN | Intermediate bulk container, composite, rigid plastic, pressurised | | ZP | Intermediate bulk container, composite, flexible plastic, pressurised | | ZQ | Intermediate bulk container, composite, rigid plastic, liquids | | ZR | Intermediate bulk container, composite, flexible plastic, liquids | | ZS | Intermediate bulk container, composite | | ZT | Intermediate bulk container, fibreboard | | ZU | Intermediate bulk container, flexible | | ZV | Intermediate bulk container, metal, other than steel | | ZW | Intermediate bulk container, natural wood | | ZX | Intermediate bulk container, plywood | | ZY | Intermediate bulk container, reconstituted wood | | ZZ | Mutually defined | | | 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 FESS will not be aligned with the changes that IE734 v3.1.0 has already introduced in production since 21/12/2023. Moreover, FESS will not be aligned with Annex II, 8. PACKAGING CODES of Regulation (EU) 2022/1636. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks. This RFC concerns only the documentary update of FESS that will be performed later, in the next FESS/BPMs release. The IE734 v3.1.0, which has been active in CA SEED since 21/12/2023, already includes this change. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the activation of IE734 v3.1.0 in CA SEED since 21/12/2023. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** IE734-053; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[5]](#footnote-6) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 21/12/2023 (activation date for business codelist BC17 – Packaging Codes update in the IE734 v3.1.0, which was deployed in Production on 20/12/2023) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-312 – Removal of NA-NL from CL National Administration – Degree Plato/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-312 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | N/A | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 13/11/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  Due to different taxation methods for beer, NAs tax beer either to Degree Plato or Alcoholic Strength by Volume In Percentage. In the case of the Netherlands, who taxes beer to Degree Plato, they will be taxing beer to Alcoholic Strength by Volume In Percentage as of 01/01/2024. This decision has been implemented in the national legislation. As a result, NA-NL shall be removed from respective codelist.  More specifically, the matrix model CL National Administration-Degree Plato shall be updated in alignment with the Regulation (EU) 2022/1636, ANNEX II, 13. NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION-DEGREE PLATO.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed to the matrix model CL National Administration-Degree Plato. The matrix model shall be changed as follows:  **FROM**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AT | Austria | | BE | Belgium | | BG | Bulgaria | | CZ | Czechia | | DE | Germany | | EL | Greece | | ES | Spain | | IT | Italy | | LU | Luxembourg | | MT | Malta | | NL | Netherlands | | PL | Poland | | PT | Portugal | | RO | Romania |   **TO**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | AT | Austria | | BE | Belgium | | BG | Bulgaria | | CZ | Czechia | | DE | Germany | | EL | Greece | | ES | Spain | | IT | Italy | | LU | Luxembourg | | MT | Malta | | PL | Poland | | PT | Portugal | | RO | Romania | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (Medium); * CS/MISE (None).   NEA:   * Impact on NEAs (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, FESS specifications will not be correct regarding the handling of the business codelist BC109. In addition, NA-NL will erroneously be shown to tax beer to Degree Plato. Furthermore, FESS will not be aligned with the changes that IE734 v3.1.0 has already introduced in production since 01/01/2024. Moreover, FESS will not be aligned with Annex II, 13. NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION-DEGREE PLATO of Regulation (EU) 2022/1636. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks. This RFC concerns the documentary update of FESS that will be performed later, in the next FESS/BPMs release. The IE734 v3.1.0, which has been active in CA SEED since 01/01/2024, already includes this change. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the activation of IE734 v3.1.0 in CA SEED since 01/01/2024. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** IE734-054; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[6]](#footnote-7) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 01/01/2024 (activation date for NA-NL Plato country code update in the IE734 v3.1.0, which was deployed in Production on 20/12/2023). | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-313 – Missing state transition from Figure 117: STD at Destination – Export Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-313 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM609411 | | Known Error | KE23668 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM609411, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications in the diagram ‘STD at Destination – Export Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1)’. More specifically, there is an arrow missing between the status ‘Exporting’ and the status ‘Accepted’ of the respective diagram and therefore the transition is not feasible. In version 3.14, as it is depicted in the scenario “Export Declaration Invalidation After Acceptance and After Release”, in the case of an Invalidation after Acceptance and after Release, the status is set to ‘Delivered’ instead of ‘Accepted’.  The EU Customs Transition Diagrams shall be updated in:   * STD at Destination – Export Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1)   **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise STDs, in the TIS\_Excise folder.  **STD at Destination – Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1) [UML2 State machine diagram]**  In the STD, the following change will be performed. Please note that the messages on the conditional flows will be depicted in this RFC as well as in the STD in the form (received IE)^(sent IE).   * A conditional flow shall be added so that the ‘IE536^IE836’ communication of messages leads from the Product/State ‘Exporting’ back to the Product/State ‘Accepted’.   The above solution concerns only a documentary update and has already been proposed to the Member States with the Known Error KE23668, directly applicable for Phase 4.1. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 there will be a discrepancy in the STD at Destination – Export Operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different from MS of Export (part 1), due to a missing depiction of a state transition and therefore, the Excise STDs will not be aligned with the specifications. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update. The KE23668 is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.1, and the current RFC is fixing specification issues. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23668. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-349; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[7]](#footnote-8) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-314 – Wording error in condition C051/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-314 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM611056 | | Known Error | KE23705 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 13/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-SE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in the related incident IM611056, an error has been observed in the wording of condition C051.  More specifically, the relevant passage mentions “IF <Request Type> is ‘Request for download of the full register of economic operators’”. However, in the TC04 “Common Request Type”, the common request type with code 5 has the code description: “Request for re-synchronisation of the register of economic operators”; there is no “Request for download of the full register of economic operators” in TC04. The if-statement in condition C051 shall be changed to be in alignment with the corresponding ones from TC04.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Class C051 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <Request Type> is “Request for download of the full register of economic operators”  or “Request for reference data”  THEN <REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION> is ‘R’  ELSE <REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION> does not apply.  **TO**  IF <Request Type> is “Request for re-synchronisation of the register of economic operators”  or “Request for reference data”  THEN <REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION> is ‘R’  ELSE <REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION> does not apply. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 in FESS, the wording of C051 will not be aligned with the description of code 5 from TC04. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23705 is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.1, and the current RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23705. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-350; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[8]](#footnote-9) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-315 – Update the wording of EMCS conditions/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-315 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM614751 | | Known Error | KE23710 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 27/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  It has been observed that the wording of some EMCS Conditions needs to be corrected, to ensure accuracy of the terminology used. More specifically, the following conditions need to be updated:  C049, C050, C053, C054, C055, C059, C152.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Class C049 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Density Applicability> is “Yes”  THEN <Density> is ‘R’  ELSE <Density> does not apply  where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Density Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>.  **TO**  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Density Applicability Flag> is “Yes”  THEN <Density> is ‘R’  ELSE <Density> does not apply  where <EXCISE PRODUCT.Density Applicability Flag> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>.   * Class C050 will be updated as follows:   **FROM** IF <Request Type> is “Request for reference data” THEN <REF\_REQUEST> is ‘R’ ELSE <REF\_REQUEST> does not apply.  **TO** IF <Request Type> is “Request for reference data”  THEN <REFERENCE REQUEST> is ‘R’  ELSE <REFERENCE REQUEST> does not apply.   * Class C053 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <Request Type> is “Request for SEED statistics” THEN <STA\_REQUEST> is ‘R’ ELSE <STA\_REQUEST> does not apply.  **TO**  IF <Request Type> is “Request for SEED statistics” THEN <STATISTICS REQUEST> is ‘R’ ELSE <STATISTICS REQUEST> does not apply.   * Class C054 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <Request Type> is “Request for SEED statistics” THEN <STA\_PERIOD> is ‘R’ ELSE <STA\_PERIOD> does not apply.  **TO** IF <Request Type> is “Request for SEED statistics” THEN <STATISTICS PERIOD> is ‘R’ ELSE <STATISTICS PERIOD> does not apply.   * Class C055 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <ACO Request Type> is “Administrative cooperation” THEN <ACO\_REQUEST> is ‘R’ ELSE <ACO\_REQUEST> does not apply.  **TO** IF <ACO Request Type> is “Administrative cooperation” THEN <(ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION) REQUEST> is ‘R’ ELSE <(ADMINISTRATIVE COOPERATION) REQUEST> does not apply.   * Class C059 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <Type> is “Scheduled” THEN <Downtime TO> is ‘R’ ELSE <Downtime TO> is ‘O’.  **TO** IF <Type> is “Scheduled” THEN <Downtime End Date and Time> is ‘R’ ELSE <Downtime End Date and Time> is ‘O’.   * Class C152 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability> is “Yes” THEN at least one of <Degree Plato> or <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> must be given.  **TO** IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Degree Plato Applicability Flag> is “Yes” THEN at least one of <Degree Plato> or <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> must be given. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 wording of the respective conditions will not be accurate in terms of the terminology used. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, as it concerns documentation updates. The KE23710 is directly applicable for Phase 4.1, and this RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be implemented in the next FESS release with no business continuity risks. The KE23710 is directly applicable for Phase 4.1, and this RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-351; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[9]](#footnote-10) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-316 – Change the wording of condition C213/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-316 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM612576, IM607465 | | Known Error | KE23800 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 18/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-RO | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM612576, a misalignment has been observed by NA-RO between the DDNEA and DDNXA specifications. More specifically, in the latest DDNEA Main Document, condition C213 which governs ‘COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT’ and ‘NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT’ data groups from the IE839 message shall be updated in order to maintain consistency between DDNEA and DDNXA.    **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed:   * Class C213 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation result> is ‘Positive’  THEN{  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS.Diagnosis code> is ‘CN codes do not match’  THEN <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is ‘R’ AND < EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply  ELSE  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS.Diagnosis code> is ‘Weight/mass do not match’ THEN <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply AND < EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is ‘R’  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply AND < EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply  }  ELSE <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is ‘R’ AND < EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply    **TO**  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation result> is equal to ‘0’  THEN {  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply AND <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS- UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> does not apply }  ELSE {  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS- UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT-COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is ‘R’ AND/OR <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION-NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS-UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT-NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is ‘R’  } | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then C213 will be in misalignment with condition C0548 of DDNXA, although the IE839 message is filled according to IE537 message of DDNXA. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23800 is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.1, and this RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23800. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-352; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[10]](#footnote-11) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-317 – Local clearance, removal of Business rules: BR036, BR037, BR038, BR039, BR040/~~Rev1~~Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-317 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM617181 | | Known Error | KE23804 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/08/2023 | | Requester | NA-RO | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM617181, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications regarding some existing business rules. More specifically, ~~in business rules BR036, BR037, BR038, BR039, and BR040, there is an erroneous reference to the “Local Clearance” term, which is out of scope in the current specifications since it is purely a national matter, and the old export messages IE501 and IE515 as well.~~ in the description of business rule BR036, there is an erroneous reference to the “Local Clearance” term. Since “Local Clearance” is purely a national matter and out of scope of the current specifications, BR036 is not applicable any longer. This change was also introduced in Phase 4.1 via DDNEA-P4-353 RFC derived from KE23804.  Regarding Business Rules BR037, BR038, BR039, and BR040, these do not refer to local clearance but to validations that EMCS performed between the Export declaration and the respective e-ADs as of Phase 4.0 (when, as per the common specifications, the validation took place in EMCS). As per Phase 4.1, the AES-EMCS interface validations take place in AES, therefore those BRs are no longer applicable. Therefore, the respective BRs need to be removed.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * Classes ‘BR036’, ‘BR037’, ‘BR038’, ‘BR039’, and ‘BR040’ will be removed; * In the data group diagram ‘OFFICE Place of Delivery’, the existing class ‘BR036’ will be removed; * In the data group diagram ‘EXCISE MOVEMENT’, the existing classes ‘BR037’ and ‘BR040’ will be removed; * In the data group diagram ‘E-AD/E-SAD Body’, the existing classes ‘BR037’, ‘BR038’, ‘BR039’ and ‘BR040’ will be removed. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 Excise BPMs will not be aligned with the specifications, since the aforementioned business rules will be removed. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23804 is directly applicable for Phase 4.1 and the current RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | ~~N/A~~  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23804. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-353; * **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 | ~~CAB #209 on 10/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[11]](#footnote-12) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-318 – Updates in relation to the Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage (ABV)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-318 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM645069, IM632531 | | Known Error | KE23996 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/10/2023 | | Requester | NA-SI | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM645069 and IM632531, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications. More specifically, there is a misalignment between the Phase 4.1 specifications and the Technical Annexes regarding the ABV (Alcoholic strength by Volume in Percentage). Condition C047 imposed on the Data Item ABV states that ABV is optional for excise products with excise product code B000, while in the Technical Annexes ABV is required for all alcoholic products (including B000).  A draft amendment was proposed to update the Technical Annexes of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636, so that 17g (Alcoholic strength by Volume in Percentage) was aligned to condition C047 as of Phase 4.1.  However, ultimately, it was decided that no changes are made to 17g in the Technical Annexes. In the Technical Annexes, the Alcoholic strength by Volume in Percentage remains Required for all alcoholic products (as of version of the 5th of July 2022). Therefore, the misalignment between the Technical Annexes and the specifications needs to be addressed, by updating the specifications as per the Technical Annexes regarding the ABV.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in order to align the specifications for C047 with the description of the condition in the Technical Annexes. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * The description of condition C047, which is applied in the data item ‘Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage’ will be as follows:   **FROM**  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Alcoholic Strength By Volume In Percentage Applicability Flag> is “Yes”  THEN  <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> is ‘R’ if the excise product code is not B000  <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> is ‘O’ if the excise product code is B000  ELSE  <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> does not apply  WHERE  <EXCISE PRODUCT.Alcoholic Strength Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>.  **TO**  IF <EXCISE PRODUCT.Alcoholic Strength By Volume In Percentage Applicability Flag> is “Yes”  THEN  <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> is ‘R’  ELSE  <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> does not apply  WHERE  <EXCISE PRODUCT.Alcoholic Strength Applicability> is the indicator (associated to each excise product) retrieved from the list of <EXCISE PRODUCT>. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Medium).   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 there will be a misalignment between the FESS specifications and the Technical Annexes regarding ABV. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The Known Error KE23996 is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.1, and this RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23996. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-354; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[12]](#footnote-13) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-319 – Change of Destination with unchanged Consignee and changed Destination Type Code/ ~~Rev1~~Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-319 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM628631 | | Known Error | KE23995 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 21/09/2023 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  According to IM628631, it has been observed by NA-AT that different approaches are being followed by the MSAs regarding the Change of Destination in the following cases:  Change of Destination without change of the Consignee and:  - change of Destination Type Code from code 1 (Destination – Tax warehouse) to code 4 (Destination – Direct delivery) and vice versa,  - change of Destination Type Code from code 2 (Destination – Registered consignee) to code 4 (Destination – Direct delivery) and vice versa.  The common specifications allow for such changes of destination to take place. The particular scenario is not common and until now it had not been explicitly specified in the common specifications, in the scenarios related to Change of Destination (under section II.I.5 “Change of Destination” of the DDNEA Main Document).  Therefore, ~~a note shall be added to~~ the FESS specifications shall be updated to explicitly mention that for those particular cases the scenario described under section II.I.5.5 “Change of Place of Delivery” applies (meaning that the MSA of Dispatch receives and validates the IE813 message and then sends an IE813 message to the MSA of Destination and not an IE801 one).  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs, in the 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM folder. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * In FESS/BPMs for EMCS Phase 4.1, the description under “L4-CORE-01-15-Perform Change of Destination indicating Change of Place of Delivery” shall be enhanced with a clarification ~~at the end of the following text~~:   “The purpose of this process is to describe the change of destination of a movement indicating Change of  Place of Delivery.  The process is triggered when a Change of destination indicating Change of Place of Delivery is available at  MSA of Dispatch.\*  This scenario also applies in the case of:  - change of Destination Type Code from code 1 (Destination - Tax warehouse) to code 4 (Destination - Direct delivery) and vice versa,  - change of Destination Type Code from code 2 (Destination - Registered consignee) to code 4 (Destination - Direct delivery) and vice versa.  The EMCS at the MSA of Dispatch forwards the Change of Destination (IE813) to the  MSA of Destination and the process continues.  After the receipt of the change of destination (IE813), the EMCS at MSA of Destination/ MSA of Export  proceeds with validating its data, by using the “L4-CORE-01-03-Perform validation of Common Domain  message” sub-process. Then, the EMCS at MSA of Destination/ MSA of Export proceeds with the handling  of the validation results by using the “L4-CORE-01-05-Handle validation Results of Common Domain  message” process. Depending on the outcome (end event) of the “L4-CORE-01-05-Handle validation  Results of Common Domain message” process, the following may happen:   1. If a refusal message (IE917/IE906) is sent to the MSA of Dispatch (since the change of destination was   found invalid), the whole process ends at this point;  b. If the change of destination is recorded (since the change of destination was found valid), the process  continues.  Then, the EMCS at MSA of Destination/ MSA of Export sets state of the e-AD/e-SAD to Accepted. After  this:  • In case of MSA of Export (i.e. for Duty Suspension movements), the whole process ends here;  • In case of MSA of Destination, the EMCS at MSA of Destination forwards the Change of Destination  (IE813) to the Consignee and the whole process ends.”  ~~\*It shall be noted that this scenario also applies in the case of:~~  ~~- change of Destination Type Code from Destination – Tax warehouse to Destination – Direct delivery and vice versa,~~  ~~- change of Destination Type Code from Destination – Registered consignee to Destination – Direct delivery and vice versa.”~~ | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 specifications will not explicitly define that the IE813 message should be sent by the MSA of Dispatch via the common domain for the Change of Destination scenarios described in the problem statement of this RFC. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC. The KE23995 is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.0 and Phase 4.1, and RFC is fixing specifications issues. | | Deployment approach | ~~N/A~~  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23995. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-355; * **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 | ~~CAB #209 on 10/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[13]](#footnote-14) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-320 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-320 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM634903 | | Known Error | KE24027 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 16/10/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  Stemming from issue IM634903, the KE24027 “Clarifications for the procedures after an e-AD Request Rejection” was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications and a workaround solution for the procedures following an e-AD Request Rejection.  More specifically, in case the Export declaration contains multiple ARCs, AES sends multiple e-AD requests (IE532) per ARC. If AES receives at least one negative response with the IE832 message for an ARC, this leads to the rejection of the entire export declaration. Then, at the EMCS side, all the e-ADs included in the Export declaration should be in the “Accepted” state, both at the MSA of Export and the MSA of Dispatch. The KE24027 was proposed since the AES specifications did not foresee a message to be sent to the MSA of Export to inform about the rejection of the Export declaration and its included ARCs. The logic of the workaround was that the MSA of Export, upon sending an IE832 message, found the included ARCs in the export declaration message on its own. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the export declaration and retrieving the ARC number included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number was proposed to be used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the Export declaration.  However, it has been pointed out that certain issues could arise and that the workaround solution is not error-proof. For example, it has been noted that, in principle, there can be cases of more than one export declarations using the same LRN. Therefore, for Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic. When EMCS receives IE532 - e-AD Request messages for an Export Declaration message and EMCS responds to at least one e-AD request with an IE832 - e-AD Request Rejection message, then the Export declaration gets rejected at the Customs Office of Export and AES should send the IE519 message to the MSA of Export to inform about the rejection of the Export declaration and which are the included ARCs.  The MSA of Export should then proceed to update the states so that all the e-ADs of the Export declaration are in the “Accepted” state. Then, the MSA of Export should inform the MSA of Dispatch about the rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection and its included ARCs via an IE839 message (with a new rejection reason equal to “e-AD Request Rejection”). In this manner, the states can become “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch, too.  Lastly, since there is a dependency with the implementation in AES and the interface of AES-EMCS remains a national matter, the updated specifications will also specify the existing solution, which had been described via the related workarounds of Phase 4.1. More specifically, the specifications will be updated to include the workarounds in KE24027 “Clarifications for the procedures after an e-AD Request Rejection” and KE24040 “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request”, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own the respective ARCs via the IE532 messages.  In particular, for the case of rejection of the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, due to e-AD request rejection, the DDNXA specifications shall not foresee the sending of the IE519 (since the IE519 message serves to inform about an Export Declaration rejection, while, in case of rejection of the IE513 message, there is no actual rejection of the export declaration). For this case, the EMCS specifications shall foresee that EMCS should retrieve on its own the list of ARCs included in the rejected IE513, from the IE532 messages received for the respective LRN (as per the workaround KE24040 of Phase 4.1).The scenarios after an Export Declaration Amendment are further elaborated under the related RFC FESS-322.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. It shall be noted that the updates to the text have been marked with yellow highlight.   * The objective of the Process **‘L4-CORE-01-26 Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension’** will be updated as below, in order to reflect that AES at the Customs Office of Export will send the IE519 message, following an e-AD request rejection, in order to inform EMCS about the rejection of the Export declaration (IE515) due to e-AD request rejection and what are the included ARCs in the Export declaration. More specifically:   “  *[…]When the MSA of Dispatch is the same as the MSA of Export, the process is as follows:*  *At the Customs Office of Export: [...]*  *e. If the e-AD Request is rejected, the Customs Office of Export receives the e-AD Request Rejection (IE832) from the MSA of Dispatch. Then the Customs Office of Export records the e-AD request rejection and proceeds with sending the IE519 (Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export) message to the MSA of Dispatch, where the received IE519 is handled. The flow at the Customs Office of Export then leads back to the bullet point of step b. [...]*  *When the MSA of Dispatch is different than the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export, the process is as follows:*  *At the Customs Office of Export: [...]*  *e. If the e-AD Request is rejected, the Customs Office of Export receives the e-AD Request Rejection (IE832) from the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export. Then the Customs Office of Export records the e-AD request rejection and proceeds with sending the IE519 (Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export) message to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export, where the received IE519 is handled. The flow at the Customs Office of Export then leads back to the bullet point of step b […]*  “   * The objective of the Process ‘**L4-CORE-01-27-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch same as the MSA of Export-Customs Formalities’** will be updated as below, to reflect also the handling by the MSA of Dispatch of a received IE519 message due to e-AD request rejection, as well as the workaround solution in which EMCS retrieves on its own the ARCs in the rejected Export Declaration (Amendment) message.   *“*  *[…] In the case of the e-AD is not available, the EMCS at the MSA of Dispatch notifies the Customs Office of Export for the non-available e-AD. The message IE832 is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Dispatch and is sent to the Customs Office of Export. The process terminates with “e-AD is not available at this MSA of Dispatch. (It shall be noted that in the event of an IE832 and in case that AES has not implemented sending the IE519 in case of e-AD request Rejection, a workaround solution in EMCS should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Dispatch, upon sending an IE832, which signifies the rejection of the export declaration message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration. The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of e-AD Request Rejection for an Export Declaration Amendment message (IE513), as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message”[…]*  *In case that the EMCS at the MSA of Dispatch receives an export declaration rejection notification with the IE519 message (due to either e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation), (from L4-CORE-01-26), it shall “Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to e-AD request rejection or Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation”, “Notify Consignor on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation~~” and “Set e-AD State to ‘Accepted' at the MSA of Dispatch”. The ‘Customs Rejection of e-AD/e-SAD’ (IE839) is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Dispatch and sent to Consignor. The process terminates with the end event “Export Declaration Rejected. […]”*  *”*  In addition, the task of this Process ‘**Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation***’* will be updated to reflect that the rejection of Export declaration that is recorded upon reception of a IE519 can also be due to an e-AD request rejection. The task also appears in the Process **‘L4-CORE-01-28-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities**’.  More specifically, the updates shall be:  Task Name: Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation’  Description: The MSA records the rejection of export declaration either due to e-AD request rejection or Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation  Lastly, the task of this Process ‘**Notify Consignor on rejection of export declaration due to negative cross-check validation***’* will be updated to reflect the different reasons for which the Consignor might be notified by the MSA of Dispatch for a rejection of export declaration (i.e. due to either e-AD request rejection, negative cross-check or Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration/Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation). The task also appears in the process **‘L4-CORE-01-28-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities**’.  More specifically, the updates shall be:  Task Name: Notify Consignor on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation~~  Description: The MSA of Dispatch notifies the consignor on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation.~~  Previous Objects:  Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to Negative Cross-Check Validation  Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation   * The objective of the Process ‘**L4-CORE-01-28-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities**’, will be updated as follows, to reflect also the handling by the MSA of Export of a received IE519 message due to e-AD request rejection, as well as the workaround solution in which EMCS retrieves on its own the ARCs in the rejected Export Declaration (Amendment) message.   *“*  *[…] In case that the e-AD is not available, the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export shall “Notify AES of the non-available e-AD”. The “e-AD Request Rejection” (IE832) is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export and sent to Customs Office of Export. The process ends with “eAD is not available and not in the correct state at this MSA of Destination/MSA of Export . (It shall be noted that in the event of an IE832 and in case that AES has not implemented sending the IE519 in case of e-AD request Rejection, the workaround solution should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Export, upon sending an IE832, which signifies the rejection of the export declaration message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration. The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of e-AD Request Rejection for an Export Declaration Amendment message (IE513), as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message. […]*  *In case that the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export receives an export declaration rejection notification (due to either e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation), it shall “Record Rejection of Export Declaration due e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation”, “Notify MSA of Dispatch on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation~~” and finally, “Set e-AD state at MSA of Destination/MSA of Export as 'Accepted'”. The message “Customs Rejection of e-AD” (IE839) is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export and sent to the MSA of Dispatch”.*  *“*  The task of this process ‘*Notify MSA of Dispatch on rejection of export declaration due to negative cross-check validation’* will be updated to reflect the different reasons for which the MSA of Dispatch might be notified by the MSA of Export for a rejection of export declaration (i.e. due to either e-AD request rejection, negative cross-check or Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration/Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation).  More specifically, the updates shall be:  Task Name: Notify MSA of Dispatch on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation’~~  Description: The MSA of Destination/MSA of Export notifies the MSA of Dispatch on rejection of export declaration ~~due to negative cross-check validation~~  Previous Objects:  Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to Negative Cross-Check Validation  Record Rejection of Export Declaration due to e-AD request rejection or due to Cancellation of the Pre-lodged Export Declaration or Timer Expiry to Receive the Export Presentation  Lastly, the model graphics of the processes **L4-CORE-01-26**, **L4-CORE-01-27** and **L4-CORE-01-28** will be updated as applicable to reflect the aforementioned updates.   * In TC ‘Customs Rejection Reason Code’, a new value ‘x’ will be added with description *'e-AD Request Rejection*'. * The class C212, which is applied in data groups of the IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs, the final proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2 can be found in Annex 4.5.   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> *is 'e-AD Request Rejection*'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'   * Updates in the State Transition Diagrams.   The following updates will take place in the STDs that are in the FESS BPMs under the directory 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM>EMCS>Core, 06\_States:  STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is same as MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” via IE519 [e-AD request Rejection].   STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted” to “Accepted” via IE839[e-AD request Rejection]; * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to “Accepted” via IE839([e-AD request Rejection] after amendment of Export declaration).   STD at Destination - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export”, to “Accepted” via IE519[e-AD request Rejection] ^ IE839[e-AD request Rejection]; * Update of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to “Accepted” from to IE532^IE832(after amendment of Export declaration) IE532^IE832.IE839([e-AD request Rejection] after amendment of Export declaration). | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (…).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of Not Implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the FESS specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how the MSA of Export can obtain the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration message (IE515) (i.e. via the respective IE519 message sent by AES, which informs about the export declaration rejection due to e-AD request rejection and includes the full list of e-AD(s)). Thus, the related workarounds should still be applicable, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own all the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration, upon rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-359; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-322. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of Change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[14]](#footnote-15) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/2026 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-322 – Export Declaration amendment; update of ARC(s)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-322 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM644206 | | Known Error | KE24040 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-IT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  Stemming from the issue IM644206, the KE24040 “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request” was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request and proposed a workaroundso that the MSA of Export could obtain all the included ARC number(s) in the IE513 message, as this had not been foreseen in the specifications. The logic of the workaround is that the MSA of Export gets the included ARCs in the rejected IE513 messages on its own. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the IE513 and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The workaround is not error-proof though. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the IE513. However, it has been pointed out that, in principle, there can be cases of more than one export declarations using the same LRN. Further to this, the workaround was based on the logic that AES sends a different IE532 message for each included e-AD in IE513 message. However, according to the existing AES specifications, this should happen only for “new or modified” e-ADs in IE513 message.  Therefore, for Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic of Export Declaration Amendment. The KE24040 will be incorporated into the specifications and the necessary modifications in the AES specifications should take place, so that AES sends an IE532 message for each included e-AD in IE513 message.  As noted before, there is a business need that the MSA of Export has all the included ARC number(s) in the IE513 message. The list of e-ADs is needed:   * so that the MSA of Export and the MSA of Dispatch can perform any necessary state transitions, following a rejection of the IE513 message due to either an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832) or due to a negative cross-check result (IE537). This has been explained in the RFCs FESS-320 and FESS-321 respectively; * so that the MSA of Export finds whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of any excluded e-ADs should be reverted to “Accepted” at the MSA of Export and at the MSA of Dispatch.   The procedure that follows in case any excluded e-AD(s) are found, is further described in the related RFC FESS-346.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. It shall be noted that the updates to the text have been highlighted with yellow colour.   * The objective of the Process **‘L4-CORE-01-27-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch same as the MSA of Export-Customs Formalities’** will be updated as below, to reflect how the case of export declaration amendment with update of ARCs is handled.   *“ […]*  *a. At the MSA of Dispatch, the process can be triggered when an e-AD Request arrives from the Customs Office of Export, i.e. “e-AD Request Received”. [In case an e-AD Request (IE532) for an LRN is received after the reception of the ‘Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export’ (IE539) message for the same LRN, EMCS will consider that this e-AD Request has been received for an Export Declaration Amendment message (IE513). The MSA of Dispatch should find whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of any excluded e-AD(s) should be reverted to “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch and the Consignor should be informed via the respective IE839 message.*  *The MSA of Dispatch can find any excluded e-ADs in order to update their state, from the delta between the ARCs of the initial Export Declaration and the IE513 message.*   * *The list of ARCs in the original Export Declaration can be retrieved from the IE539 - Export Declaration Acceptance message sent by AES.* * *The list of ARCs in the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message can be found:*   + *in case of acceptance of the IE513, from the new Export Declaration Acceptance (IE539) message sent by AES.*   + *in case of rejection of the IE513, due to e-AD request rejection, or due to Negative cross-check results, the list of ARCs in IE513 can be retrieved by the MSA of Dispatch on its own, from the IE532 messages received by AES for the IE513 message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message. […].“* * The objective of the Process **‘L4-CORE-01-28-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities’** will be updated as below, to reflect how the case of export declaration amendment with update of ARCs is handled.   *“ […]*  *At the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export:*  *The process can be triggered when an ‘e-AD Request’ (IE532) arrives from the Customs Offices of Export, i.e. “e-AD Request Received”. [In case an e-AD Request (IE532) for an LRN is received after the reception of the ‘Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export’ (IE539) message for the same LRN, EMCS will consider that this e-AD Request has been received for an Export Declaration Amendment message (IE513). The MSA of Export should find whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of the excluded e-AD(s) should be reverted to “Accepted” at the MSA of Destination/Export. Then, the MSA of Destination/Export should inform the MSA of Dispatch regarding the excluded e-AD(s), via the respective IE839 message, so that the states are “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch too. The MSA of Dispatch shall then proceed to inform the Consignor via the IE839 message.*  *The MSA of Destination/Export can find any excluded e-ADs in order to update their state, from the delta between the ARCs of the initial Export Declaration and the IE513 message. More specifically,*   * *The list of ARCs in the original Export Declaration can be retrieved from the IE539 - Export Declaration Acceptance message sent by AES.* * *The list of ARCs in the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message can be found:*   + *in case of acceptance of the IE513, from the new Export Declaration Acceptance (IE539) message sent by AES;*   + *in case of rejection of the IE513, due to e-AD request rejection, or due to Negative cross-check results, the list of ARCs in IE513 can be retrieved by the MSA of Destination/Export on its own, from the IE532 messages received by AES for the IE513 message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message […].”* | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (…).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of Not Implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the FESS specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how the MSA of Export can find whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513 message, while it was included in the initial export declaration. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-361; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-320, FESS-321, FESS-346. | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[15]](#footnote-16) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/2026 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-323 – Addition of the new data item ‘Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG’ in the IE815/IE801 messages/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-323 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM612104 | | Known Error | KE23707 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-IT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM612104, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications. As per NA-IT, the data item ‘Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG’ is missing in the IE815/IE801 messages.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a new technical term will be added in both IE801 and IE815 MADs. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.  More specifically, the existing MADs will be updated as follows:   * IE801 – E-AD/E-SAD (C\_EAD\_VAL)   + New technical term (data item) ‘Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG’ will be created with the following attributes and will be added under **‘(BODY) E-AD/E-SAD’: D**  **a2** **BC12** **C002** * IE815 – SUBMITTED DRAFT OF E-AD/E-SAD (N\_EAD\_SUB)   + New technical term (data item) ‘Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG’ will be created with the following attributes and will be added under **‘(BODY) E-AD/E-SAD’: D**  **a2 BC12 C002**   Therefore, the structure of the technical term ‘(BODY) E-AD/E-SAD’ in both MADs will be the following:  ---(BODY) E-AD/E-SAD  (…)  Independent Small Producers Declaration O an..350  Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  (…) | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.1 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 data item ‘Independent Small Producers Declaration\_LNG’ will be missing, and therefore the FESS will not be aligned with the changes proposed for DDNEA and with Table 1 of Technical Annex I of the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/263. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentary update. The RFC is fixing specifications issues. In terms of the KE23707, the xsd file has been provided and is directly applicable for EMCS Phase 4.1. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE23707. This RFC is fixing only specification issues. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:**-; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-362; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-306 (already implemented in EMCS Phase 4.1), CTP-P4-055, TRP-P4-082. | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024[[16]](#footnote-17) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 13/02/2024 (Milestone Mo) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-324 – Update of rules R271 – R276

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-324 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM567289 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/12/2022 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  During Conformance Testing, it was detected that a few test cases were failing due to violations of one of the rules introduced for NA-XI, i.e. R271, 272, R273, R274, R275 and R276. However, it shall be highlighted that in case where more than one of the NA-XI introduced rules are applied on a single message (e.g. in IE840), then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’, i.e. if one of the rules is validated successfully, then the message should pass the corresponding validations regarding its relevance to Northern Ireland. Therefore, rules R271 – R276 will have to be enhanced for clarity purposes and in alignment with Phase 3 RFCs DDNEA-P3-291 and FESS-258.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed:   * Classes R271, R272, R273, R274, R275 and R276 shall be updated with the inclusion of the following phrase at the end of the existing wording of the rules:   (…)  Note: In the case where more than one of the rules R271 – R276 are applied on a single message, then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’ condition, i.e. if one of the rules is validated successfully, then the message should pass the corresponding validations regarding its relevance to Northern Ireland. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, FESS specifications will not make clear that in the case where more than one of the rules R271 – R276 are applied on a single message, then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’ condition. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-363; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx,DDNEA-P3-291, FESS-258. | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-325 – Removal of ‘SAD’ from Common Specifications/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-325 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681399 | | Known Error | KE24439 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM681399, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications. More specifically, due to the obsolesce of the use of the term ‘SAD – Single Administrative Document’, there is a need for removing, replacing and renaming the respective term in the common specifications for EMCS in order to be aligned with current Customs procedure and to reflect Explanatory Note 2(e) of Annex I to Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636.  (Note: The paper-based SAD is still provided in Customs legislation for those cases where electronic exchange is not possible. The term 'customs declaration' is broader as it covers all types of declarations made for Customs purposes and therefore encompasses the SAD.  Explanatory Note 2(e) of Annex I to Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636 explains that the abbreviation 'Import SAD' is used to mean the import Customs Declaration.)  This RFC proposes the appropriate changes in FESS BPMs for rule R100, conditions C096, C097, business codelist BC106 and messages IE801/IE815.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * Class R100 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM**  A valid MRN or SAD Number confirmed against Customs data, according to the Customs case.  MRN = Movement Reference Number  SAD = Single Administrative Document  **TO**  A valid MRN Number confirmed against Customs data, according to the Customs case.  MRN = Movement Reference Number   * Class C096 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT SAD> is 'R'  ELSE <IMPORT SAD> does not apply.  **TO**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> is 'R'  ELSE <IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> does not apply.   * Class C097 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM**   IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT SAD> is 'O'  ELSE <IMPORT SAD> does not apply.  **TO**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> is 'O'  ELSE < IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> does not apply.   * In Information Exchanges, for the IE801/IE815 messages, the ‘IMPORT SAD’ Data Group and the ‘Import SAD Number’ Data Item shall be updated to ‘IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION’ and ‘Import Customs Declaration Number’ respectively. * In the matrix model of the Business Codelist BC106 – Type of Document, the name of the value ‘18’ shall be updated respectively   **FROM**  “(...)  18: SAD (Single Administrative Document) <TARIC code> Any TARIC code used in 'box44' of the SAD.”    **TO**  “(...)  18: Customs Declaration <TARIC code>: Any TARIC code used in Data Element 1203000000 (sub-element 002000) of the export declaration.” | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 respective FESS specifications will not be aligned with the updated terminology regarding SAD in the current legislation. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC to BPMs. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-364; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx, TRP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 1) | |
| **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024[[17]](#footnote-18) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-326 – Minor Updates in the description of EMCS Codelists/~~Rev1~~Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-326 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681404 | | Known Error | KE24357 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM681404, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications regarding certain EMCS codelists and the naming of the IE818 message.  More specifically, the technical codelists TC50, TC60, and TC64, as well as the business codelists BC107 and BC46, need to be updated in order fix certain specifications misalignments. ~~More specifically~~In more detail,   * In the technical codelist TC50 - Status Type, the code ‘X12’ is related to Local Clearance, however Local Clearance is not applicable in Phase 4.1; * In the Technical Codelist TC60 – Technical Message Type and Technical Codelist TC64 – Requested Message Type:   + the description of code ‘IE803’ is “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD”, while it should refer to both e-AD/e-SAD;   + ~~the description of code ‘IE818’ is erroneously “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”, while the name of the message IE818 is “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + the description of code ‘IE839’ is erroneously “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT”, while the name of the message IE839 is “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD”; * In the Business Codelist BC107 – Manual Closure Request Reasons, code ‘1’ has the erroneous description “Export closed but no IE518/IE598 available”, while it should be “Export closed but no IE598 available”~~,~~ since IE518 is not applicable for the respective scenario; * In the Business Codelist BC46 – Reasons for Unsatisfactory Receipt or Control Report, the description of the code ‘5’ is erroneously “Report by ECS’, while it should refer to AES instead of ECS.   Furthermore, regarding the discrepancy in the IE818 message, the naming of the certain message has erroneously remained as “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT” throughout EMCS specifications. Therefore, it needs to be updated to be aligned with the name of the value “IE818” as exists in the technical codelists TC60/TC64 and the current legislation as amended under the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/289 of 12 January 2024, i.e. “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC50 – Status Type, the name of value ‘X12’ shall be updated respectively from "Accepted for Export" to "reserved", since it is related to Local Clearance which is no longer applicable; * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC60 – Technical Message Type, the values shall be updated as follows:   + The name of the value ‘IE803’ shall be updated respectively from “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD" to “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD”;   + The name of the value ‘IE810’ shall be updated respectively from “CANCELLATION OF E-AD" to “CANCELLATION OF AN E-AD";   + ~~The name of the value ‘IE818’ shall be updated respectively from “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT” to “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + The name of the value ‘IE839’ shall be updated respectively from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD". * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC64 – Requested Message Type, the values shall be updated as following:   + The name of the value ‘IE803’ shall be updated respectively from “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD" to “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD”;   + ~~The name of the value ‘IE818’ shall be updated respectively from “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT” to “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + The name of the value ‘IE839’ shall be updated respectively from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD". * In the matrix model of the Business Codelist BC107 – Manual Closure Request Reasons, the name of the value ‘1’ shall be updated respectively from “Export closed but no IE518/IE598 available” to “Export closed but no IE598 available”; * In the matrix model of the Business Codelist BC46 – Reasons for Unsatisfactory Receipt or Control Report, the name of the value ‘5’ shall be updated respectively from “Report by ECS’ to ‘Report by AES”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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, there will be misalignments in certain codelists in the Excise BPMs specifications, as identified in the problem statement. | | 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-P4-365; * **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 | ~~CAB #210 on 25/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[18]](#footnote-19) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-327 – Change the wording in FESS documentation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-327 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM631681 | | Known Error | KE24043 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/10/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM631681, a misalignment has been observed by NA-BE in the FESS specifications. More specifically, in the EU Customs Functional Requirements BPM Report for Core, under chapter “5.24. Process L4-CORE-01-28-Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension for the case of having MSA of Dispatch different than MSA of Export-Customs Formalities”, there is an erroneous wording that needs to be changed.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. The text shall be updated as highlighted in yellow:  “(...) c. Depending on the e-AD state received (availability and status), one of the following occur:  In case that the e-AD is not available, the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export shall “Notify AES of the non-available e-AD”. The “e-AD Request Rejection” (IE832) is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export and sent to Customs Office of Export. The process ends with “e-AD is not available and not in the correct state at this MSA of Destination/MSA of Export”.  In case that the e-AD is ~~not~~ available, the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export shall “Notify AES of the available e-AD”. The ‘e-AD” (IE801) is generated by the EMCS at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export and is sent to Customs Office of Export. (...)” | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 there will be an erroneous wording in the FESS specifications. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns only a documentation update in the FESS specifications. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be implemented in the next FESS/BPMs release. The | | 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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-328 – Update the description of IE839 in TC60 and TC64

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-328 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681401 | | Known Error | KE24405 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In the Annex of Directive 2022/1636, Table 8, which refers to the IE839 message, is named “Customs rejection of electronic administrative document (not applicable to e-SAD)”. Therefore, in order to be aligned, the naming “Customs rejection of e-AD” has been used in the specifications. This should also apply to the technical codelists TC60 and TC64, where the code IE839 is present, and the name of the code shall be changed to “Customs rejection of e-AD”.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC60 – Technical Message Type, the name of the value ‘IE839’ shall be updated respectively from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD"; * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC64 – Requested Message Type, the name of the value ‘IE839’ shall be updated respectively from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD". | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 Excise BPMs will not be aligned with the correct name of the IE839 message. | | 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-P4-366; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-329 – Attach the business codelist BC11 to additional data item

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-329 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681406 | | Known Error | KE24363 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  During the update of the Technical Annexes I and II of the Council Directives, it was identified that the data item ‘Member State Code’ in the IE701 message does not have attached to it the Business Codelist BC11 - National Administrations. In the current structure of IE701, BC11 is already attached to the ‘Member State Code’ data item under ‘E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST’ and ‘LIST OF MEMBER STATES’ data groups. It also needs to be attached to the data item ‘Member State Code’ in the IE701 for alignment purposes.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:  More specifically, the existing MAD for IΕ701 – COMMON REQUEST (C\_REQ\_SUB) will be updated so that the technical term (data item) “Member State Code” under “REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION”, is linked to BC11.  Therefore, the structure of the “REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION”, will be the following:  ---REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION  Period from date R date TR9080 TR9115  Period to date R date TR9080 TR9115  Extraction O n1 TR9110  Member State Code O a2 BC11 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High).   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 in the FESS specifications, the business codelist BC11 will not be linked to the IE701 data item ---REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION. Member State Code. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-367; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx, 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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-330 – Inclusion of CN Code ‘24041100’ in the business codelist BC37/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-330 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681414 | | Known Error | KE24354 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM681414, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications. More specifically, in Annex 4 Codelists of the FESS documentation, in the business codelist ‘BC37 - CN Codes’ there is a missing CN Code with the value “24041100” which was introduced with FESS-286 and therefore its description already exists. It shall be noted that the CN Code with the value “24041100” has already been implemented in production (activation date of the CN Code in SEED was on 15/05/2022). This RFC addresses only the issue regarding the documentary misalignment in FESS.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:  In the matrix model of the Business Codelist BC37 – CN Codes, the value ‘24041100’ shall be added to existing name “Products intended for inhalation without combustion containing tobacco or reconstituted tobacco”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 FESS will not be aligned with the changes proposed by FESS-286 RFC. Furthermore, FESS will not be aligned with the changes that IE734 v2.76.1 has already introduced in production since 15/05/2022. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns only a documentation update. The CN Code with the value “24041100” has been already implemented in production (the IE734 v2.76.1, which has been active in CA SEED since 15/05/2022, includes this CN code) and this RFC is fixing specifications issues regarding how this CN code is represented in FESS. | | Deployment approach | N/A  The change in the system has already been deployed in production via the KE24354. This RFC is fixing only the FESS specification issue. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** -; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-286. | |
| **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024[[19]](#footnote-20) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-331 – Update format of the ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code’ data item

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-331 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681415 | | Known Error | KE24355 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/09/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  A misalignment has been observed in the FESS specifications regarding the format of a data item. More specifically, in the IE714 – REFUSAL OF UPDATE OF ECONOMIC OPERATORS (C\_QRO\_REF) message, the Data Item ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code’ under the ‘FUNCTIONAL ERROR’ Data Group has format ‘n..5’. However, in the respective Data Item, is applied the technical codelist TC63, which has format ‘n..3’. Therefore, the format of the Data Item ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code’ shall be updated in order to be aligned with the format of TC63.  **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 <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> technical term shall be updated to ‘n..3’. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 format of <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> data item will not be consistent with the format of the technical codelist TC63, which is applied to it. | | 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-P4-368; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-332 – Align the structure of IEs in FESS with DDNEA Appendix D

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-332 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681407 | | Known Error | KE24362 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/09/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  During the update of the Technical Annexes I and II of the Council Directives, it was identified that the structure of several IEs is not aligned with the structure of the messages in DDNEA Appendix D.  More specifically, the following messages need to be updated: IE701, IE819 and IE713.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:  In Annex 5 Information Exchanges, the structure of IE701, IE819 and IE713 messages shall be updated according to the structure of the respective messages in DDNEA Appendix D. Please note that all amendments are highlighted in yellow (and strikethrough for removals).  **IE701 common request C\_REQ\_SUB**  C\_REQ\_SUB  ---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE701 (R) 1x  ---E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST (D) 1x C052  ------RA\_PRIMARY CRITERION (R) 99x  ---------RA\_PRIMARY VALUE (O) 99x  ---STA\_REQUEST (D) 1x C053  ------LIST OF MEMBER STATES CODE (R) 99x  ---STA\_PERIOD (D) 1x C054  ---REF\_SYNCHRONISATION (D) 1x C051  ---REF\_REQUEST (D) 1x C050  ------LIST OF CODES CODE FOR IE701 (O) 99x  C\_REQ\_SUB  ---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE701 (R) 1x  Request Type n1 (R) 1x TC04  Request Message Name a..9 (D) 1x C044 TC05  Requesting Office an8 (R) 1x R032 R236  ~~Request Correlation Identifier an..44 (D) 1x C108 R193~~  ~~Start Date date (D) 1x C134~~  ~~End Date date (D) 1x C134~~  ~~Single Date date (D) 1x C135~~  ---E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST (D) 1x C052  Member State Code a2 (R) 1x BC11  ------RA PRIMARY CRITERION (R) 99x  Primary Criterion Type Code n..2 (R) 1x TC06  --------RA PRIMARY VALUE (R) 99x  Value an..255 (R) 1x R249  ---STA\_REQUEST (D) 1x C053  Statistic Type n1 (R) TC07  ------LIST OF MEMBER STATES (R) 99x  Member State Code a2 (R) 1x BC11  ---STATISTICS PERIOD (D) 1x C054  Year n4 (R) 1x R232  Semester n1 (D) 1x C133 TC94  Quarter n1 (D) 1x C133 TC95  Month n..2 (D) 1x C133 TC96  ---REF\_SYNCHRONISATION (D) 1x C051  Period from date date (R) 1x TR9080  Period to date date (R) 1x TR9115 TR9080  Extraction n1 (O) 1x TR9110  Member State Code a2 (O) 1x  ---REF\_REQUEST (D) 1x C050  Common Risk Assessment Criteria flag n1 (O) TC27  ------LIST OF CODES CODE (O) 99x  Requested List of Code n..2 (O) 1x TC25  **IE819 alert or rejection of an e-AD/e-SAD (C\_REJ\_DAT)**  C\_REJ\_DAT  ---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE819 (R) 1x  ---TRADER CONSIGNEE FOR IE819 (D) C116  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT FOR IE819 (R)  ---OFFICE OF DESTINATION FOR IE819 (R) 1x  ---ALERT (R) 1x  ---ALERT OR REJECTION OF MOVEMENT REASON CODE n..2 (D) 9x C032  C\_REJ\_DAT  ---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE819 (R) 1x  Date and Time of Validation of Alert Rejection dateTime (D) 1x C149  ---TRADER CONSIGNEE FOR IE819 (D) C116  Trader Identification an..16 (D) 1x C010 R271 R045 BR021 R272  Trader Name an..182 (R) 1x  Street Name an..65 (R) 1x  Street Number an..11 (O) 1x  Postcode an..10 (R) 1x  City an..50 (R) 1x  NAD\_LNG R a2 BC12  EORI Number an..17 (D) 1x C180  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT (R)  ARC an21 (R) 1x R273 BR020 R030  Sequence Number n..2 (R) 1x R232  --- OFFICE OF DESTINATION FOR IE819  Office Reference Number an8 (R) 1x BR026 BR027 R236 R032  --- ALERT (R) 1x  Date of Alert date (R) 1x  Movement Rejected flag n1 (R) 1x TC27  --- ALERT OR REJECTION OF MOVEMENT REASON CODE n..2 (D) 9x C032  Alert or Rejection of Movement Reason Code n..2 (R) BC22  Complementary Information an..350 (D) 1x C161  Complementary Information\_LNG a2 (D) 1x C002 BC12    **IE713 incremental update or full register of economic operators (C\_QRO\_DAT)**  C\_QRO\_DAT  ---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE713 1x R  ---TRADER AUTHORISATION 9999x D C141  ------ACTION 1x R  ------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R  ---------ADDRESS 1x R  ------OPERATOR ROLE 9x O  ------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY 999x D C139  ------EXCISE PRODUCT 999x D C139  ------(USING) TAX WAREHOUSE 999x D C009  ---TAX WAREHOUSE 9999x D C141  ------ACTION 1x R  ------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R  ---------ADDRESS 1x R  ------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY 999x D C139  ------EXCISE PRODUCT 999x D C139  ---TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION 9999x D C141  ------ACTION 1x R  ------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R  ---------ADDRESS 1x R  ------(LINKED TO TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION) TRADER 1x D C209  ------TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION DETAILS 999x R  **C\_QRO\_DAT**  **---ATTRIBUTES FOR IE713 1x R**  Incremental Message Type R n1 TC21 ~~Request Correlation Identifier D an..44 C136 R193~~  **---TRADER AUTHORISATION** **9999x** **D** **C141**  Trader Excise Number R an13 R070  VAT Number O an..14  Authorisation Begin Date R date  Authorisation End Date O date  Operator Type Code R n1 TC65 R206  Reference Number of Excise Office R an8 R214  Global Excise Trader Identifier O an22 R266  **------ACTION 1x R**  Operation R a1 TC24 BR044 R007 R267 R268 R269  Activation Date R date ~~C001~~ R230  Action identification R an..20 TR9001  Responsible Data Manager O an..35  Modification Date and Time D dateTime C163  **------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R**  Name R an..182  NAD\_LNG R a2 BC12  **---------ADDRESS 1x R**  Country Code R a2 BC11  Street Name R an..65  Street Number O an..11  City R an..50  Postcode R an..10 R270  **------OPERATOR ROLE** **9x** **O**  Operator Role Code R n1 TC69 R026 R265  **------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY** **999x** **D** **C139**  Excise Products Category Code R a1 BC66 R208  ------**EXCISE PRODUCT** **999x** **D** **C139**  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R207 R209 R264  **------(USING) TAX WAREHOUSE 999x D C009**  Reference of Tax Warehouse R an13 R204 ~~R070~~  **---TAX WAREHOUSE** **9999x** **D** **C141**  Reference of Tax Warehouse R an13 R070 R205  Validity Begin Date R date  Validity End Date O date  Reference Number of Excise Office R an8 R214  **------ACTION 1x R**  Operation R a1 TC24 BR044 R007 R267 R268 R269  Activation Date R date ~~C001~~ R230  Action identification R an..20 TR9001  Responsible Data Manager O an..35  Modification Date and Time D dateTime C163  **------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R**  Name R an..182  NAD\_LNG R a2 BC12  **---------ADDRESS 1x R**  Country Code R a2 BC11  Street Name R an..65  Street Number O an..11  City R an..50  Postcode R an..10 ~~R270~~  **------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY** **999x** **D** **C139**  Excise Products Category Code R a1 BC66 R208  **------EXCISE PRODUCT** **999x** **D** **C139**  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R207 R209 ~~R264~~  **---TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION** **9999x** **D** **C141**  Temporary Authorisation Reference R an13 R040  Operator Type Code R n1 TC110  Reference Number of Issuance Office R an8 R214  Date of Expiry R date  Re-usable Temporary Authorisation flag R n1 TC27  VAT Number O an..14  Authorisation Begin Date R date  Small Wine Producer O n1 TC27  **------ACTION 1x R**  Operation R a1 TC24 BR044 R007 R267 R268 R269  Activation Date R date ~~C001~~ R230  Action identification R an..20 TR9001  Responsible Data Manager O an..35  Modification Date and Time D dateTime C163  **------NAME AND ADDRESS 99x R**  Name R an..182  NAD\_LNG R a2 BC12  **---------ADDRESS 1x R**  Country Code R a2 BC11  Street Name R an..65  Street Number O an..11  City R an..50  Postcode R an..10 ~~R270~~  **------(LINKED TO TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION) TRADER 1x D** **C209**  Trader Excise Number D an13 BR051 C157 R233  Trader Name R an..182  Street Name R an..65  Street Number O an..11  Postcode R an..10  City R an..50  NAD\_LNG R a2 BC12  **------TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION DETAILS 999x R**  Excise Product Code R an4 BC36 R209 R212 R264  Quantity R n..15,3 R232 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 there will be a misalignment between the FESS and the DDNEA specifications regarding the message specifications of the respective messages. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns only a documentation update in the FESS specifications. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | 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 | Table 4 of Annex 1 to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/323 (to align with proposed change to IE701) | |
| **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-333 – Update of the multiplicity of the IE839 data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS from 99x to 999x

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-333 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM645904 | | Known Error | KE24456 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 23/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-SK | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  A discrepancy has been observed by NA-SK in the FESS specifications regarding the multiplicity of the data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS in the IE839 message, in relation to the corresponding message structure of the IE537 message of AES.  More specifically, in the IE537 message, the negative cross-check results are reported under the structure:  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD **999x** R  ------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  On the other hand, in the IE839 message, the corresponding message structure for reporting negative cross-check results is:  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS **99x** D  ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  Therefore, the multiplicity of <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> data group in the IE839 message should be changed to be in full alignment with the IE537 message of AES.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the FESS documentation:   * The data set for IE839 - CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD (C\_CUS\_REJ) shall be changed:   **FROM**  (...)  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99x D C212  (...)    **TO**  (...)  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 999x D C212  (...) | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low).   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 multiplicity of the data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS of IE839 will not be in alignment with the multiplicity of the corresponding data group EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD in the IE537 message of AES. | | 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-P4-369; * **Other RFCs:** CTP-P4-xxx, TRP-P4-xxx. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-334 – Update of the wording of C147 in IE839 to use the term "Export Declaration Information"

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-334 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM646712 | | Known Error | KE24457 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/10/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM646712, a discrepancy has been observed in the FESS specifications regarding condition C147. More specifically, the condition needs to be updated since the naming of ‘EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES’ data group needs to be corrected to become ‘EΧPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION’. During the update of Phase 4.1 specifications, the wording of the ‘EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES’ data group had been changed from 'EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES' to 'EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION'. However, condition C147 was not updated accordingly to reflect the respective change.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. The updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Class C147 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  “IF <REJECTION.Rejection reason code> is ‘Negative Cross-check result’  THEN  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES.LRN> is ‘R’  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES. Document Reference Number> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES.LRN> does not apply  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES. Document Reference Number> is ‘R’ ”    **TO**  “IF <REJECTION.Rejection reason code> is ‘Negative Cross-check result’  THEN  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION.LRN> is ‘R’  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION. Document Reference Number> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION.LRN> does not apply  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION. Document Reference Number> is ‘R’ ” | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium).   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 description of condition C147 will be in misalignment with the specifications, as these had been updated for Phase 4.1. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-370; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-335 – Change the Condition C066 to a Business Rule/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-335 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681403 | | Known Error | KE24417 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM681403, a discrepancy has been observed regarding condition C066, which is imposed on the Required data item ‘Date and Time of Update Validation’. The wording of C066 is not related to controlling the optionality of the respective data item. Therefore, condition C066 shall be deprecated and replaced by a new business rule ~~Rxxx~~BRxxx, which will have the same wording as the condition.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * Class C066 shall be removed from the ‘Date and Time of Update Validation’ technical term, which is linked to the data group diagram ‘(HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD for IE801’; * A new class ~~Rxxx~~BRxxx shall be added to the ‘Date and Time of Update Validation’ technical term, which is linked to the data group diagram ‘(HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD for IE801’.   More specifically, the existing MADs will be updated as follows:  A new class ‘BRxxx’ will be created and associated with the <Date and Time of Update Validation> data item of the IE801 message with the following details:  *BR ID:* BRxxx    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:* It is obligatory that if Sequence Number is 1, then the Date and Time of Update Validation that is included in the draft e-ad/e-sad is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT.Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD>​ data item, else is equal to the date and time of the change of destination.    *FESS Validation Rule:* If sequence number is 1, then the Date and Time of Update Validation that is included in the draft e-ad/e-sad is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT.Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD> data item, else is equal to the date and time of the change of destination  *IE:*   * IE801 (e-AD/e-SAD)   *Data Item:*  (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD. Date and Time of Update Validation  *Optionality:* Mandatory | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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~~ condition C066 will be erroneously imposed on a Required data item, whilst its wording does not control the optionality of the data item. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-372; * **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 | ~~CAB #210 on 25/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[20]](#footnote-21) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-337 – Update of the IE836 message for the removal of the GOODS SHIPMENT data group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-337 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM612741 | | Known Error | KE23708 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 19/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  The initial issue reported by NA-DE as part of IM612741 concerned the misalignment between the optionality of the Data Group GOODS SHIPMENT between the IE536 – Invalidation Notification to MSA of Export message of AES and the IE836 – Export Declaration Invalidation Notification to MSA of Dispatch/Consignor message of EMCS. Following the discussion with the MSAs on 05/09/2023 and considering the late stage of developments for AES, the Known Error KE23708 - ‘Update the optionality of data groups/data items in IE836 to be in alignment with the IE536 message of AES’ was registered.  For Phase 4.2, the issue shall be reconsidered. Although the IE536 and IE836 messages became aligned via the KE23708, the structure under GOODS SHIPMENT data group is not the correct one. More specifically, the Optional Data Group ---GOODS SHIPMENT does not have the correct structure for declaring e-ADs as previous documents, as in the IE515 - Export Declaration message. The correct structure according to IE515 message would be:  ---GOODS SHIPMENT  ------GOODS ITEM  ---------PREVIOUS DOCUMENT.  It is proposed that the message structure under GOODS SHIPMENT is removed from both the IE536 and the IE836 messages. The ARCs do not need to be defined in the IE836 message, since in case of invalidation of the Export declaration, this concerns all the e-ADs included in the Export declaration.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs.   * The technical term ‘GOODS SHIPMENT’ (i.e. data group) will be removed from the ‘IE836 export declaration invalidation notification to MSA of dispatch/consignor C\_INV\_DIS’ message allocation diagram, including all the included technical terms (i.e. data items). | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 there will be a misalignment in FESS since the ‘GOODS SHIPMENT’ data group will not have the correct structure for declaring e-ADs as previous documents, as in the IE515 message of AES. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-386; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 9) | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-338 – Update of C212 for an IE839 with Rejection Reason Code = ‘Negative Cross-check result’ that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-338 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM647115 | | Known Error | KE24064 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  In IM647115, a discrepancy has been observed by NA-AT regarding condition C212.  There is a legal requirement that in case of inconsistencies between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, the MSA of Dispatch should be notified.  More specifically, Article 21(4) of Directive (EU) 2020/262 states:  *“Where there are any inconsistencies between the electronic administrative document and the export declaration, the competent authorities in the Member State of export shall notify the competent authorities in the Member State of dispatch using the computerised system.”*  Thus, in case of negative cross-check results between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, there should be sent an IE839 – CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD message to the MSA of Dispatch to inform about the inconsistencies. This also applies for the case that the IE839 message sent to a particular MSA of Dispatch includes only e-ADs that were positively cross-checked.  Therefore, there is a need to update the specifications in order to allow the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check validation results’ of the IE839 message not to be required to be filled in this scenario.  A new condition Cxxx will be applied to the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check validation results’ to handle its optionality, which shall also control that in case of an IE839 message with only positively cross-checked e-ADs declared, this Data group is not applicable. Condition C212 shall be updated accordingly, so that it is no longer applicable for the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check validation results’.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs.   * Update the existing MADs as follows: * The class C212 shall be removed from the ‘NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS’ data group, which is linked to the data group diagram "EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION for IE839". * A new Class Cxxx shall be added to the ‘NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS’ data group, which is linked to the data group diagram "EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION for IE839". * The new class Cxxx will have the following wording:   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result' and there are negative cross-check validation results to be reported for any of the ARCs included in the data group C\_EAD\_VAL  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is ‘R’ ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply  Note: in the data group C\_EAD\_VAL are declared all the e-ADs concerning the recipient of the IE839 message regarding the particular Export Declaration   * Class C212 to be updated as follows:   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R' | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then it will not be possible to have an IE839 – CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD message that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs after the rejection of the Export declaration due to negative cross-check results. Therefore, the MSA of Export will not send the IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch and the legal requirement that the MSA of Dispatch should be notified in the cases where there are inconsistencies between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, would not be covered for this case. | | 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-P4-375; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-339 – Update of TC87 Business Process Code for registering the unavailability in CS/MIS2 and renaming of Data Items in IE770/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-339 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM567295 | | Known Error | KE24529 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/01/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  During 2025, there will be migration of CS/MISE to CS/MIS2 to endure that statistics regarding all Customs and Excise domains are kept in one place. The present RFC describes the change that has to be performed for the IE770 message in order to align the search fields regarding the registered unavailability. There are two issues in relation to the present RFC:   1. In the CS/MISE application, the values that currently exist in the specific drop-down list for the unavailability are based on the values of the technical codelist TC87 - BUSINESS PROCESS CODE, applied on IE770.<SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY. Business Process Code> data item.   For EMCS Phase 4.1, the “Explanation” field (in the IE770 data item and in the UI of CS/MISE) could be used to indicate the unavailability of EMCS Central Circuit, with a remark within this field that the entry is related to Duty Suspension or Duty Paid functionality.  The specifications in EMCS Phase 4.2 shall be changed and the values in TC87 will be updated to increase clarity regarding the possible causes of the unavailability.  The new TC87 shall be updated to include distinct codes for the External/Common domain, and drill down further, by having separate codes for Duty Suspension and Duty Paid per domain.  It was agreed between the NAs during the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm (30-31/05/2024) that, in Phase 4.2, the technical codelist TC87 shall be updated so that it distinguishes between the two functionalities (Duty Suspension and Duty Paid).   1. A renaming of the Data Item(s): Explanation and Explanation\_LNG, that belong to the Data Group <SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY> of IE770, will be implemented, for alignment purposes.   **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs.   * In the matrix model of the codelist TC87- Business Process Code the following updates shall be performed:   + Value ‘2’ shall be changed to ‘2- EMCS - Central Circuit – External Domain Functionality – Duty Suspension’;   + Value ‘3’ shall be changed to ‘3- EMCS - Central Circuit – Common Domain Functionality – Duty Suspension’;   + Value ‘6- EMCS - Central Circuit – External Domain Functionality – Duty Paid’ shall be added;   + Value ‘7- EMCS - Central Circuit – Common Domain Functionality – Duty Paid’ shall be added. * In the IE770 message the following change will be implemented:   **FROM**  ---------SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY  Business Process Code R n..2 TC87  Downtime Start Date and Time R dateTime  Type R a1 TC89  Downtime End Date and Time D dateTime C059  Explanation O an..350  Explanation\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  **TO**  ---------SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY  Business Process Code R n..2 TC87  Downtime Start Date and Time R dateTime  Type R a1 TC89  Downtime End Date and Time D dateTime C059  Justification O an..350  Justification\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 Excise BPMs will not be aligned regarding the proposed update in codelist TC87 and regarding the renaming of the respective data items in IE770. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since for FESS it concerns a documentation update only. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC.  During 2025, CS/MISE will be migrated to CS/MIS2, which is a joint statistics tool for Customs and Excise Domain, thus this change will be implemented in CS/MIS2 as well. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-376; * **Other RFCs:** CSMISE-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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[21]](#footnote-22) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-341 – Filling of the Data Group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER in the IE829, IE839 messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-341 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM638230 | | Known Error | KE24530 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  In IM638230, a discrepancy has been observed by NA-AT regarding the filling of the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in the IE829 and IE839 messages. For an Export-related movement, since a Consignee is understood to be the person representing the Consignor at the office of export, there have been two issues identified.  More specifically, in the data group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER of IE829 and IE839 messages, for the case of “Destination Type Code = Export”, the “TraderID” and “EORI Number” data items are optional, and the required data items name and address are not sufficient for a unique identification of the Consignee Trader.  Further to this, in the most common case, the Consignors of e-ADs do not know beforehand who is going to submit the export declaration, so as to declare this in the e-AD. Indeed, it is very likely that the different e-ADs that are included in the same Export declaration have different values under the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group.  On the other hand, the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group has only a multiplicity of 1x in the IE829 and IE839 messages. Thus, it is not clear with what values should the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group be filled in the IE829 and IE839 messages in the case where the respective data group is different in the included e-ADs.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * The existing MADs will be updated as follows: * IE829 – NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT (C\_EXP\_NOT)   + The existing technical term (data group) “(CONSIGNEE) TRADER” will be updated to: “**(CONSIGNEE) TRADER**”: **1x** **O** * IE839 – CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD (C\_CUS\_REJ)   + The existing technical term (data group) “(CONSIGNEE) TRADER” will be updated to: “**(CONSIGNEE) TRADER**”: **1x** **O** | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 Excise BPMs will not be aligned with the specifications. It shall be noted that there are not any significant business continuity risks associated with the implementation of this RFC. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns a documentation update only. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-378; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-342 – Moving the Data Item 'Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export' under the Data Group 'EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE' of IE829/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-342 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM689040 | | Known Error | KE24532 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/04/2024 | | Requester | NA-RO | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In IM689040, a discrepancy has been observed by NA-RO in the FESS specifications regarding the "Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export" data item under the "EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD" data group of the IE829 message. More specifically, the data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” acts as a flag regarding whether the IE829 message reports that the Export Declaration has been accepted, or that the goods have been released for Export.  Therefore, it has erroneously been listed under “EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD" data group, which has multiplicity 999x and refers to the e-ADs included in the Export Declaration.  Consequently, the data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” shall be moved under the data group “EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE”, which has multiplicity 1x and refers to the Export Declaration and its acceptance or release.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. The updates are highlighted in yellow.   * ~~More specifically, the~~The existing MADs will be updated as follows:   + IE829 – NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT (C\_EXP\_NOT)   The existing technical term (data item) “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” will be removed from “EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD” and will be added under “EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE” with the following attributes:  **---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE**  Reference Number of Sender Customs Office R an8 R032 R236  Identification of Sender Customs Officer O an..35  Date of Acceptance D date C222  Date of Release D date C222  Document Reference Number R an..21 R100  Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export R n1 TC27   * Class C222 will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  IF <EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD. Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export > is "0"  THEN  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> is 'R'  < EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> does not apply  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> is ‘R’  **TO**  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE. Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export > is "0"  THEN  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> is 'R'  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> does not apply  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> is ‘R’ | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 existing data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” will still be erroneously listed under “EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD” data group, which has multiplicity 999x and refers to the e-ADs that are included in the Export Declaration. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-380; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Table 7 of Annex I to delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636 | |
| **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 | ~~CAB #211 on 02/07/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[22]](#footnote-23) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-343 – New business validation on the “Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item of the IE818 – Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-343 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM691016 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/04/2024 | | Requester | NA-ΒΕ | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  In IM691016, NA-BE proposed the introduction of an additional business validation on the "Date of Arrival of Excise Products" data item of the IE818 (Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export) message:  **---REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT**  Date of Arrival of Excise Products R date BR023    More specifically, the existing BR023 checks that the submission date of the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the date of arrival of excise products declared in the draft report of receipt/export. The inclusion of an additional Business Rule has been proposed in order to check that the date of arrival of excise products that is declared in the Report of Receipt/Export is also equal or after the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD.  This will prevent the case of IE818 messages received from other NAs in which the date of arrival of excise products is earlier than the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a new Business Rule shall be imposed on the occurrences of the data item Date of Arrival of Excise Products in the IE818 – ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT message.  The following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs.  More specifically, the existing MADs will be updated as follows:   1. A new class ‘BRxx1’ will be created and associated to the <Date of Arrival of Excise Products> data item of the IE818 message with the following details:   *BR ID:* BRxx1    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:* It is obligatory that the Date of Arrival of Excise Products that is included in the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the Date of Dispatch that is included in the e-AD/e-SAD message.    *FESS Validation Rule:* The date of arrival of excise products that is included in the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the date of dispatch in the e-AD/e-SAD  *IE:*   * Draft IE818(draft report of receipt/export)   *Data Item:*  REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Date of Arrival of Excise Products  ATTRIBUTES.Date of Arrival of Excise Products  *Optionality:* Mandatory | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 FESS will not be updated to validate that the date of arrival of excise products in the draft Report of Receipt/Export is equal or after the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-381; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 6) | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-345 – Validations regarding the usage of temporary authorisations in e-AD/e-SAD/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-345 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM629844 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 18/09/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion ~~to~~at the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As per IM629844, NA-BE raised the issue at the ECWP meeting in September 2023 that there should be a requirement in the common specifications to validate e-SAD regarding the temporary certified consignee authorisations used. More specifically, a SEED authorisation of type temporary certified consignee which is marked as not re-usable, should only be validated for a single e-SAD. In addition, summing up the quantities in the different e-SADs having the same temporary certified consignee should not exceed the quantities mentioned in the SEED authorization of this consignee.  Further to the request by NA-BE, it shall be noted that there are three types of temporary authorisations, i.e. Temporary Registered Consignee, Temporary Certified Consignor and Temporary Certified Consignee. A temporary authorisation can cover one or several movements. In both cases, a temporary authorisation can only concern one Consignor and one Consignee for a given period of validity and a certain quantity of goods (expressed in the unit associated with the product code).  According to the EMCS principle for semantic validations, the National Excise Application at the MSA of Dispatch has to validate successfully the business compliance of the messages before transmission. It is the responsibility of the MSA of Dispatch of the Consignor related to the temporary authorisation, to validate the business content of the submitted message by the Consignor, in relation to the usage of this temporary authorisation. In order to perform the validations, the MSA of Dispatch needs to implement a mechanism to track the usage of the related temporary authorisations in all respective movements.  Thus, four new business validations should be added to check the data validity regarding the usage of Temporary Authorisations.  **Proposed solution:**  Three new Business Rules shall be imposed on the occurrences of the technical term Quantity in the IE801 – E-AD/E-SAD, IE815 – SUBMITTED DRAFT OF E-AD/E-SAD, and IE825 – SUBMITTED DRAFT OF SPLITTING OPERATION information exchanges, as well as a new Business Rule on the occurrence of the technical term Journey Time in the IE815 – SUBMITTED DRAFT OF E-AD/E-SAD, IE813 – CHANGE OF DESTINATION, and IE825 – SUBMITTED DRAFT OF SPLITTING OPERATION information exchanges.  The following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs.   More specifically, the existing MADs will be updated as follows:     1. A new class ‘BRxx2’ will be created and associated with the <Quantity> technical term of the IE815 message with the following details:     *BR ID:* BRxx2    *BR Category:* SEED – Registration Data    *BR Description:* In case of a re-useable temporary authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs/e-SADS (per excise product and temporary authorisation) of the respective movement must be within the amount declared in the temporary authorisation. The amount of each movement should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in SEED while obtaining the temporary authorisation.  *Source FESS BPMs*: L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD    *FESS Validation Rule:* Compared to the data declared in seed and the previous movements of the reusable temporary authorisations, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs/e-SADs is less or equal to the quantity left to use per both temporary authorisations (for each excise product).    *IE:* Draft IE815(draft e-AD/e-SAD)    *Data Item:* (BODY)E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity    *Optionality:* ~~Optional~~Mandatory    *Comments:* Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement.   1. A new class ‘BRxx3’ will be created and associated with the <Quantity> technical term of the IE801 message with the following details:   *BR ID:* BRxx3    *BR Category:* SEED – Registration Data    *BR Description:* It is obligatory for an e-AD/e-SAD created as a result of a change of destination that in case of a re-useable temporary authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs/e-SADS (per excise product and temporary authorisation) of the respective movement must be within the amount declared in the temporary authorisation. The amount of each movement should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in seed while obtaining the temporary authorisation.  *Source FESS BPMs*: L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD    *FESS Validation Rule:* Compared to the data declared in seed and the previous movements of the reusable temporary authorisations, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs/e-SADs is less or equal to the quantity left to use per both temporary authorisations (for each excise product).    *IE:* Draft IE801 (e-AD/e-SAD)    *Data Item:* (BODY)E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity  *Note: Due to the fact that the (BODY) E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity is not contained in the IE813 message, it is proposed (for consistency reasons) that the current BR is applied to the IE801 message.*    *Optionality:* ~~Optional~~Mandatory    *Comments:* Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement.   1. A new class ‘BRxx4’ will be created and associated with the <Quantity> technical term of the IE825 message with the following details:   *BR ID:* BRxx4    *BR Category:* SEED – Registration Data    *BR Description:* In case of a temporary registered authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs (per excise product and temporary registered authorisation) contained in the draft splitting operation must be within the amount declared in the temporary registered authorisation. In case of a re-useable temporary registered authorisation, the amount to be received by the temporary registered consignee should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in SEED while obtaining the temporary registered authorisation.  *Source FESS BPMs*: L4-CORE-01-18-Splitting of Consignment    *FESS Validation Rule*: Compared to the data declared in seed, the former e-AD, and the previous movements of the reusable temporary registered authorisation, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs is less or equal to the quantity that can be used by the temporary registered authorisation (for each excise product).    *IE:* Draft IE825 (draft splitting operation)    *Data Item:* (BODY)E-AD.Quantity    *Optionality:* ~~Optional~~Mandatory    *Comments:* Subject to national implementation.   1. A new class ‘BRxx5’ will be created and associated with the <Journey Time> technical term of the IE815, IE813, and IE825 messages with the following details:   *BR ID:* BRxx5    *BR Category:* Relation    *BR Description:* It is obligatory that the journey time of the draft message is such that the movement is completed before or at the expiry date of the temporary authorisation(s) declared in SEED.  *Source FESS BPMs*:  L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD  L4-CORE-01-12-Change of Destination  L4-CORE-01-18-Splitting of Consignment    *FESS Validation Rule*: The journey time allows the movement to be completed before or at the date of expiry of the temporary authorisation(s).    *IE:*   * Draft IE815 (drafr e-AD/e-SAD); * Draft IE813 (draft change of destination); * Draft IE825 (draft splitting operation);     *Data Item:*  (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Journey Time  (UPDATE) E-AD/E-SAD.Journey Time  (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD.Journey Time    *Optionality:* ~~Optional~~Mandatory    *Comments:* Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then FESS will not be updated to validate the necessary values of the temporary authorisations against SEED data. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-383; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 1 and Table 5 and Table 6) | |
| **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 | ~~CAB #211 02/07/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[23]](#footnote-24) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-346 – Use of IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch for a removed ARC from the Export Declaration Amendment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-346 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of Functionality | | Incidents | IM660219 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 10/01/2024 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in the related RFC FESS-322, there is a business need that the MSA of Export has the delta between the ARCs included in the IE515 – Export Declaration and IE513 – Export Declaration Amendment messages, in case that any ARCs have been excluded from IE513, while they were included in the IE515 message.  In case of excluded e-ADs, the MSA of Dispatch should be informed electronically via EMCS, so as to revert the state back to “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch too. Currently, there is no mechanism foreseen for this case. As per the Known Error KE24040, the MSA of Dispatch can be informed outside the EMCS System and/or the TIM\_EAD\_ESAD for each excluded ARC will expire and the standard procedure will follow.  NA-AT has proposed to use the IE839 - CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD message, to inform the MSA of Dispatch that the states of the included e-AD(s) in the IE839 message should be reverted to “Accepted” due to exclusion from the IE513 message. Such an IE839 message could be sent by the MSA of Export as soon as it has the list of any excluded e-ADs from the IE513 message and has reverted their states to “Accepted” at the MSA of Export. The Consignor could also be informed by the MSA of Dispatch via an IE839 message. In order to allow having an IE839 message with such values, a new Rejection Reason Code could be added to the technical codelist TC18 – Customs Rejection Reason Code. Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that the IE839 in this case does not actually inform about any rejection of export declaration, but only about the excluded e-AD(s) from the Export Declaration Amendment.  It shall be noted that the proposed solution for this RFC should be viewed together with the related proposed solution in the RFC FESS-322.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * In the matrix model of the Technical Codelist TC18 – Customs Rejection Reason Code, the value ‘6 – ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message’ shall be added. * The condition C212, which is applied in data groups of IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs in Phase 4.2, in Annex 4.5 can be found the finalised proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2.   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is *‘ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message’*  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'   * Updates in the State Transition Diagrams.   The following updates will take place in the STDs that are in the FESS BPMs under the directory 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM>EMCS>Core, 06\_States:  STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to state “Accepted”, with the message exchange marked as “IE839 (excluded e-AD after amendment of the Export declaration)”.   STD at Destination - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to state “Accepted”, with the message exchange marked as “IE839 (excluded e-AD after amendment of the Export declaration)”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (…).   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 Excise BPMs will not be updated with the necessary specifications, that allow to re-use the IE839 message, so as to inform the MSA of Dispatch/Consignor, about ARC(s) removed from the Export Declaration Amendment. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-384; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-322. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-347 – Update of SEED RAD and RADM non-functional requirements in alignment with overall TAXUD targets/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-347 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications defect | | Incidents | IM720745 | | Known Error | KE24664 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 29/04/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As identified by EMCS CPT, the availability requirements in FESS for SEED have not been updated since the initial version of FESS. Therefore, the availability requirements in the FESS specifications for SEED need to be updated, in order to reflect the current best service that DG TAXUD can provide to the NAs, regarding the availability of Central SEED.  Regarding the provided service levels, TAXUD employs internal mechanisms so that the Central SEED services are delivered effectively. These mechanisms translate to a certain Availability class, which has specific values for the technical terms of: ‘Uptime Service Availability’, ‘Unplanned Downtime’ and lastly, ‘Disaster Recovery’.  In particular to disaster recovery, this refers to the ability to protect the application/data from major unplanned/natural outages at a production site. It shall be noted that there are not any particular legal requirements restricting the disaster recovery time. The FESS specifications currently do not cover the case for disaster recovery. Therefore, this RFC will update the FESS specifications, so that it is stated that disaster recovery will be according to the Availability class that TAXUD can guarantee to provide for the Central SEED application.  The issue regarding the unavailability of Central SEED has been also discussed at the Fiscalis workshop on 30-31/05/2024. It has been mentioned by certain NAs that their National SEED registers can deal with the unavailability of the Central SEED, in case that the unavailability happens for a limited time period (up to one week approximately). Regarding the impact of the unavailability of Central SEED, it needs to be considered that for basic functions of EMCS (such as submission of e-AD/e-SAD), the submitted message to the National Excise Application should be validated against the National SEED application. Therefore, the main impact of the unavailability of Central SEED is in case of updates in the registration and authorisation data, which have been initiated in a National SEED register during this unavailability. In this scenario, there will be de-synchronisation of the databases of the National SEED applications of the NAs regarding the particular registration and authorisation data.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in FESS BPMs:   * Under the L4 BPMs for ‘Registration and Authorisation Data Management’ (RADM) and ‘Reference Data Management’ (RDM), the ‘Availability Requirements’ described under the path *Requirements/Requirements Trees* shall be updated.   More specifically, the existing requirements: *‘Permanent Availability’*, *‘High Availability’*, *‘General Availability’*, *‘Office Availability’*, *‘Scheduled Availability’* and *‘Disconnected Availability’* will be removed as obsolete.  A new requirement will be added as below:  *Name: Provided Availability*  *Description:*  *The availability requirements are the following:*  *Uptime Service Availability: 99,4%*  *Unplanned Downtime: 13h (max), RPO≤1h*  *Disaster Recovery: Max RTO<1w, RPO≤1d*  *(where RPO=Recovery Point Objective, RTO=Recovery Time Objective)*   * The ‘*Provided Availability’* requirement will then be associated to the functionalities of SEED for ‘Reference Data Management’ (RDM) and ‘Registration and Authorisation Data Management’ (RADM).   More specifically, in L4 BPMs, under the path *Requirements/ Requirements Trees,* the following functionalities of RDM and RADM are listed and each one of them will be associated to the ‘*Provided Availability’* requirement.  RDM  *Maintenance and dissemination of reference data other than the EOL*  *Consultation of public reference data by economic operators*  *Consultation of reference data by MSA central services*  RADM  *Consultation of registration data by MSA central services*  *Consultation of registration information by Economic Operators*  *Dissemination of registration data*  *Maintenance of the Central Register*  *SEED statistics*  It shall be noted that the abovementioned association of the RDM/RADM functionalities with the respective Availability Requirement will be part of the exported EU Customs Reports. More specifically, it can be found per RDM/RADM, under the section “Non-functional Requirements” of Annex 3: ‘Requirements’. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * SRD for SEED (Medium).   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 FESS specifications will not be in full alignment with the availability levels for Central SEED, as per the current service level that DG TAXUD can provide. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | N/A | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** 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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[24]](#footnote-25) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-348 – Additional validation for business consistency between the UBR cross-check result information and the Diagnosis code data items of the IE839 message/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-348 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM681452 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/03/2024 | | Requester | ITSM3-TES | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  It has been observed that there is lack of a validation between the values of the data items Validation Result and Diagnosis code of the IE839 message, to maintain business consistency. More specifically, currently, there is no such validation, and nothing prevents the values that are set in IE839 for the Validation Result and Diagnosis code are inconsistent.  This issue could be handled by a new rule imposed on the Diagnosis code. Such a rule could state for example that if the Validation Result is '0' then the Diagnosis Code should be '2 = Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD or no corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration'. If the Validation Result is '1' and e.g. both COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT are present, then the Diagnosis Code should be '7 = Weight/mass do not match and CN codes do not match' etc.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs:   * Class Rxx1:   A new Class Rxx1 shall be introduced with the following wording:  *IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '0',*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '2' (Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD or no corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration).*  *IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND both data groups <COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> and <NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> are present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '7' (Weight/mass do not match and CN codes do not match).*  *ELSE IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND only the data group <COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '6' (CN codes do not match).*  *ELSE IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND only the data group <NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '4' (Weight/mass do not match).*   * ΙΕ839 Message Allocation Diagram:   Data Group Diagram “UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT for IE839” shall be updated to include the new class Rxx1 applied to “Diagnosis Code” technical term. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Low); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 FESS will be in misalignment with the specifications. There are no business continuity risks associated with the implementation of this RFC. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns a documentation update only. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-385; * **Other RFCs:** -. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[25]](#footnote-26) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | xx/xx/2024 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-349 – Deprecation of MVS messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-349 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Change of functionality | | Incidents | IM722881 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 31/05/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  It has been observed that after transferring the duty-paid related information from MVS messages into ACO messages (IE721, IE867, IE868, and IE869) in Phase 4.0 (February 2023), MVS messages remain only for administrative cooperation regarding undocumented movements. Due to the low usage volume of MVS messages in the EMCS production environment and the fact that these messages currently do not have strict legal requirements it is proposed that these messages should be phased out from EMCS. On a few occasions when there is a need, MSAs can use the CCN Mail 3 to exchange such information between MSAs. The necessary actions need to be taken at the Common Specifications so that the MVS messages are correctly deprecated.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates are required in order to phase out MVS functionality from the Excise BPMs:   * Processes: * Process L4-ACO-01-00-Administrative Cooperation shall be updated to exclude the MVS functionality; * Process L4-ACO-01-11-Movement Verification–Request (Request) shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-12-Movement Verification-Reminder shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-13-Movement Verification-Request (Results) shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-14-Handle Deadline Extension- Movement Verification shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-23-Handle Refusal Response- Movement Verification shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-25-Movement Verification for Duty Paid Movements-Spontaneous information shall be deprecated; * Process L4-ACO-01-27-Movement Verification–Provide Feedback shall be deprecated; * The L1, L2, and L3 processes that are impacted by the removal of the MVS functionality shall be updated accordingly. * The following message allocation diagrams will be removed: * IE722 MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST (C\_MVS\_SUB); * IE723 MOVEMENT VERIFICATION ANSWER (C\_MVS\_ANS); * IE724 REMINDER MESSAGE FOR MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST (C\_MVS\_REM); * IE725 MOVEMENT VERIFICATION RESULTS (C\_MVS\_RES). * Classes ‘C166’, ‘C167’, ‘C168’, ‘C169’, ‘C170’, ‘C171’, ‘C172’, ‘C173’, ‘C174’, ‘C175’, ‘C176’, ‘C177’, ‘C178’, ‘C179’, ‘C183’, ‘C185’, ‘C187’, and ‘C189’ will be removed; * Classes ‘R217’, ‘R224’, ‘R229’, ‘R238’, ‘R239’, and ‘R241’ will be removed; * Class R275 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  “For information exchanges from United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the Follow Up Correlation ID/~~MV Correlation ID~~ must be related to Northern Ireland (i.e. Member State to be ‘XI’ as derived from its structure).”  **TO:**  “For information exchanges from United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the Follow Up Correlation ID must be related to Northern Ireland (i.e. Member State to be ‘XI’ as derived from its structure).”   * The matrix model of the technical codelist TC99 – MV Request Type shall be removed; * The matrix model of the technical codelist TC100 – Result Code shall be removed; * In the matrix model of the technical codelist TC49 – Functional Error Codes, values ‘94’ and ‘95’ shall be updated:   **FROM:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 94 | Invalid Follow Up Correlation ID~~/ MV Correlation ID~~ | The structure of the Follow Up Correlation ID ~~or MV Correlation ID~~ does not conform to the specifications given in Rule R083. | | 95 | Unknown Follow Up Correlation ID ~~/ MV Correlation ID~~ | The Follow Up Correlation ID ~~or MV Correlation ID~~ of the received message is not known, whereas it is expected to be known. |     **TO:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 94 | Invalid Follow Up Correlation ID | The structure of the Follow Up Correlation ID does not conform to the specifications given in Rule R083. | | 95 | Unknown Follow Up Correlation ID | The Follow Up Correlation ID of the received message is not known, whereas it is expected to be known. | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (High); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (High). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the FESS will be in misalignment with the specifications due to the removal of the MVS functionality. Furthermore, since Member States do not use it or use it in very few cases, there are no business continuity risks. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since there is no impact on current legislation.  Nevertheless, technical and business statistics from CS/MISE, which are related to MVS messages, should be kept. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-387; * **Other RFCs:** CSMISE-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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### FESS-350 – Inclusion of the IE839 message in the scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-350 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM634903 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 30/05/2024 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  In the discussions at the Fiscalis group on 30-31/05/2024 for the RFC FESS-321, NA-BE requested that the reception of an IE519 - EXPORT DECLARATION REJECTION NOTIFICATION TO MSA OF EXPORT should always trigger the sending/forwarding of an IE839 - CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD to inform the MSA of Dispatch about the rejection of the related export declaration and not only in the specific scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration.  For the case of Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832), the related RFCs FESS-320 and DDNEA-P4-359 foresee a specifications’ update so that the MSA of Export sends the IE839 message to the MSA of Dispatch, after the reception of the IE519 due to e-AD request rejection.  In addition, in the RFC FESS-321, it is proposed that AES sends after the IE537 message, additionally, an IE519 message. For this scenario, it was already foreseen, as of Phase 4.1, that the IE839 is sent to the MSA of Dispatch, following the rejection of the Export declaration due to negative cross-check result.  Lastly, for the business scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration, it is proposed that the existing specifications are updated as applicable to specify that, after the reception of IE519, the IE839 message is sent by the MSA of Export to the MSA of Dispatch. After successful reception of the IE839 message by the MSA of Dispatch, the MSA of Dispatch should also forward the respective IE839 message to the Consignor.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the FESS BPMs. The changes have been marked with yellow highlight.   * In ‘TC Customs Rejection Reason code, a new value ‘x’ will be added with description ‘*Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration’*; * The condition C212, which is applied in data groups of the IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs in Phase 4.2, in Annex 4.5 can be found the finalised proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2.   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection *Reason Code> is ‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration'*  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'   * Updates in the State Transition diagrams.   The following updates will take place in the STDs that are in the FESS BPMs under the directory 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM>EMCS>Core, 06\_States. It shall be noted that the messages on the conditional flows will be depicted in this RFC, as well as on the STDs in the form (received IE) ^(sent IE). (sent IE).  STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is same as MS of Export   * The description of the existing transition from “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” will be updated from IE519 to IE519 [Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration].   STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * The description of the existing transition from “Accepted” to “Accepted” via IE839 will be updated to include also the transition via IE839 [Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration].   STD at Destination - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * The description of the transition from “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” will be updated from IE519 to IE519[Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration]^IE839[Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration]. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of Not Implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, the MSA of Dispatch/Consignor (as applicable) will not be properly informed, via an IE839 message with rejection reason ‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration’, regarding the Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-389; * **Other RFCs:**-. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of Change in Legislation | Annexes to the Commission Delegated Regulation, supplementing Council Directive 2020/262, Annex I (Table 8) | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[26]](#footnote-27) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

### DDNEA Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2

#### DDNEA-P4-359 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-359 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM634903 | | Known Error | KE24027 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 16/10/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-320, stemming from issue IM634903, the KE24027 “Clarifications for the procedures after an e-AD Request Rejection” was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications and a workaround solution for the procedures following an e-AD Request Rejection. More specifically, in case the Export declaration contains multiple ARCs, AES sends multiple e-AD requests (IE532) per ARC. If AES receives at least one negative response with the IE832 message for an ARC, this leads to the rejection of the entire export declaration. Then, at the EMCS side, all the e-ADs included in the Export declaration should be in the “Accepted” state, both at the MSA of Export and the MSA of Dispatch. The KE24027 was proposed since the AES specifications did not foresee a message to be sent to the MSA of Export to inform about the rejection of the Export declaration and its included ARCs. The logic of the workaround was that the MSA of Export, upon sending an IE832 message, found the included ARCs in the export declaration message on its own. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the export declaration and retrieving the ARC number included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number was proposed to be used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the Export declaration.  However, it has been pointed out that certain issues could arise and that the workaround solution is not error-proof. For example, it has been noted that in principle there can be cases of more than one export declarations using the same LRN. Therefore, for Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic. When EMCS receives IE532 - e-AD Request messages for an Export Declaration message and EMCS responds to at least one e-AD request with an IE832 - e-AD Request Rejection message, then the Export declaration gets rejected at the Customs Office of Export and AES should send the IE519 message to the MSA of Export to inform about the rejection of the Export declaration and which are the included ARCs.  The MSA of Export should then proceed to update the states so that all the e-ADs of the Export declaration are in the “Accepted” state. Then, the MSA of Export should inform the MSA of Dispatch about the rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection and its included ARCs via an IE839 message (with a new rejection reason equal to “e-AD Request Rejection”). In this manner, the states can become “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch, too.  Lastly, since there is a dependency with the implementation in AES and the interface of AES-EMCS remains a national matter, the updated specifications will also specify the existing solution, which had been described via the related workarounds of Phase 4.1. More specifically, the specifications will be updated to include the workarounds in KE24027 “Clarifications for the procedures after an e-AD Request Rejection”, and KE24040 – “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request”, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own the respective ARCs via the IE532 messages.  In particular for the case of rejection of the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, due to e-AD request rejection, the DDNXA specifications shall not foresee the sending of the IE519 (since the IE519 message serves to inform about an Export Declaration rejection, while in case of rejection of the IE513 message, there is no actual rejection of the Export Declaration). For this case, the EMCS specifications shall foresee that EMCS should retrieve on its own the list of ARCs included in the rejected IE513, from the IE532 messages received for the respective LRN (as per the workaround KE24040 of Phase 4.1).  The scenarios after an Export Declaration Amendment are further elaborated under the related RFC DDNEA-P4-361.  **Proposed solution:**  The issues reported in the [Problem Statement] were discussed with AES Central Project Team and AES National Project Managers and the agreement is to update both DDNXA for AES and FESS&DDNEA for EMCS. Thus, there is a dependency. The following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA Specifications.   * DDNEA Main Document * Under section II.II.1.4 ‘Export Operation at office of export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection’, for the case that MSA of Dispatch is MSA of Export as well the paragraph below will be updated to become:   “*[…] In this scenario, the e-AD request is rejected since the ARC is* ~~is not known to the MSA of Dispatch where the e-AD request is submitted~~ *either wrong, or not for Export, or not in the correct state in that MSA, when it receives the e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ)*  *II.II.1.4.1 Export Operation at office of export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection*  *According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA of Dispatch including export as the destination type (Destination Type Code is “6 = Destination - Export”). The validation of the submitted draft e-AD passes successfully and the MSA of Dispatch returns the validated e-AD (IE801: C\_EAD\_VAL) back to the Consignor. Finally, the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to “Accepted” and the TIM\_EAD\_ESAD timer is initiated.*  *The Declarant/Representative submits an export declaration (IE515) to the Customs Export Application. This IE is not depicted in the Time Sequence Diagrams as it takes place fully in the AES system. The e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ) is sent from the Customs Export Application to another MSA of Dispatch. Thus, MSA of Dispatch ~~2~~ returns an IE832 (N\_EAD\_REJ) to the Customs Export Application, since the ARC ~~is not known.~~ either wrong, or not for Export, or not in the correct state. Then, the Customs Export Application sends the IE519-Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export (N\_EXP\_REJ) message to the MSA of Dispatch, to inform about the rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection and the included ARCs in the declaration\*. The MSA of Dispatch builds and sends a rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) to the Consignor with rejection reason equal to “e-AD request rejection”, which includes the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. ~~The flow ends at this point.~~*  *~~It should be noted that the same flow will be followed in case there is a single MSA of Dispatch, but the ARC is either wrong or not in the correct state in that MSA of Dispatch when it receives the e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ).~~*  *\* It shall be noted that in the event of an IE832 and in case that AES has not implemented sending the IE519 in case of e-AD request Rejection, a workaround solution in EMCS should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Dispatch, upon sending an IE832, which signifies the rejection of the export declaration, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration).*  *The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of e-AD Request Rejection for an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message. Between the IE532 messages received for an initial Export Declaration and an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, the Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export (IE539) message has been sent by AES for the initial Export Declaration. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends, both for the initial Export Declaration and for the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message.”*   * Under section II.II.2.4 ‘Export Operation at Office of Export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection, when MSA of Dispatch is different from MSA of export’, the paragraph below will be updated to become:   *“[…] In this scenario, the e-AD request is rejected since the ARC is either wrong, or not for Export, or not in the correct state in that MSA of Destination/MSA of Export when it receives the e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ)*  *II.II.2.4.1 Export Operation at office of export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection*  *According to this scenario, the Consignor submits a draft e-AD (IE815: N\_EAD\_SUB) to the MSA of Dispatch including export as the destination type (Destination Type Code is “6 = Destination - Export”). Upon successful validation of the draft e-AD, the MSA of Dispatch returns the validated e-AD (IE801: C\_EAD\_VAL) back to the Consignor and disseminates it to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export. Finally, the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is set to “Accepted” and the TIM\_EAD\_ESAD timer is initiated. The Declarant/Representative submits an export declaration (IE515) to the Customs Export Application. This IE is not depicted in the Time Sequence Diagrams as it takes place fully in the AES system. The e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ) is sent from the Customs Export Application to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export ~~2~~. Thus, MSA of Destination/MSA of Export ~~2~~ returns an IE832 (N\_EAD\_REJ) to the Customs Export Application, since the ARC is either wrong, or not for Export, or not in the correct state. Then, the Customs Export Application sends the IE519-Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export (N\_EXP\_REJ) message to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export, to inform about the rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection and the included ARCs in the declaration\*. ~~The flow ends at this point.~~*  *~~It should be noted that the same flow will be followed in case there is a single MSA of Destination/MSA of Export, but the ARC is either wrong or not in the correct state in that MSA of Destination/MSA of Export when it receives the e-AD request (IE532: N\_EAD\_REQ).~~*  *The MSA of Destination/MSA of Export builds and sends a rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) to the MSA of Dispatch with rejection reason equal to “e-AD request rejection”, which includes the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. The state of the e-AD(s) at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export is changed to “Accepted”.*  *Then, upon reception of the IE839 message by the MSA of Dispatch, the state of the e-AD(s) at the MSA of Dispatch is changed to “Accepted” and the rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) is forwarded to the Consignor.*  *\* It shall be noted that in the event of an IE832 and in case that AES has not implemented sending the IE519 in case of e-AD request Rejection, the workaround solution should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Export, upon sending an IE832, which signifies the rejection of the export declaration, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration).*  *The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of e-AD Request Rejection for an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message. Between the IE532 messages received for an initial Export Declaration and an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, the Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export (IE539) message has been sent by AES for the initial Export Declaration. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends, both for the initial Export Declaration and for the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message.*   * The changes proposed above in sections II.II.1.4.1 and II.II.2.4.1 will be reflected in the respective TSD-time sequence diagrams and in the CLD-collaboration diagrams of the DDNEA Main Document. The respective TSD and CLD diagrams for section II.II.2.4.1 are provided in Annex 4.2. * In addition, the following updates in the State Transition Diagrams of Sub-Section II.IV STATE-TRANSITION DIAGRAMS FOR EXPORT SCENARIOS are proposed.   It shall be noted that the messages on the conditional flows will be depicted in this RFC, as well as on the STDs, in the form (received IE) ^(sent IE). (sent IE).  STD at Dispatch under section II.IV.1.1.1 When MS of Dispatch is MS of Export as well   * Addition of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” via IE519 [e-AD request Rejection].   STD at Dispatch under section II.IV.1.1.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted” to “Accepted” via IE839[e-AD request Rejection]; * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to “Accepted” via IE839([e-AD request Rejection] after amendment of Export declaration).   STD at Destination under section II.IV.1.2.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export”, to “Accepted” via IE519[e-AD request Rejection] ^ IE839[e-AD request Rejection]; * Update of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to “Accepted” from to IE532^IE832(after amendment of Export declaration) IE532^IE832.IE839([e-AD request Rejection] after amendment of Export declaration).   The respective STDs when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export (STD at Dispatch, STD at Destination) are provided in Annex 4.4.   * Appendix B - Codelists   In TC18 - Customs Rejection Reason Code, a new code ‘x’ will be added with description: *'e-AD Request Rejection*'.   * Appendix D – Technical Message Structure   The condition C212, which is applied in various data groups of the IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs, the final proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2 can be found in Annex 4.5.  IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> *is 'e-AD Request Rejection*'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'   * Appendix H: Directory with XML Schemas (XSDS)   The tcl.xsd file shall be impacted in order to reflect the aforementioned update in TC18.   * 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 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 RFC FESS-320. Moreover, the DDNEA specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how the MSA of Export can obtain the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration message (IE515) (i.e. via the respective IE519 message sent by AES, which informs about the export declaration rejection due to e-AD request rejection and includes the full list of ARC(s)). Thus, the related workarounds should still be applicable, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own all the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration, upon rejection of the export declaration due to e-AD request rejection. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level (addition of a new value in the technical codelist TC18) and at the semantic level regarding the coordination protocol (IE839 message regarding the e-AD Request Rejection) as well as business compliance (update of C212).  It shall be noted that a transformation solution is not suggested for this RFC. Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before Mr, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that they behave as today when communicating with Phase 4.1 MSAs whereas they behave in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4 .2 MSAs (only), 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.  Regarding the interaction between AES and EMCS in the National Domain, it shall be noted that the goal is to have a synchronized deployment in production of the related changes in AES and EMCS. Nevertheless, if that is not possible, there are measures in place to overcome incompatibilities. It is considered that there will be no impact on business continuity of EMCS, if the respective MSA can also support the existing workaround solution up to the moment when both AES and EMCS deployments have been completed. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all MSAs at the end of Migration Period (Mr) due to the entailed business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-320; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-361. | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[27]](#footnote-28) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/2026 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-361 – Export Declaration amendment; update of ARC(s)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-361 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM644206 | | Known Error | KE24040 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-IT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-322, stemming from issue IM644206, the KE24040 was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request and proposed a workaroundso that the MSA of Export could obtain all the included ARC number(s) in the IE513 message, as this had not been foreseen in the specifications. The logic of the workaround is that the MSA of Export gets the included ARCs in the rejected IE513 messages on its own. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the IE513 and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The workaround is not error-proof though. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the IE513 message. However, it has been pointed out that in principle, there can be cases of more than one export declaration using the same LRN. Further to this, the workaround was based on the logic that AES sends a different IE532 message for each included e-AD in IE513. However, according to the existing AES specifications, this should happen only for “new or modified” e-ADs in IE513 message.  Therefore, for Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic of Export Declaration Amendment. The KE24040 “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request” will be incorporated into the specifications and the necessary modifications in the AES specifications should take place, so that AES sends an IE532 message for each included e-AD in IE513 message.  As noted before, there is a business need that the MSA of Export has all the included ARC number(s) in the IE513 message. The list of e-ADs is needed:   * so that the MSA of Export and the MSA of Dispatch can perform any necessary state transitions, following a rejection of the IE513 message due to either an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832) or due to a negative cross-check result (IE537). This has been explained in the RFCs DDNEA-359 and DDNEA-360 respectively; * so that the MSA of Export finds whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513 message, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of any excluded e-ADs should be reverted to “**Accepted**” at the MSA of Export and at the MSA of Dispatch.   The procedure that follows in case any excluded e-AD(s) are found, is further described in the related RFC DDNEA-P4-384.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:   * DDNEA Main Document * Under Sub-Section II.II EXPORT SCENARIOS, certain clarifications will be provided for the case of Export Declaration Amendment (IE513). More specifically, it will be added that:   *The Export scenarios under II.II.1 ‘Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is MSA of export as well’ and ‘II.II.2 Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is different from MSA of export’ describe the case where the Declarant/Representative sends an Export Declaration (IE515) message to the Customs Export Application. It shall be noted that the Export scenarios may also refer to the case of an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message being submitted to the Customs Export Application (following the submission of the IE515, as per the AES procedures). Neither the IE515 nor the IE513 IEs are depicted in the Time Sequence Diagrams, as they take place fully in the AES system and are not sent directly to EMCS. Regardless of whether an IE515 or an IE513 message is submitted in AES, the Export scenarios in EMCS start with the reception of the respective e-AD Request (IE532) messages.*   * Under II.II.1 Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is MSA of export as well, it shall be noted that:   *The MSA of Dispatch finds whether there is any e-AD excluded from the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of the excluded e-AD(s) should be reverted to “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch and the Consignor should be informed via the respective Customs Rejection of e-AD (IE839) message.*  *The MSA of Dispatch can find any excluded e-ADs in order to update their state, from the delta between the ARCs of the initial Export Declaration and the IE513 message. More specifically,*   * *The list of ARCs in the original Export Declaration can be retrieved from the IE539 - Export Declaration Acceptance message sent by AES;* * *The list of ARCs in the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message can be found:* * *in case of acceptance of the IE513, from the new Export Declaration Acceptance (IE539) message sent by AES.* * *in case of rejection of the IE513, due to e-AD request rejection, or due to Negative cross-check results, the list of ARCs in IE513 can be retrieved by the MSA of Dispatch on its own, from the IE532 message(s) received by AES for the IE513, as described in sections II.II.1.3 and II.II.1.4. […]* * Under II.II.2 Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is different from MSA of export, a note will be added to describe that:   *The MSA of Destination/Export finds whether there is any e-AD excluded from the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. In such case, the state of the excluded e-AD(s) should be reverted to “Accepted” at the MSA of Destination/Export. Then, the MSA of Destination/Export should inform the MSA of Dispatch regarding the excluded e-AD(s), via the respective Customs Rejection of e-AD (IE839) message, so that the states are “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch too. The MSA of Dispatch shall then proceed to inform the Consignor via the IE839 message.*  *The MSA of Destination/Export can find any excluded e-ADs in order to update their state, from the delta between the ARCs of the initial Export Declaration and the IE513 message. More specifically,*   * *The list of ARCs in the original Export Declaration can be retrieved from the IE539 - Export Declaration Acceptance message sent by AES.* * *The list of ARCs in the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message can be found:* * *in case of acceptance of the IE513, from the new Export Declaration Acceptance (IE539) message sent by AES;* * *in case of rejection of the IE513, due to e-AD request rejection, or due to Negative cross-check results, the list of ARCs in IE513 can be retrieved by the MSA of Destination/Export on its own, from the IE532 messages received by AES for the IE513 message as described in sections II.II.2.3 and II.II.2.4. […].* | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   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 RFC FESS-322. Moreover, the DDNEA specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how the MSA of Export can find whether there has been any e-AD excluded from the IE513, while it was included in the initial Export Declaration. | | 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 | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-322; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-359, DDNEA-P4-360, DDNEA-P4-384. | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[28]](#footnote-29) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-363 – Update of rules R271 – R276

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-363 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM567289 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/12/2022 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As stated in the parent FESS RFC, during Conformance Testing, it was detected that a few test cases were failing due to violations of one of the rules introduced for NA-XI, i.e. R271, 272, R273, R274, R275 and R276. However, it shall be highlighted that in case where more than one of the NA-XI introduced rules are applied on a single message (e.g. in IE840), then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’, i.e. if one of the rules is validated successfully, then the message should pass the corresponding validations regarding its relevance to Northern Ireland. Therefore, rules R271 – R276 will have to be enhanced for clarity purposes and in alignment with Phase 3 RFCs DDNEA-P3-291 and FESS-258.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in Appendix D of the DDNEA. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.  Rules R271, R272, R273, R274, R275 and R276 shall be updated with the inclusion of the following phrase at the end of the existing wording of the rules:  (…)  Note: In the case where more than one of the rules R271 – R276 are applied on a single message, then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’ condition, i.e. if one of the rules is validated successfully, then the message should pass the corresponding validations regarding its relevance to Northern Ireland. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in a misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-307 and the DDNEA specifications will not make clear that in the case where more than one of the rules R271 – R276 are applied on a single message, then the corresponding validations should be performed based on a logical ‘OR’ condition. | | Risk assessment | This RFC does not pose business continuity risks, since it concerns documentation updates only in the DDNEA. | | Deployment approach | This RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-324; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** TRP-P4-xxx, DDNEA-P3-291, FESS-258. | |
| **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-364 – Removal of ‘SAD’ from Common Specifications

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-364 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681399 | | Known Error | KE24439 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-325, a discrepancy has been observed in the common specifications for EMCS. More specifically, due to the obsolesce of the term ‘SAD – Single Administrative Document’, there is a need for removing, replacing and renaming the respective term in the common specifications for EMCS in order to be aligned with current Customs procedure and to reflect Explanatory Note 2(e) of Annex I to Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636.  (Note: The paper-based SAD is still provided in Customs legislation for those cases where electronic exchange is not possible. The term 'customs declaration' is broader as it covers all types of declarations made for Customs purposes and therefore encompasses the SAD.  Explanatory Note 2(e) of Annex I to Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636 explains that the abbreviation 'Import SAD' is used to mean the import Customs Declaration.)  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the following Appendices of DDNEA. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   + Rule R100 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  A valid MRN or SAD Number confirmed against Customs data, according to the Customs case.  MRN = Movement Reference Number  SAD = Single Administrative Document  **TO:**  A valid MRN Number confirmed against Customs data, according to the Customs case.  MRN = Movement Reference Number   * + Condition C096 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT SAD> is 'R'  ELSE <IMPORT SAD> does not apply.  **TO:**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN < IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> is 'R'  ELSE < IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> does not apply.   * Condition C097 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**   IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN <IMPORT SAD> is 'O'  ELSE <IMPORT SAD> does not apply.  **TO:**  IF <Origin Type Code> is "2 = Origin - Import"  THEN < IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> is 'O'  ELSE < IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION> does not apply.   * In the IE801/IE815 messages, the Data Group “IMPORT SAD” and the Data Item “Import SAD Number” shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  ------IMPORT SAD  Import SAD Number R an..21  **TO:**  ------IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION  Import Customs Declaration Number R an..21   * Appendix F: Data Groups & Transaction Hierarchy   + The Data Group ‘IMPORT SAD’ with Identifier ‘ISF’ shall be renamed to ‘IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION’ with Identifier ‘ICD’; * The Data Group ‘IMPORT SAD’ with Identifier ‘IMS’ shall be renamed to ‘IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION’ with Identifier ‘ICE’. * Appendix G: Data Items   The Data Item ‘Import SAD Number’ shall be renamed to ‘Import Customs Declaration Number’.   * Appendix E: XML MAPPING   The following updates will take place in Appendix E:  **FROM:**   | **Data-group or Data-item** | **Data Type** | **XML-Tag** | | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE - E-AD/E-SAD - IMPORT SAD |  | ImportSad | | MESSAGE - E-AD/E-SAD - IMPORT SAD.Import SAD Number | an..21 | ImportSadNumber |   **TO:**   | **Data-group or Data-item** | **Data Type** | **XML-Tag** | | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE - E-AD/E-SAD – IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION |  | ImportCustomsDeclaration | | MESSAGE - E-AD/E-SAD – IMPORT CUSTOMS DECLARATION.Import Customs Declaration Number | an..21 | ImportCustomsDeclarationNumber |  * Appendices C (EMCS CORRELATION TABLES), H (XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)) and K (RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING) shall be updated accordingly. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None). | | Effect of not implementing the Change | If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in a misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-325 and the obsolete term “SAD” will remain in the DDNEA specifications. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns certain changes both at syntactic and at semantic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the XML tags in relation to the <IMPORT SAD> data group and the <Import SAD Number> data item.  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 <ImportCustomsDeclaration> and <ImportCustomsDeclarationNumber> XML tags with the <ImportSad> and <ImportSadNumber> XML tags respectively; * 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, 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 <ImportSad> and <ImportSadNumber> XML tags with the <ImportCustomsDeclaration> and <ImportCustomsDeclarationNumber> XML tags respectively in the received messages.   The related semantic changes concern the update of the wording of rule R100 and conditions C096 and C097. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the aforementioned updates will be validated only at the sending side of the respective message, in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the Common Domain. Hence, any such semantic violation deriving from the related updates by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection by the receiver. Apart from this, the change constitutes only a wording correction of the used term and does not change the business validation per se.  It is considered that the aforementioned changes have no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risk. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-325; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-365 – Minor Updates in the description of EMCS Codelists/~~Rev1~~Rev2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-365 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681404 | | Known Error | KE24357 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-326, a discrepancy has been observed in the specifications regarding some EMCS codelists and the naming of the IE818 message.  More specifically, the technical codelists TC50, TC60, and TC64 need to be updated in order to be aligned with the current specifications, as of DDNEA v3.14. ~~More specifically~~In more detail,   * In the technical codelist TC50 - Status Type, the code ‘X12’ is related to Local Clearance, however Local Clearance is not applicable in Phase 4.1; * In the Technical Codelist TC60 – Technical Message Type and Technical Codelist TC64 – Requested Message Type:   + the description of code ‘IE803’ is “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD”, while it should refer to both e-AD/e-SAD;   + ~~the description of code ‘IE818’ is erroneously “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”, while the name of the message IE818 is “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + the description of code ‘IE839’ is erroneously “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT”, while the name of the message IE839 is “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD”;   Furthermore, regarding the discrepancy in the IE818 message, the naming of the certain message has erroneously remained as “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT” throughout EMCS specifications. Therefore, it needs to be updated to be aligned with the name of the value “IE818” as exists in the technical codelists TC60/TC64 and the current legislation as amended under the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2024/289 of 12 January 2024, i.e. “ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in ~~the Appendices of~~ DDNEA:   * DDNEA Main Document * Under section II.II.1.1.2 ‘Export confirmation of Exit’, the paragraph will be updated to become:   *“[…] the MSA of Dispatch sends the Accepted or (Partially) Refused Report of Receipt/Export message (IE818: C\_DEL\_DAT) to the Consignor. […]”*   * Under section II.II.1.2.2 ‘Export Cancellation of Exit’, the paragraph will be updated to become:   *“[…]) the MSA of Dispatch sends the Accepted or (Partially) Refused Report of Receipt/Export message (IE818: C\_DEL\_DAT) to the Consignor. […]”* Under section IX.I.2.2.5 ‘Encoding the CSIDD for EMCS’, the IE Name for value ‘818’ in Table 40: MsgTypId used for an Information Exchange of EMCS shall be updated from “Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export” to “Accepted or (Partially) Refused Report of Receipt/Export”.  * Under section IX.I.3 ‘Environment’, the IE Name for value ‘818’ in Table 45: Information Exchanges exchanged via the ‘Core flow’ queue shall be updated from “Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export” to “Accepted or (Partially) Refused Report of Receipt/Export”. * Appendix B: Codelists * In the codelist TC50 “Status Type” (applied to: IE904, IE905), the code ‘X12’ shall be modified from "Accepted for Export" to (reserved) since it is related to Local Clearance which is no longer applicable; * In the codelist TC60 “Technical Message Type” (applied to: IE934), the codes shall be updated as following:   + The description for the code IE803 shall be modified to “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD”;   + The description for the code IE810 shall be modified to “CANCELLATION OF AN E-AD”;   + ~~The description for code IE818 shall be modified to “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + The description for code IE839 shall be modified to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD”. * In the codelist TC64 “Requested Message Type” (applied to: IE904, IE905), the codes shall be updated as following:   + The description for code IE803 shall be modified to “NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD”;   + ~~The description for IE818 shall be modified to “ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT”;~~   + The description for IE839 shall be modified to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD”. * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The naming of the IE818 message shall be updated as follows:  **FROM:**  IE818 - ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT (C\_DEL\_DAT)  **TO:**  IE818 - ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT (C\_DEL\_DAT)   * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS) * In tcl.xsd, TC50 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====* Status Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..*  <xs:enumeration value="X12"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * In tcl.xsd, TC60 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->* *<!--=====*Technical Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..*  <xs:enumeration value="IE803"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * In tcl.xsd, TC60 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====*Technical Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..*  <xs:enumeration value="IE810"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>CANCELLATION OF AN E-AD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * ~~In tcl.xsd, TC60 will be updated as follows:~~   *~~“…~~**~~<!-~~**~~=========================================-->~~* *~~<!--=====~~*~~Technical Message Type~~ *~~=====-->~~**~~<!--=========================================-~~**~~>~~**~~…..~~* ~~<xs:enumeration value="IE818"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>~~*~~…”~~*   * In tcl.xsd, TC60 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====*Technical Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..* <xs:enumeration value="IE839"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * In tcl.xsd, TC64 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====*Requested Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..* <xs:enumeration value="IE803"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD/E-SAD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * ~~In tcl.xsd, TC64 will be updated as follows:~~   *~~“…~~**~~<!-~~**~~=========================================-->~~**~~<!--=====~~*~~Requested Message Type~~ *~~=====-->~~**~~<!--=========================================-~~**~~>~~**~~…..~~* ~~<xs:enumeration value="IE818"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>~~*~~…”~~*   * In tcl.xsd, TC64 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====*Requested Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..* <xs:enumeration value="IE839"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * The IE818.xsd shall be updated as follows:   *“…*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<!--===== IE818:C\_DEL\_DAT -->*  *<!--===== ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT -->*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *…”*   * Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the tcl.xsd ~~file~~ and IE818.xsd files in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 FESS specifications and there will be a discrepancy in the DDNEA specifications regarding certain codelists, as described in the problem statement. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns a change at the syntactic level. The change in the XSDs concerns an update in annotations within tcl.xsd and IE818.xsd. Therefore, it is considered that this change does not pose an impact on business continuity. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-326; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **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 | ~~CAB #210 on 25/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[29]](#footnote-30) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-366 – Update the description of IE839 in TC60 and TC64

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-366 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681401 | | Known Error | KE24405 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-328, the IE839 message had been updated to be used both for Export scenarios and when the origin is Import and it is considered to be a dual-purpose message. More specifically, in the Annex of Directive 2022/1636, Table 8, which refers to the IE839 message, is named “Customs rejection of electronic administrative document (not applicable to e-SAD)”. Therefore, in order to be aligned, the same title should remain as “Customs rejection of e-AD”. This change also applies to the technical codelists TC60 and TC64, where the IE839 is present, and the name shall be changed to “Customs rejection of e-AD”.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA:   * Appendix B: Codelists * In the Technical Codelist TC60 – Technical Message Type (applied to: IE934), the description for IE839 shall be modified from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD"; * In the Technical Codelist TC64 – Requested Message Type (applied to: IE904, IE905), the description for IE839 shall be modified from “REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT” to “CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD". * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS) * In tcl.xsd, TC60 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====* Technical Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..*  <xs:enumeration value="IE839"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * In tcl.xsd, TC64 will be updated as follows:   *“…* *<!-* *=========================================-->*  *<!--=====* Requested Message Type *=====-->* *<!--=========================================-* *>* *…..*  <xs:enumeration value="IE839"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD </xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration>*…”*   * 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 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 FESS specifications and the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-328 RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns a change at the syntactic level. The change in the XSDs concerns an update in annotations within tcl.xsd. Therefore, it is considered that this change does not pose an impact on business continuity. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-328; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-367 – Attach the business codelist BC11 to additional data item

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-367 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681406 | | Known Error | KE24363 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-329, a discrepancy has been observed regarding a data item of the IE701 message. More specifically, during the update of the Technical Annexes I and II of the Council Directives, it was identified that the data item ‘Member State Code’ in the IE701 message does not have attached to it the Business Codelist BC11 - National Administrations. In the current structure of IE701, BC11 is already attached to the ‘Member State Code’ data item under ‘E-AD/E-SAD LIST REQUEST’ and ‘LIST OF MEMBER STATES’ data groups. Therefore, the specifications need to be updated so that the BC11 is also attached to the data item ‘Member State Code’.    **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 IE701 message shall be updated to become as follows:  **---REFERENCE SYNCHRONISATION**  Period from date R date TR9080 TR9115  Period to date R date TR9080 TR9115  Extraction O n1 TR9110  Member State Code O a2 BC11 | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High).   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-329 RFC. The data item “Member State Code” will not have attached to it the BC11. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks since it concerns a documentation update only. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-329; * **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 | CAB #209 on 10/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-368 – Update format of the ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code’ data item

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-368 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681415 | | Known Error | KE24355 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/09/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-331, a misalignment has been observed in the specifications regarding the format of a data item. More specifically, in the IE714 – REFUSAL OF UPDATE OF ECONOMIC OPERATORS (C\_QRO\_REF) message, the format of the data item ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code’ under the ‘FUNCTIONAL ERROR’ data group has format ‘n..5’. However, in the respective data item, is applied the technical codelist TC63, which has format ‘n..3’. Therefore, the format of the data item ‘Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code’ shall be updated in order to be aligned with the format of TC63.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The format of the existing data item in the IE714 message will be modified as follows:  **IE714 - REFUSAL OF UPDATE OF ECONOMIC OPERATORS (C\_QRO\_REF)**  **---FUNCTIONAL ERROR**  Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code R n..3 TC63     * Appendix G: Data Items   The existing entry for the <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> data item will be updated as highlighted below:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Data item** | **Format** | | … | …. | | Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code | n..3 |  * Appendix E: XML Mapping   The existing entry for the <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> data item will be updated as highlighted below:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Data-group or Data-item** | **Data Type** | | … | …. | | MESSAGE - FUNCTIONAL ERROR.Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Reason Code | n..3 |  * Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Tables   The following entries for the <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> data item will be updated as highlighted below:   | **Message Element** | **Data Type** | | --- | --- | | … | …. | | ‘MESSAGE - FUNCTIONAL ERROR.Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code’ | ‘n..3’ | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.1 (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 be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-331 RFC. In addition, there will be inconsistency between the format of the <Refusal of Update of Economic Operators Code> data item and the format of the technical codelist TC63, which is applied on the data item. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risk. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-331; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-369 – Update of the multiplicity of the IE839 data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS from 99x to 999x

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-369 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM645904 | | Known Error | KE24456 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 23/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-SK | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-333, a discrepancy has been observed by NA-SK in the specifications regarding the multiplicity of the data group NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS in the IE839 message, in relation to the corresponding message structure of the IE537 message of AES.  More specifically, in the IE537 message, the negative cross-check results are reported under the structure:  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD **999x** R  ------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  On the other hand, in the IE839 message, the corresponding message structure for reporting negative cross-check results is:  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS **99x** D  ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999x R  Therefore, the multiplicity of <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> data group in the IE839 message should be changed to be in full alignment with the IE537 message of AES.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The multiplicity of NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS data group of the IE839 message shall be changed from 99x to 999x. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.  More specifically, IE839 shall be changed:  **FROM:**  (...)  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99x D C212  (...)    **TO:**  (...)  ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 999x D C212  (...)   * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   Appendix H shall be modified accordingly to reflect the aforementioned updates in Appendix D. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low).   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 be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-333. In addition, the IE839 message will not be in alignment with the IE537 message of AES and there is a possibility that some negative cross-check results in IE537 could not be covered in IE839. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at syntactic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the ie839.xsd file in relation to the <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> data group.  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 not aligned with the new ie839.xsd file when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will be validated successfully by the receiver in any case. More specifically, the multiplicity of the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> can be up to 99x at the sending side, while the receiver can receive an IE839 with multiplicity up to 999x. Therefore, any values specified in the respective data group according to the previous format (i.e. 99x) at the sending side should also be compatible with the updated format (i.e. 999x) at the receiving side, so no further transformation actions are suggested in this case; * In the same way, if the sender is aligned with the new ie839.xsd file, while the receiver is not, the corresponding message sent may or may not be validated successfully by the receiver, depending on the case. More specifically: * In case the multiplicity of the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is up to 99x at the sending side, the messages sent will be validated successfully by the receiver, since the receiver will validate successfully an IE839 with multiplicity up to 99x in the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS>; * In case the multiplicity of the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is more than 99x at the sending side, the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. A transformation action is required at the sending side, so that the message structure follows the 99x multiplicity of the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> that the receiving side awaits. It is anticipated that there will not be any loss of business information due to the proposed message transformation. More specifically, the current specifications allow to report up to 99\*999 = 98,901 UBR cross-check results in IE839 and there is no limitation for the ARC declared under the data group UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT. Therefore, it is considered that most, if not all, of the information for the UBR cross-check results in the IE839 message can be depicted in the transformed message sent, which should be compliant to the 99x multiplicity of the data group <NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> that the receiver awaits. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risk. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-333; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-370 – Update of the wording of C147 in IE839 to use the term "Export Declaration Information"

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-370 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM646712 | | Known Error | KE24457 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/10/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-334, a discrepancy has been observed in the DDNEA specifications regarding condition C147. More specifically, the certain condition needs to be updated since the naming of ‘EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES’ data group needs to be corrected to become ‘EΧPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION’. During the update of Phase 4.1 specifications, the wording of the ‘EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES’ data group had been changed from 'EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES' to 'EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION'. However, condition C147 was not updated accordingly in order to reflect the respective change.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA:   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The description of condition C147 shall be updated as follows. The updates are highlighted in yellow.  **FROM:**  IF <REJECTION.Rejection reason code> is ‘Negative Cross-check result’​  THEN​  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES.LRN> is ‘R’​  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES. Document Reference Number> does not apply​  ELSE​  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES.LRN> does not apply​  <EXPORT CROSS CHECKING DIAGNOSES. Document Reference Number> is ‘R’  **TO:**  IF <REJECTION.Rejection reason code> is ‘Negative Cross-check result’​  THEN​  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION.LRN> is ‘R’​  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION. Document Reference Number> does not apply​  ELSE​  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION.LRN> does not apply​  <EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION. Document Reference Number> is ‘R’ | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium).   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 there will be a misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-334 RFC and the specifications as updated for Phase 4.1. Moreover, the wording of C147 will contain wrong terminology instead of the correct term ‘EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION’. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns only 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-334; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **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 | CAB #210 on 25/04/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-371 – Update of the wording of the technical rule TR0104/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-371 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM635616, IM634343 | | Known Error | KE24458 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 17/10/2023 | | Requester | NA-FI | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  A discrepancy has been observed in the DDNEA specifications regarding the description of TR0104. In further detail, TR0104 is imposed on the dependent <HEADER> data group of the IE906 and IE917 messages, which contains the data items ‘Administrative Reference Code’ and ‘Sequence Number’.  TR0104 states that:  *“The HEADER Data Group is required for rejecting IE717, IE801, IE802, IE803, IE807, IE810, IE813, IE818, IE819, IE837, IE861, IE871, IE904, IE905 messages.*   * *It must not be present for rejecting all other messages (refer to Section “Design Principles - Exception Handling - Syntactic layer” of DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 Main Document).”*   The IE880~~,~~ and IE881~~, and IE704~~ messages include a <HEADER> data group that includes the data items ‘Administrative Reference Code’ and ‘Sequence Number’, but they are not mentioned in TR0104 in the messages for the rejection of which the <HEADER> data group is required.  ~~On the other hand, the IE837, IE861 and IE871 messages do not include a <HEADER> data group, with the data items ‘Administrative Reference Code’ and ‘Sequence Number’, but they are mentioned in TR0104 in the messages for the rejection of which the <HEADER> data group is required.~~  Therefore, the description of TR0104 should be updated to handle the aforementioned issue~~s~~.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA:   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The description of TR0104 shall be updated as follows in order to include the IE880~~,~~ and IE881~~, and IE704~~ messages ~~and exclude IE837, IE861 and IE871 messages~~. The new additions are highlighted in yellow.  **FROM:**  "The HEADER Data Group is required for rejecting IE717, IE801, IE802, IE803, IE807, IE810, IE813, IE818, IE819, ~~IE837, IE861, IE871,~~ IE837, IE861, IE871, IE904, IE905 messages, except for the cases where the data item <Administrative Reference code> is syntactically invalid or missing in the afore-mentioned messages.  It must not be present for rejecting all other messages (refer to Section “Design Principles - Exception Handling - Syntactic layer” of DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 Main Document)."  **TO:**  "The HEADER Data Group is required for rejecting ~~IE704,~~ IE717, IE801, IE802, IE803, IE807, IE810, IE813, IE818, IE819, IE837, IE861, IE871, IE880, IE881, IE904, IE905 messages, except for the cases where the data item <Administrative Reference code> is syntactically invalid or missing in the afore-mentioned messages.  It must not be present for rejecting all other messages (refer to Section “Design Principles - Exception Handling - Syntactic layer” of DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4 Main Document)." | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High).   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 there will be a misalignment in the TR0104 specifications. TR01014 will erroneously ~~mention that the <HEADER> data group is required for rejecting IE837, IE861 and IE871 messages. In addition, it will~~ not mention that the <HEADER> data group is required for rejecting IE880 and IE881 messages. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks since it concerns only a documentation update in the DDNEA. | | 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:** 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 | ~~CAB #210 on 25/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[30]](#footnote-31) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-372 – Change the Condition C066 to a Business Rule/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-372 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM681403 | | Known Error | KE24417 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 28/07/2023 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-335, a discrepancy has been observed regarding condition C066, which is imposed on a Required data item (i.e. ---(HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Date and Time of Update Validation). More specifically, in the DDNEA v3.14 Main Document, under Section VI.I.3 Technical Message Structure, the functionality of conditions is defined as a way of controlling the optionality of a Data Group or a Data Item.  Therefore, condition C066 shall be deprecated and replaced by a new business rule ~~Rxxx~~BRxxx which will have the same wording as the condition.    **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA:   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * ~~A new rule Rxxx shall be added with the following description:~~   ~~“IF <Sequence Number> is 1​ THEN <Date and Time of Update Validation> is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT.Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD>​ ELSE < Date and Time of Update Validation > is equal to the date and time of the change of destination.”~~   * The IE801 message shall be updated as follows: * Removal of C066 from <Date and Time of Update Validation> data item * Addition of a new business rule ~~Rxxx~~BRxxx to <Date and Time of Update Validation> data item * Appendix J: Business Rules Catalogue   A new Business Rule shall be added and applied in the <Date and Time of Update Validation> data item in the IE801 message with the following description:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxxx | | **BR Category** | Relation | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory that if Sequence Number is 1, then the Date and Time of Update Validation that is included in the draft e-ad/e-sad is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT.Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD> data item​, else is equal to the date and time of the change of destination. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * if sequence number is 1, then the Date and Time of Update Validation that is included in the draft e-ad/e-sad is equal to <EXCISE MOVEMENT.Date and Time of Validation of e-AD/e-SAD> data item, else is equal to the date and time of the change of destination. | | **IE** | IE801 (e-AD/e-SAD) | | **Data Item** | * (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Date and Time of Update Validation | | **Optionality** | Mandatory |  * Appendix K: Rules and Conditions Mapping * Removal of the following table entry: * C066: IE801.MESSAGE – (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Date and Time of Update Validation * ~~Addition of the following table entry:~~ * ~~Rxxx: IE801.MESSAGE – (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Date and Time of Update Validation~~ | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 FESS specifications and the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-335 RFC. Moreover, ~~the~~ condition C066 will be erroneously imposed on a Required data item, whilst its wording does not control the optionality of the data item. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks 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-335; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **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 | ~~CAB #210 on 25/04/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[31]](#footnote-32) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-375 – Update of C212 for an IE839 with Rejection Reason Code = ‘Negative Cross-check result’ that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-375 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Legislation Alignment | | Incidents | IM647115 | | Known Error | KE24064 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-338, a discrepancy has been observed regarding condition C212.  There is a legal requirement that in case of inconsistencies between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, the MSA of Dispatch should be notified.  More specifically, Article 21(4) of Directive (EU) 2020/262 states:  *“Where there are any inconsistencies between the electronic administrative document and the export declaration, the competent authorities in the Member State of export shall notify the competent authorities in the Member State of dispatch using the computerised system.”*  Thus, in case of negative cross-check results between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, there should be sent an IE839 – CUSTOMS REJECCTION OF E-AD message to the MSA of Dispatch to inform about the inconsistencies. This also applies for the case that the IE839 message sent to a particular MSA of Dispatch includes only e-ADs that were positively cross-checked.  Therefore, there is a need to update the specifications in order to allow the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check result’ of the IE839 message not to be required to be filled in this scenario.  A new condition, Cxxx will be applied to the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check validation results’ to handle its optionality, which shall also control that in case of an IE839 message with only positively cross-checked e-ADs declared, this Data group is not applicable. Condition C212 shall be updated accordingly, so that it is no longer applicable for the Data group ‘Negative Cross-check validation results’.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. The updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * Addition of a new condition Cxxx imposed on the data group NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS of the IE839 message. In case that there are negative cross-check validation results to be reported for any of the ARCs included in the IE839 data group C\_EAD\_VAL, then the data group is Required, else it is N/A.   More specifically, the new condition Cxxx shall be added with the following description:  “IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result' and there are negative cross-check validation results to be reported for any of the ARCs included in the data group C\_EAD\_VAL  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is ‘R’ ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply  Note: in the data group C\_EAD\_VAL are declared all the e-ADs concerning the recipient of the IE839 message regarding the particular Export Declaration”   * Condition C212 shall be removed from the ‘NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS’ data group of the IE839 message. * Condition C212 shall be updated as follows:   IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  ~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'   * Appendix K: Rules and Conditions Mapping * Addition of the following table entry:   Cxxx: IE839.MESSAGE – EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION – NEGATIVE CROSS- CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS   * Removal of the following table entry:   ~~C212: IE839.MESSAGE – EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION – NEGATIVE CROSS- CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS~~ | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   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 FESS specifications and the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-338 RFC. In addition, it will not be possible to have an IE839 – CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD message that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs after the rejection of the Export declaration due to negative cross-check results. Therefore, the MSA of Export will not send the IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch and the legal requirement that the MSA of Dispatch should be notified in the cases where there are inconsistencies between the Export declaration and the included e-ADs, would not be covered for this case. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the semantic level, namely the inclusion of ‘Cxxx’ to the “Negative cross-check validation results” data group in the IE839 message. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the new condition will be validated only at the sending side of the IE839 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 inclusion of the business rule 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:** FESS-338; * **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-376 – Update of TC87 Business Process Code for registering the unavailability in CS/MIS2 and renaming of Data Items in IE770/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-376 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM567295 | | Known Error | KE24529 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 25/01/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-339, during 2025, there will be migration of CS/MISE to CS/MIS2 to endure that statistics regarding all Customs and Excise domains are kept in one place. The present RFC describes the change that has to be performed for the IE770 message in order to align the search fields regarding the registered unavailability. There are two issues in relation to the present RFC:   1. In the CS/MISE application, the values that currently exist in the specific drop-down list for the unavailability are based on the values of the technical codelist TC87 - BUSINESS PROCESS CODE, applied on IE770.<SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY.Business Process Code> data item.   For EMCS Phase 4.1, the “Explanation” field (in the IE770 data item and in the UI of CS/MISE) could be used to indicate the unavailability of EMCS Central Circuit, with a remark within this field that the entry is related to Duty Suspension or Duty Paid functionality.  The specifications in EMCS Phase 4.2 shall be changed and the values in TC87 will be updated to increase clarity regarding the possible causes of the unavailability.  The new TC87 shall be updated to include distinct codes for External/Common domain, and drill down further, by having separate codes for Duty Suspension and Duty Paid per domain.  It was agreed between the NAs that the technical codelist TC87 shall be updated so that it distinguishes between the two functionalities (Duty Suspension and Duty Paid).   1. A renaming of the Data Item(s): Explanation and Explanation\_LNG, that belong to the Data Group <SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY>of IE770, will be implemented for alignment purposes.   **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA:   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   In IE770 the following change will be implemented:  **FROM**  ---------SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY  Business Process Code R n..2 TC87  Downtime Start Date and Time R dateTime  Type R a1 TC89  Downtime End Date and Time D dateTime C059  Explanation O an..350  Explanation\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002  **TO**  ---------SYSTEM UNAVAILABILITY  Business Process Code R n..2 TC87  Downtime Start Date and Time R dateTime  Type R a1 TC89  Downtime End Date and Time D dateTime C059  Justification O an..350  Justification\_LNG D a2 BC12 C002   * Appendix B: Cοdelists   The technical Codelist TC87 Business Process Code shall be updated as described below:  **FROM:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | All Functionality |  | | 2 | EMCS - Central Circuit – External Domain Functionality |  | | 3 | EMCS - Central Circuit – Common Domain Functionality |  | | 4 | EMCS - Follow-up and Collaboration Functionality |  | | 5 | National SEED Functionality |  |   **TO:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | All Functionality |  | | 2 | EMCS - Central Circuit – External Domain Functionality– **Duty Suspension** | This value refers to the Duty Suspension functionality in the external Domain. | | 3 | EMCS - Central Circuit – Common Domain Functionality – **Duty Suspension** | This value refers to the Duty Suspension functionality in the common Domain. | | 4 | EMCS - Follow-up and Collaboration Functionality |  | | 5 | National SEED Functionality |  | | 6 | EMCS - Central Circuit – External Domain Functionality **– Duty Paid** | This value refers to the Duty Paid functionality in the external Domain. | | 7 | EMCS - Central Circuit – Common Domain Functionality **– Duty Paid** | This value refers to the Duty Paid functionality in the common Domain. |   In alignment to the aforementioned changes in Appendix D, regarding the renaming of the respective Data Items in the IE770 message, the following Appendices will be updated accordingly:   * + Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Table;   + Appendix E: XML Mapping;   + Appendix G: Data Items;   + Appendix K: Rules and Conditions Mapping;   + Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS): the IE770.xsd file shall be updated.   In alignment to the aforementioned changes in Appendix B, regarding the updates in TC87, the following Appendices will be updated accordingly:   * + Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS): the tcl.xsd file shall be updated;   + 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 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * 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 FESS specifications regarding the proposed update in codelist TC87 and regarding the renaming of the respective data items in IE770. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level, i.e. changes in the Technical Codelist TC87 and in the structure of the IE770 message.  If not all NEAs deploy this RFC in production at the same time, when the sender is aligned with the new xsd files, while the receiver is not, there will be cases when the IE770 message will not be validated successfully by the receiver, according to the different values used in IE770. It shall be noted that a transformation solution is not suggested in this case, due to the corresponding complexity of the introduced changes. Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before the milestone Mr (the beginning of the production period for Phase 4.2), are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that it behaves as today when communicating with Phase 4.1 MSAs, whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4.2 MSAs, a simultaneous deployment by all MSAs is proposed to be followed for the roll-out of this RFC, so that no syntactic violations occur. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all MSAs at Milestone Mr due to the entailed complexities. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-339; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** CSMISE-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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[32]](#footnote-33) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-378 – Filling of the Data Group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER in the IE829, IE839 messages/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-378 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM638230 | | Known Error | KE24530 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in the parent RFC FESS-341, a discrepancy has been observed regarding the filling of the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in the IE829 and IE839 messages. For an Export-related movement, as a Consignee is understood to be the person representing the Consignor at the office of export, there have been two issues identified.  More specifically, in the data group (CONSIGNEE) TRADER of IE829 and IE839 messages, for the case of “Destination Type Code = Export”, the “TraderID” and “EORI Number” data items are optional, and the required data items name and address are not sufficient for a unique identification of the Consignee Trader.  Further to this, in the most common case, the Consignors of e-ADs do not know beforehand who is going to submit the export declaration, so as to declare this in the e-AD. Indeed, it is very likely that the different e-ADs that are included in the same Export declaration have different values under the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group.  On the other hand, the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group has only a multiplicity of 1x in the IE829 and IE839 messages. Thus, it is not clear to the MSAs with what values should the (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group be filed in the IE829 and IE839 messages in the case where the respective data group is different in the included e-ADs.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * The IE829 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE | 1x | R | | ---HEADER | 1x | R | | ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER | 1x | R | | ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | 999x | R | | ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE | 1x | O | | ---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE | 1x | R |   **TO:**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE | 1x | R | | ---HEADER | 1x | R | | ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER | 1x | O | | ---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD | 999x | R | | ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE | 1x | O | | ---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE | 1x | R |  * The IE839 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE | 1x | R |  | | ---HEADER | 1x | R |  | | ---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER | 1x | R |  | | ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE | 1x | O |  | | ---REJECTION | 1x | R |  | | ---EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION | 1x | D | C117 | | ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS | 99x | D | C212 | | ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 999x | R |  | | ------------COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 1x | D | C213 | | ------------NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 1x | D | C213 | | ------N\_NON\_DES | 1x | D | C212 | | ---C\_EAD\_VAL | 999x | D | C212 | | ---N\_EAD\_SUB | 1x | D | C212 |   **TO:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MESSAGE | 1x | R |  | | ---HEADER | 1x | R |  | | **---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER** | **1x** | **O** |  | | ---(EXPORT PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE | 1x | O |  | | ---REJECTION | 1x | R |  | | ---EXPORT DECLARATION INFORMATION | 1x | D | C117 | | ------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS | 99x | D | C212 | | ---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 999x | R |  | | ------------COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 1x | D | C213 | | ------------NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT | 1x | D | C213 | | ------N\_NON\_DES | 1x | D | C212 | | ---C\_EAD\_VAL | 999x | D | C212 | | ---N\_EAD\_SUB | 1x | D | C212 |  * Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Tables   Appendix C will be updated accordingly.   * Appendix H: Directory with XML Schemas (XSDs)   The ie829.xsd, ie839.xsd files will be updated accordingly. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 not be aligned with the changes proposed by RFC FESS-341. In addition, there are not any significant business continuity risks associated with the implementation of this RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  ~~More specifically:~~   * ~~If the sending NEA has implemented the change but the receiving NEA has not, then the respective messages will be validated successfully by the receiving NEA;~~ * ~~If the receiving NEA has implemented this change but the sending NEA has not, then the messages will be validated successfully posing no business continuity risks.~~   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 application has implemented this change but the receiver has not, then there are two possible cases:   + the sender application has filled the optional data group <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER>. Then the messages will be validated successfully by the receiver, posing no business continuity risks.   + the sender application has not filled the optional data group <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER>. Then any corresponding message sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. Therefore, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application places an occurrence of the respective XML element accordingly. * If the receiver application has implemented this change but the sender has not, then the messages will be validated successfully posing 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:** FESS-341; * **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 | ~~CAB #211 on 02/07/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[33]](#footnote-34) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-379 – Update of the DDNEA XSDs regarding the multiplicity defined as maxOccurs="unbounded"/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-379 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM614681 | | Known Error | KE24534 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 27/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  A discrepancy has been observed by NA-DE within the DDNEA Appendix D and the XSDs scheme. More particularly, in the cases where in the DDNEA the multiplicity of a Data Group is 999x, this is described differently in the XDSs schemes and is defined as maxOccurs="unbounded". Up until now, the multiplicity of 999x and/or 9999x in Appendix D has been mentioned as “unbounded” in the XSDs.  If the XSDs are not updated to reflect fully Appendix D regarding the multiplicity of 999x and 9999x, the misalignment between the specifications in Appendix D and the actual implementation will remain. In other words, although Appendix D will state for a particular data group that it has multiplicity 999x or 9999x, the generated XML could have more occurrences than the one stated in DDNEA and still be a valid one.  The XSDs that are affected are the following:  IE702.xsd, IE704.xsd, IE709.xsd, IE713.xsd, IE714.xsd, IE717.xsd, IE721.xsd, IE722.xsd, IE725.xsd, IE733.xsd, IE734.xsd, IE742.xsd, IE801.xsd, IE815.xsd, IE818.xsd, IE825.xsd, IE829.xsd, IE836.xsd, IE839.xsd, IE840.xsd, ΙΕ861.xsd, IE867.xsd, IE868.xsd, IE871.xsd, IE880.xsd, IE881.xsd, IE906.xsd and IE917.xsd  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA:   * Appendix H: Directory with XML Schemas (XSDS) * All occurrences of “unbounded” in the XSDs will be replaced with 999 in the case in the DDNEA Appendix D the multiplicity of the data groups is 999x; * All occurrences of “unbounded” in the XSDs will be replaced with 9999 in the case in the DDNEA Appendix D the multiplicity of the data groups is 9999x. * Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the .xsd files in Appendix H are also applicable to the corresponding ones in Appendix I. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 the DDNEA will include incorrect multiplicities in the xsd’s. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the XML tags and the .xsd files.   * If not all NEAs 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 be validated successfully by the receiver; * 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 NEA drops any occurrences that surpass the multiplicity of the respective data groups in the received messages. Therefore, no further transformation actions are suggested in this case.   Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before Milestone Mr, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that it behaves as today when communicating with Phase 4.1 MSAs, whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4.2 MSAs (only), 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 the External, National and Common Domain, since the impacted messages are exchanged over these domains, as well as SEED. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all MSAs during the Migration Period due to the entailed business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:**-; * **Children RFCs:** **-**; * **Other RFCs:** SEED-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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[34]](#footnote-35) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-380 – Moving the Data Item 'Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export' under the Data Group 'EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE' of IE829/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-380 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM689040 | | Known Error | KE24532 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 01/04/2024 | | Requester | NA-RO | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As described in its parent RFC FESS-342, a discrepancy has been observed in the DDNEA specifications regarding the "Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export" data item under the "EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD" data group of the IE829 message. More specifically, the data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” acts as a flag regarding whether the IE829 message reports that the Export Declaration has been accepted, or that the goods have been released for Export.  Therefore, it is not correct that it has been listed under “EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD" data group, which has multiplicity 999x and refers to the e-ADs included in the Export Declaration.  Consequently, the data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” shall be moved under the data group “EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE”, which has multiplicity 1x and refers to the Export Declaration and its acceptance or release.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * The IE829 message will be updated as follows:   **FROM**  (…)  **--- EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD**  Administrative Reference Code R an21 R273  Sequence Number R n..2 R232  ~~Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export R n1~~ ~~TC27~~  (…)  **---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE**  Reference Number of Sender Customs Office R an8 R032 R236  Identification of Sender Customs Officer O an..35  Date of Acceptance D date C222  Date of Release D date C222  Document Reference Number R an..21 R100  (…)  **TO**  (…)  **--- EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD**  Administrative Reference Code R an21 R273  Sequence Number R n..2 R232  (…)  **---EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE**  Reference Number of Sender Customs Office R an8 R032 R236  Identification of Sender Customs Officer O an..35  Date of Acceptance D date C222  Date of Release D date C222  Document Reference Number R an..21 R100  Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export R n1 TC27  (…)   * The description of condition C222 shall be updated as follows.  The updates are highlighted in yellow.   **FROM**  IF <EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD. Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export > is "0"  THEN  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> is 'R'  < EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> does not apply  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> is ‘R’  **TO**  IF <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE. Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export > is "0"  THEN  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> is 'R'  < EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> does not apply  ELSE  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Acceptance> does not apply  <EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE.Date of Release> is ‘R’   * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   Appendix H shall be modified accordingly to reflect the aforementioned updates in Appendix D.   * Appendix E: XML Mapping   Appendix E shall be modified accordingly to reflect the aforementioned updates in Appendix D. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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-342 RFC. In addition, the existing data item “Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export” will still be erroneously listed under “EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD” data group, which has multiplicity 999x and refers to the e-ADs that are included in the Export Declaration. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the ie829.xsd in relation to moving the data item <Export Declaration Acceptance or Goods Released for Export> under EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE data group.  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 moves the occurrence of the <ExportDeclarationAcceptanceOrGoodsReleasedForExport> XML element accordingly (i.e. to be under the data group EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD and not under the data group EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE), so that the receiving application can validate successfully the XML received; * 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 as a transformation solution that the receiving application moves the occurrences of the <ExportDeclarationAcceptanceOrGoodsReleasedForExport> XML elements (i.e. to be under the data group EXPORT DECLARATION ACCEPTANCE/RELEASE and not under the data group EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD), respectively in the received messages, so that the XML received is valid. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-342; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs: -**. | |
| **Indicative changes to legislation**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Draft recital for information | N/A | | Location of change in Legislation | Table 7 of Annex I to delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1636 | |
| **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 | ~~CAB #211 on 02/07/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[35]](#footnote-36) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-381 – New business validation on the “Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item of the IE818 – Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-381 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM691016 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 05/04/2024 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-343, NA-BE has proposed the introduction of an additional business validation on the "Date of Arrival of Excise Products" data item of the IE818 (Accepted or Rejected Report of Receipt/Export) message:  **---REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT**  Date of Arrival of Excise Products R date BR023    More specifically, the existing BR023 checks that the submission date of the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the date of arrival of excise products declared in the draft report of receipt/export. The inclusion of an additional Business Rule has been proposed in order to check that the date of arrival of excise products that is declared in the report of receipt/export is also equal or after the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD.  This will prevent the case of IE818 messages received from other MSAs in which the date of arrival of excise products is earlier than the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a new Business Rule shall be imposed on the occurrences of the data item Date of Arrival of Excise Products in the IE818 – ACCEPTED OR REJECTED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT message.  The following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. The updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix J: Business Rules Catalogue   A new Business Rule shall be added and applied in the data item “Date of Arrival of Excise Products” in the IE818 message with the following description:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxx1 | | **BR Category** | Relation | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory that the Date of Arrival of Excise Products that is included in the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the Date of Dispatch that is included in the e-AD/e-SAD message. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | L4-CORE-01-02-Perform Report of Receipt/Export | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * the date of arrival of excise products that is included in the draft report of receipt/export is equal or after the date of dispatch in the e-AD/e-SAD | | **IE** | Draft IE818(draft report of receipt/export) | | **Data Item** | * REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Date of Arrival of Excise Products * ATTRIBUTES.Date of Arrival of Excise Products | | **Optionality** | Mandatory |  * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The new business rule will be added in the “Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item under “REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT” data group of the IE818 message as shown below:  **FROM:**  " (...) **---REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT**  Date of Arrival of Excise Products R date BR023  (...)"  **TO:**  " (...) **---REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT**  Date of Arrival of Excise Products R date BR023 BRxx1  (...)" | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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-343 RFC. In addition, if the proposed change is not implemented, then the specifications will not be updated to validate that the date of arrival of excise products in the draft Report of Receipt/Export is equal or after the Date of Dispatch declared in the e-AD/e-SAD. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at semantic level, namely the inclusion of ‘BRxxx’ to the “Date of Arrival of Excise Products” data item in the IE818 message. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the new business rule will be validated only at the sending side of the IE818 message, in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the Common Domain. Hence, any such semantic violation related to the inclusion of the business rule 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:** FESS-343; * **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-383 – Validations regarding the usage of temporary authorisations in e-AD/e-SAD/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-383 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM629844 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 18/09/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As explained in its parent RFC FESS-345, NA-BE raised the issue at the ECWP meeting in September 2023 that there should be a requirement in the common specifications to validate e-SAD regarding the temporary certified consignee authorisations used. More specifically, a SEED authorisation of type temporary certified consignee which is marked as not re-usable, should only be validated for a single e-SAD. In addition, summing up the quantities in the different e-SADs having the same temporary certified consignee should not exceed the quantities mentioned in the SEED authorization of this consignee.  Further to the requested by NA-BE, it shall be noted that there are three types of temporary authorisations, i.e. Temporary Registered Consignee, Temporary Certified Consignor and Temporary Certified Consignee. A temporary authorisation can cover one or several movements. In both cases, a temporary authorisation can only concern one Consignor and one Consignee for a given period of validity and a certain quantity of goods (expressed in the unit associated with the product code).  According to the EMCS principle for semantic validations, the ~~NEA~~MSA of Dispatch has to validate successfully the business compliance of the messages before transmission. It is the responsibility of the ~~NEA~~MSA of Dispatch of the Consignor related to the temporary authorisation, to validate the business content of the submitted message by the Consignor, in relation to the usage of this temporary authorisation. In order to perform the validations, the MSA of Dispatch needs to implement a mechanism to track the usage of the related temporary authorisations in all respective movements.  Thus, four new business rules should be added to check the data validity regarding the usage of Temporary Authorisations.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. Please note that all updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * The IE815 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  (…)    (...)  **TO:**  (…)    (...)   * The IE801 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  (...)    (…)  **TO:**  (...)    (…)   * The IE813 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  (…)    (…)  **TO:**  (…)    (…)   * The IE825 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  (…)    (…)  **TO:**  (…)    (…)   * Appendix J: Business Rules Catalogue   Four new Business Rules BRxx2, BRxx3, BRxx4, and BRxx5 shall be added with the following descriptions:   * BRxx2  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxx2 | | **BR Category** | SEED - Registration Data | | **BR Description** | In case of a re-useable temporary authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs/e-SADS (per excise product and temporary authorisation) of the respective movement must be within the amount declared in the temporary authorisation. The amount of each movement should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in SEED while obtaining the temporary authorisation. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * compared to the data declared in seed and the previous movements of the reusable temporary authorisations, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs/e-SADs is less or equal to the quantity left to use per both temporary authorisations (for each excise product). | | **IE** | Draft IE815 (draft e-AD/e-SAD) | | **Data Item** | (BODY)E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity | | **Optionality** | ~~Optional~~Mandatory | | **Comments** | Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement. |  * BRxx3  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxx3 | | **BR Category** | SEED - Registration Data | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory for an e-AD/e-SAD created as a result of a change of destination that in case of a re-useable temporary authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs/e-SADS (per excise product and temporary authorisation) of the respective movement must be within the amount declared in the temporary authorisation. The amount of each movement should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in seed while obtaining the temporary authorisation. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * compared to the data declared in seed and the previous movements of the reusable temporary authorisations, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs/e-SADs is less or equal to the quantity left to use per both temporary authorisations (for each excise product). | | **IE** | IE801 (e-AD/e-SAD) | | **Data Item** | (BODY)E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity  *Note: Due to the fact that the (BODY) E-AD/E-SAD.Quantity is not contained in the IE813 message, it is proposed (for consistency reasons) that the current BR is applied to the IE801 message.* | | **Optionality** | ~~Optional~~Mandatory | | **Comments** | Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement. |  * BRxx4  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxx4 | | **BR Category** | SEED - Registration Data | | **BR Description** | In case of a temporary registered authorisation, the sum of quantities of the body e-ADs (per excise product and temporary registered authorisation) contained in the draft splitting operation must be within the amount declared in the temporary registered authorisation. In case of a re-useable temporary registered authorisation, the amount to be received by the temporary registered consignee should not exceed the amount left to be used from the one declared in SEED while obtaining the temporary registered authorisation. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | L4-CORE-01-18-Splitting of Consignment | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * compared to the data declared in seed, the former e-AD, and the previous movements of the reusable temporary registered authorisation, the sum of quantities described in the new e-ADs is less or equal to the quantity that can be used by the temporary registered authorisation (for each excise product). | | **IE** | Draft IE825 (draft splitting operation) | | **Data Item** | (BODY) E-AD.Quantity | | **Optionality** | ~~Optional~~Mandatory | | **Comments** | Subject to national implementation. |  * BRxx5  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BR ID** | BRxx5 | | **BR Category** | Relation | | **BR Description** | It is obligatory that the journey time of the draft message is such that the movement is completed before or at the expiry date of the temporary authorisation(s) declared in SEED. | | **Source FESS BPMs** | * L4-CORE-01-01-Submit and Register e-AD/e-SAD * L4-CORE-01-12-Change of Destination * L4-CORE-01-18-Splitting of Consignment | | **FESS Validation Rule** | * the journey time allows the movement to be completed before or at the date of expiry of the temporary authorisation(s). | | **IE** | * Draft IE815 (draft e-AD/e-SAD) * Draft IE813 (draft change of destination) * Draft IE825 (draft splitting operation) | | **Data Item** | * (HEADER) E-AD/E-SAD.Journey Time * (UPDATE) E-AD/E-SAD.Journey Time * (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD.Journey Time | | **Optionality** | ~~Optional~~Mandatory | | **Comments** | Subject to national implementation.  It shall be noted that it is strongly advised to validate all temporary authorisations involved in the movement | | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   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-345 RFC. In addition, the specifications will not be able to check the data validity regarding the usage of Temporary Authorisations. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the semantic level, namely the inclusion of BRxx2, BRxx3, BRxx4 and BRxx5. More specifically, BRxx2, BRxx3 and BRxx4 will be included in the “Quantity” data item of the IE815 message, IE801 message and IE825 message respectively. Finally, BRxx5 will be included in the data item ‘Journey Time’ of the IE815, IE813 and IE801 messages.  Even though the changes of this RFC concern semantic validations, they are subject to national implementation, since NAs shall validate the aforementioned values in EMCS against SEED data. What is more, although the implementation of the new business rules (BRxx2, BRxx3, BRxx4 and BRxx5) is ~~optional. Therefore~~mandatory, this RfC does not pose any 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:** FESS-345; * **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 | ~~CAB #211 on 02/07/2024~~Written approval procedure via e-mail on 17/10/2024[[36]](#footnote-37) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-384 – Use of IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch for a removed ARC from the Export Declaration Amendment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-384 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM660219 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 10/01/2024 | | Requester | NA-AT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-346, there is a business need that the MSA of Export has the delta between the ARCs included in the IE515 – Export Declaration and the IE513 - Export Declaration Amendment messages, in case any ARCs have been excluded from IE513, while they were included in the IE515 message.  In case of excluded e-ADs, the MSA of Dispatch should be informed electronically via EMCS, so as to revert the states back to “Accepted” at the MSA of Dispatch too. Currently, there is no mechanism foreseen for this case. As per the Known Error KE24040, the MSA of Dispatch can be informed outside the EMCS System and/or the TIM\_EAD\_ESAD for each excluded ARC will expire and the standard procedure will follow.  NA-AT has proposed to re-use the IE839 - CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD message with certain “dummy” values, to inform the MSA of Dispatch that the states of the included e-AD(s) in the IE839 message should be reverted to “Accepted” due to exclusion from the IE513 message.  Such an IE839 message could be sent by the MSA of Export as soon as it has the list of any excluded e-ADs from the IE513 message and has reverted their states to “Accepted” at the MSA of Export. The Consignor could also be informed by the MSA of Dispatch via an IE839 message. In order to allow having an IE839 message with such values, a new Rejection Reason Code could be added to the technical codelist TC18-Customs Rejection Reason Code.  It shall be noted that the RFC DDNEA-P4-361 shall also be considered.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in Appendices of DDNEA:   * DDNEA Main Document   The following updates in the STDs-State Transition Diagrams of Sub-Section II.IV STATE-TRANSITION DIAGRAMS FOR EXPORT SCENARIOS are proposed:  STD at Dispatch under section II.IV.1.1.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to state “Accepted”, with the message exchange marked as “IE839 (excluded e-AD after amendment of the Export declaration)”.   STD at Destination under section II.IV.1.2.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Addition of the state transition from state “Accepted Export Declaration” to state “Accepted”, with the message exchange marked as “IE839 (excluded e-AD after amendment of the Export declaration)”.   The respective STDs When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export (STD at Dispatch, STD at Destination) are provided in Annex 4.4.   * Appendix B: Codelists   In the ‘TC18 - Customs Rejection Reason Code’, the following changes will be performed:  **FROM:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Import data not found |  | | 2 | The content of the e-AD does not match with import data |  | | 3 | (reserved) |  | | 4 | Negative Cross-check result |  | | 5 | Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp |  |   **TO:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Import data not found |  | | 2 | The content of the e-AD does not match with import data |  | | 3 | (reserved) |  | | 4 | Negative Cross-check result |  | | 5 | Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp |  | | 6 | ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message |  |  * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure   The condition C212, which is applied in various data groups of the IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs, in Annex 4.5 can be found the finalised proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2.  IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is *‘ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message’*  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'  It shall be noted that in case of rejection reason code equal to *‘ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message’,* in the data group <C\_EAD\_VAL> shall be included the information about the ARC(s) that have been excluded from the Export Declaration Amendment message.   * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   In tcl.xsd, TC18 will be updated as follows:  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<!--===== Customs Rejection Reason Code =====-->*  *<!--=========================================-->*  *<xs:simpleType name="CustomsRejectionReasonCode">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>Customs Rejection Reason Code </xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *<xs:restriction base="xs:nonNegativeInteger">*  *<xs:enumeration value="1">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>Import data not found</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *<xs:enumeration value="2">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>The content of the e-AD does not match with import data</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *<xs:enumeration value="3">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *<xs:enumeration value="4">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>Negative Cross-check result</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *<xs:enumeration value="5">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp</xs:documentation>*  *</xs:annotation>*  *</xs:enumeration>*  *<xs:enumeration value="6">*  *<xs:annotation>*  *<xs:documentation>ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message</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 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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-346 RFC. Additionally, the new value will be missing from the DDNEA codelist TC18. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns a minor change at syntactic level.  If not all NEAs deploy this RFC in production simultaneously, 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.  Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before the Milestone Mr, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that it behaves as today when communicating with Phase 4.1 MSAs whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4.2 MSAs (only), 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. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all NAs at Milestone Mr due to the entailed business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-346; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-361. | |
| **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-385 – Additional validation for business consistency between the UBR cross-check result information and the Diagnosis code data items of the IE839 message/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-385 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM681452 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 08/03/2024 | | Requester | ITSM3-TES | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-348, it has been observed that there is a lack of validation between the values of the data items Validation Result and Diagnosis code of the IE839 message, to maintain business consistency. More specifically, currently, there is no such validation, and nothing prevents that the values that are set in IE839 for Validation Result and Diagnosis code are inconsistent.  This issue could be handled by a new rule imposed on Diagnosis code. Such a rule could state that if Validation Result is '0' then Diagnosis Code should be '2 = Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD or no corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration'. If the Validation Result is '1' and e.g. both COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT are present, then Diagnosis Code should be '7 = Weight/mass do not match and CN codes do not match' etc.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of the DDNEA:   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * The IE839 message shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  (…)  R100  **------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99X D C212**  **---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999X R**  Administrative Reference Code R an21 R030  Body Record Unique Reference R n..3  Diagnosis Code R n1 TC72  Validation Result R n1 TC27  Rejection reason O an..512  (…)  **TO:**  (…)  R100  **------NEGATIVE CROSS-CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS 99X D C212**  **---------UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT 999X R**  Administrative Reference Code R an21 R030  Body Record Unique Reference R n..3  Diagnosis Code R n1 **Rxx1** TC72  Validation Result R n1 TC27  Rejection reason O an..512  (…)   * A new rule Rxx1 shall be introduced with the following wording:   *IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '0',*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '2' (Body Record Unique Reference does not exist in the e-AD or no corresponding GOODS ITEM in the export declaration).*  *IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND both data groups <COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> and <NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> are present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '7' (Weight/mass do not match and CN codes do not match).*  *ELSE IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND only the data group <COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '6' (CN codes do not match).*  *ELSE IF <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Validation Result> is equal to '1' AND only the data group <NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT> is present under <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT>,*  *THEN <UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.Diagnosis Code> should be equal to '4' (Weight/mass do not match).*   * Appendix K will be updated accordingly. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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-348 RFC. There are no business continuity risks associated with the implementation of this RFC. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at semantic level. The related changes concern the introduction of a new rule Rxx1. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the aforementioned updates will be validated only at the sending side of the respective message, in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the Common Domain. Hence, any such semantic violation related to the related updates by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection by the receiver. Moreover, the addition of the new rule Rxx1 does not change the current implementation, but it is added to facilitate the filling in of the data item ‘Diagnosis Code’. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-348; * **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[37]](#footnote-38) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-386 – Update of the IE836 message for the removal of the GOODS SHIPMENT data group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-386 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specification Defect | | Incidents | IM612741 | | Known Error | KE23708 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 19/07/2023 | | Requester | NA-DE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-337, the initial issue reported by NA-DE as part of IM612741 concerned the misalignment between the optionality of the Data Group GOODS SHIPMENT between the IE536 – Invalidation Notification to MSA of Export message of AES and the IE836 – Export Declaration Invalidation Notification to MSA of Dispatch/Consignor message of EMCS. Following the discussion with the MSAs on 05/09/2023 and considering the late stage of developments for AES, the Known Error KE23708 - ‘Update the optionality of data groups/data items in IE836 to be in alignment with the IE536 message of AES’ was registered.  For Phase 4.2, the issue shall be reconsidered. Although the IE536 and IE836 messages became aligned via the KE23708, the structure under GOODS SHIPMENT data group is not the correct one. More specifically, the Optional Data Group ---GOODS SHIPMENT does not have the correct structure for declaring e-ADs as previous documents, as in the IE515 - Export Declaration message. The correct structure according to IE515 message would be:  ---GOODS SHIPMENT  ------GOODS ITEM  ---------PREVIOUS DOCUMENT.  It is proposed that the message structure under GOODS SHIPMENT is removed from both the IE536 and the IE836 messages. The ARCs do not need to be defined in the IE836 message, since in case of invalidation of the Export declaration, this concerns all the e-ADs included in the Export declaration.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA. The updates are highlighted in yellow.   * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * The <GOODS SHIPMENT> Data Group with its included data groups/data items will be removed from the IE836 message, as shown below:     IE836 - EXPORT DECLARATION INVALIDATION NOTIFICATION TO MSA OF DISPATCH/CONSIGNOR (C\_INV\_DIS)  MESSAGE 1x R  ---EXCISE MOVEMENT 999x R  ------EXPORT OPERATION 1x R  ------CUSTOMS OFFICE OF EXPORT 1x D C055  ------MSA OF EXPORT 1x R  ~~------GOODS SHIPMENT 1x RO~~  ~~---------PREVIOUS DOCUMENT 999x O~~   * In alignment to the aforementioned changes in Appendix D, the following Appendices will be updated accordingly:   + Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Table;   + Appendix E: XML Mapping;   + Appendix F: Data Groups & Transaction Hierarchy;   + Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS);   + Appendix G: Data Items;   + Appendix K: Rules and Conditions Mapping. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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-337 RFC. In addition, the ‘GOODS SHIPMENT’ data group in the IE836 message will not have the correct structure for declaring e-ADs as previous documents, as in the IE515 message of AES. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level.  More specifically, it concerns the update of the ie836.xsd file regarding the removal of the <GOODS SHIPMENT> Data Group and its including data groups/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 not aligned with the new .xsd file when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the corresponding message sent may or may not be validated successfully by the receiver, depending on the case. More specifically:   + In case an IE836 message is sent containing the <GOODS SHIPMENT> Data Group filled in by the sender, this will not be validated successfully by the receiving application. In such a case and in order to avoid rejections, as a transformation action it is proposed that the receiving side removes the occurrence of this data group;   + In case an IE836 message is sent without the Data Group <GOODS SHIPMENT> being filled in by the sender, then the received message will be validated successfully by the receiving side. * In the same way, if the sender is aligned with the new .xsd file, while the receiver is not, the IE836 message that will be sent will not contain the Data Group <GOODS SHIPMENT>. In this case, the received message will be validated successfully by the receiving application since the respective Data Group is optional in the .xsd of the receiving application.   Regarding the interaction between AES and EMCS in the national domain, it shall be noted that the deadline for alignment in production of this RFC for EMCS may not necessarily coincide with the respective date of deployment on production for the IE536 message in AES. It is high likely that the deployment date for AES will be later than the deployment date for EMCS. Nevertheless, it is considered that the aforementioned change has no impact on business continuity. More specifically, the EMCS application should be able to consume both the previous and the newly proposed XSD for the IE536 message. In the event that the MSA of Export at EMCS has implemented the change and AES operates as per the previous XSD:  - if the IE536 does not have an occurrence of the optional data group GOODS SHIPMENT, there will be no issue;  - if the IE536 message has an occurrence of the optional data group GOODS SHIPMENT, then the MSA of Export at EMCS needs to perform as a transformation action the removal of the GOODS SHIPMENT occurrence from the received XML. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-337; * **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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024[[38]](#footnote-39) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-387 – Deprecation of MVS messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-387 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Change of Functionality | | Incidents | IM722881 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 31/05/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | High | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-349, it has been observed that, after transferring the duty paid related information from MVS messages into ACO messages (IE721, IE867, IE868 and IE869) in Phase 4.0 (February 2023), MVS messages remain only for administrative cooperation regarding undocumented movements. Due to the low usage volume of MVS messages in the EMCS production environment and the fact that these messages currently do not have strict legal requirements, it is proposed that these messages should be phased out from EMCS. In few occasions when there is a need, NAs can use the CCN Mail 3 to exchange such information between NAs. The necessary actions need to be taken at the Common Specifications so that the MVS messages are correctly deprecated.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed to the DDNEA Main Document for EMCS and the Appendices:   * DDNEA Main Document: * The text in the Sub-Section III.III MOVEMENT VERIFICATION FOR DUTY PAID B2C OR UNDOCUMENTED MOVEMENTS SCENARIOS and its sub-chapters shall be removed; * The numbering of the sections and sub-sections in the documentation shall be updated accordingly. * Appendix A1: Full Message Scope * IE722, IE723, IE724, and IE725 shall be removed from Table 2: Follow-Up and Collaboration Messages message exchanges. * Appendix A2: Messages per Business Domain * IE722, IE723, IE724, and IE725 shall be removed from Table 1: In-scope Message Exchanges. * Appendix B: Codelists * Technical Codelist TC99 – MV Request Type shall be removed; * Technical Codelist TC100 – Result Code shall be removed; * In the Technical Codelist “TC49 – Functional Error Codes”, values ‘94’ and ‘95’ shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 94 | Invalid Follow Up Correlation ID~~/ MV Correlation ID~~ | The structure of the Follow Up Correlation ID ~~or MV Correlation ID~~ does not conform to the specifications given in Rule R083. | | 95 | Unknown Follow Up Correlation ID ~~/ MV Correlation ID~~ | The Follow Up Correlation ID ~~or MV Correlation ID~~ of the received message is not known, whereas it is expected to be known. |   **TO:**   | **Code** | **Description** | **Remarks** | | --- | --- | --- | | 94 | Invalid Follow Up Correlation ID | The structure of the Follow Up Correlation ID does not conform to the specifications given in Rule R083. | | 95 | Unknown Follow Up Correlation ID | The Follow Up Correlation ID of the received message is not known, whereas it is expected to be known. |  * Appendix C: EMCS Correlation Tables * The correlation tables of Appendix C shall be updated to depict the deprecation of the MVS functionality by the removal of the IE722 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST, IE723 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION ANSWER, IE724 - REMINDER MESSAGE FOR MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST, and IE725 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION RESULTS messages and their respective data groups and data items. * Appendix D: Technical Message Structure * IE722 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST, IE723 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION ANSWER, IE724 - REMINDER MESSAGE FOR MOVEMENT VERIFICATION REQUEST, and IE725 - MOVEMENT VERIFICATION RESULTS messages shall be removed; * Conditions C166, C167, C168, C169, C170, C171, C172, C173, C174, C175, C176, C177, C178, C179, C183, C185, C187, C189 shall be removed; * Rules R217, R224, R229, R238, R239, R241 shall be removed; * Rule R275 shall be updated as follows:   **FROM:**  “For information exchanges from United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the Follow Up Correlation ID/~~MV Correlation ID~~ must be related to Northern Ireland (i.e. Member State to be ‘XI’ as derived from its structure).”  **TO:**  “For information exchanges from United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the Follow Up Correlation ID must be related to Northern Ireland (i.e. Member State to be ‘XI’ as derived from its structure).”   * Appendix H: Directory with XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)   The IE722.xsd, IE723.xsd, IE724.xsd and IE725.xsd shall be removed from Appendix H. The files types.xsd and tcl.xsd shall be updated accordingly.   * Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLS)   The changes applicable to the tcl.xsd and types.xsd files in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I.   * Appendices E, F, G and K will be updated accordingly. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (High); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (High).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (High). | | 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-349 RFC. Nonetheless, the removal of the MVS functionality is due to its redundancy. Therefore, since NAs do not use it or use it in very few cases, there are no business continuity risks. | | Risk assessment | This RFC concerns changes both at syntactic and semantic level regarding the removal of the MVS functionality.  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 NEAs that have not implemented this RFC, do not make use of the MVS functionality.  More specifically:   * Assuming that the sending NEA has implemented the change whereas the receiving NEA has not, there is no impact; * Assuming that the receiving NEA has implemented the change whereas the sending NEA has not, in case one or more of the IE722, IE723, IE724, and IE725 messages are sent, it will not be validated successfully by the receiving NEA. For this scenario, a transformation solution is not proposed, on the basis that the MVS functionality has a very low usage volume. It is proposed that the sending NEA that will not be aligned to this RFC, shall not request movement verification from receiving NEAs that have implemented this RFC for Phase 4.2.   The related semantic changes concern the removal of conditions C166, C167, C168, C169, C170, C171, C172, C173, C174, C175, C176, C177, C178, C179, C183, C185, C187, C189 as well as the rules R217, R224, R229, R238, R239, R241. Thus, alike any other semantic validation, the aforementioned updates will be validated only at the sending side of the respective message, in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the Common Domain. Hence, any such semantic violation related to the related updates by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection by the receiver.  It is considered that these changes do not pose an impact on business continuity, thus, this RFC is directly applicable to Phase 4.2.  Nevertheless, technical and business statistics from CS/MISE, which are related to MVS messages, should be kept. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all MSAs at Milestone Mr due to the large amount of changes. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-349; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** CSMISE-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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-388 – Misalignment in the structure of the IE537 and IE839 messages

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-388 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM632811, IM597742, IM604523 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/05/2023 | | Requester | NA-HR, NA-IE, NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Low | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  Several MSAs have pointed out in the respective IMs that there are structural discrepancies between the IE537 – ‘e-AD Negative Cross Check Result’ and the IE839 – ‘Customs Rejection of e-AD’ messages. More specifically, in the IE839 message, the data groups COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT are nested below the data group UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT. However, this is not the case for the IE537 message, in which all the aforementioned data groups are on the same level. This may result in confusion on how the information from the IE537 message will be mapped to the IE839 message by the MSA of Export.  In order to address the misalignment between the IE537 and the IE839 message, it was decided that in AES the structure of the IE537 message will be updated in order to be fully aligned with IE839; the data groups COMBINED NOMENCLATURE CODE CROSS-CHECK RESULT and NET MASS CROSS-CHECK RESULT should be nested below the data group UBR CROSS-CHECK RESULT.  The update impacts the AES message specifications for IE537 and not the EMCS message specifications for IE839.  Nevertheless, it is proposed to include a note in the DDNEA specifications, to inform the MSAs that any updates in the structure of the IE537 message should be taken into consideration.  **Proposed solution:**  The issues reported in the [Problem Statement] were discussed with AES Central Project Team and AES National Project Managers and the agreement is to update both DDNXA for AES and FESS&DDNEA for EMCS. Thus, there is a dependency. In the DDNEA Main Document, a footnote will be added in the following references to the IE537 message:  a) under section II.II.1.3.1 Export Operation at office of export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release:  "In addition, the MSA of Dispatch receives the Negative Cross-check Result message (IE537: N\_EAD\_RES)\* from the Customs Export Application. The state of the movement is changed to “Accepted”." and,  b) under section II.II.2.3.1 Export Operation at office of export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release:  "When the cross-checking performed by AES is negative, the Customs Export Application sends the negative cross-check result (IE537: N\_EAD\_RES)\* to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export."  The footnote shall state: “Any updates for Phase 4.2 in the structure of the IE537 – ‘e-AD NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK RESULT’ message need to be taken into consideration, when the MSA generates the respective IE839 – ‘CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD’ message(s)”. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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, meaning that the note is not incorporated in the specifications and the NEA does not consider the updated IE537 structure before generating the IE839 message, there might be technical issues, such as data loss and compatibility issues. | | 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 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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-389 – Inclusion of the IE839 message in the scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-389 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM634903 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 30/05/2024 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  As stated in its parent RFC FESS-350, during the discussion at the Fiscalis group on 30-31/05/2024 for the RFC FESS-321 ‘Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection’, NA-BE requested that the reception of an IE519 - EXPORT DECLARATION REJECTION NOTIFICATION TO MSA OF EXPORT, should always trigger the sending/forwarding of an IE839 - CUSTOMS REJECTION OF E-AD to inform the MSA of Dispatch about the rejection of the related export declaration and not only in the specific scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation / Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration.  For the case of Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832), the related RFC DDNEA-P4-359 foresees a specifications’ update so that the MSA of Export sends the IE839 message to the MSA of Dispatch, after the reception of the IE519 due to e-AD request rejection.  In addition, in the RFC DDNEA-P4-360, it is proposed that AES sends after the IE537 message, additionally, an IE519 message. For this scenario it was already foreseen, as of Phase 4.1, that the IE839 is sent to the MSA of Dispatch, following the rejection of the Export declaration due to negative cross-check result.  Lastly, for the business scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration, it is proposed that the existing specifications are updated as applicable to specify that, after the reception of IE519, the IE839 message is sent by the MSA of Export to the MSA of Dispatch. After successful reception of the IE839 message by the MSA of Dispatch, the MSA of Dispatch should also forward the respective IE839 message to the Consignor.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA Specifications. The updates in the DDNEA Main Document text are highlighted with yellow.   * DDNEA Main Document   In the DDNEA Main Document, the following changes will be performed:   * For the case of MSA of Dispatch being MSA of Export as well, under section II.II.1.7.1 Export Operation at office of export and Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration:   […]  Before the goods are presented, the pre-lodged declaration is cancelled on the AES side. After AES accepts the cancellation, an IE519 (N\_EXP\_REJ) is sent to EMCS. Thus, the state of the movement at the MSA of Dispatch is changed back to “Accepted”. Lastly, the MSA of Dispatch sends a rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) with rejection reason “Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration”, to inform the Consignor.   * For the case of MSA of Dispatch being different that the MSA of Export, under section II.II.2.7.1 Export Operation at office of export and Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration:   […]  Before the goods are presented, the pre-lodged declaration is cancelled on the AES side. After AES accepts the cancellation, an IE519 (N\_EXP\_REJ) is sent to EMCS. ~~Thus, the state of the movement at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export is changed back to “Accepted."~~  Then, the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export builds and sends a rejection message to the MSA of Dispatch (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ), with rejection reason “Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration”, to inform the MSA of Dispatch and the state of the e-AD at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export is changed to “Accepted”.  Finally, the MSA of Dispatch receives the IE839 message, the state of the e-AD at the MSA of Dispatch is “Accepted” and the rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) is forwarded to the Consignor.   * For all the affected DDNEA Main Document sections mentioned above, the Time Sequence Diagrams and Collaboration Diagrams will be modified accordingly and updated in the DDNEA Main Document. * In addition, the following updates in the STDs of Sub-Section II.IV STATE-TRANSITION DIAGRAMS FOR EXPORT SCENARIOS are proposed:   STD at Dispatch, under section II.IV.1.1.1 When MS of Dispatch is MS of Export as well   * The description of the existing transition from “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” will be updated from IE519 to IE519[Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration].   STD at Dispatch, under section II.IV.1.1.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * From state “Accepted”, upon reception of IE839 [Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration], there will be a loop back to state “Accepted”.   STD at Destination under II.IV.1.2.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * The description of the existing transition from “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted” will be updated from IE519 to IE519[Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration]^IE839[Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration]. * Appendix B – Codelists   In TC18 - Customs Rejection Reason code, a new code ‘x’ will be added with description*: ‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration”.*   * Appendix D – Technical Message Structure   The condition C212, which is applied in data groups of the IE839 message, will be updated as follows, in relation to the specifications of Phase 4.1. Nevertheless, since the condition C212 is affected by various RFCs in Phase 4.2, in Annex 4.5 can be found the finalised proposed wording for C212 for Phase 4.2.  IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection *Reason Code> is ‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration'*  THEN  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply  <N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply  ELSE  <NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND  <C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND  <N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND  <N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R' | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 changes proposed for FESS by RFC FESS-350. In addition, the NA of Dispatch/Consignor (as applicable) will not be properly informed, via a IE839 message with rejection reason ‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration’, regarding the Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration. | | Risk assessment | This RFC includes changes at both syntactic and semantic level (coordination protocol and business compliance).  Firstly, regarding the coordination protocol, in case that two MSAs are not in the same phase the following cases might apply:   * Case A - MSA of Dispatch is in Phase 4.1 and MSA of Export/Destination is in Phase 4.2   Issue is identified, since in case of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration, after the reception of the IE519 the MSA of Export/Destination will send the IE839 message to the MSA of Dispatch and this will be rejected as an out of sequence message.   * Case B - MSA of Dispatch is in Phase 4.2 and MSA of Export/Destination is in Phase 4.1   Issue is identified, since in case of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration, after the reception of the IE519 message, the MSA of Export will not send the IE839 message to the MSA of Dispatch, and therefore the MSA of Dispatch (nor the Consignor) will not be informed.  In addition, this RFC concerns additional changes at the business compliance level (update of the wording of condition C212) and syntactic level (addition of a new value in the technical codelist TC18).  It shall be noted that a transformation solution is not suggested for this RFC.  Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before Mr, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEA, so that it behaves as of today when communicating with Phase 4.1 MSAs, whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 4.2 MSAs, a simultaneous deployment by all MSAs is proposed for the roll-out of this RFC, so that no syntactic/semantic violations occur.  It should be noted that the changes introduced by this specific RFC affect the External, National and Common Domain since the impacted message is exchanged over these domains. | | Deployment approach | This RFC shall be simultaneously deployed by all MSAs at Milestone Mr due to the entailed business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-350; * **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[39]](#footnote-40) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-390 – Figure 5: Information Exchange Map of EMCS Phase 4 – Figure update according to the current phase

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-390 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Specifications Defect | | Incidents | IM731799 | | Known Error | KE24744 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 22/07/2024 | | Requester | EMCS CPT | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  During the update of the figures in the DDNEA Main Document v3.16, it was spotted that “Figure 5: Information Exchange Map for EMCS Phase 4” is outdated. The figure refers to EMCS Phase 3, and the depicted messages do not correspond to the latest specifications. Therefore, Figure 5 shall be updated.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA Main Document:  “Figure 5: Information Exchange Map for EMCS Phase 4” shall be replaced with a new one which shall contain the information exchange map for EMCS that corresponds to the latest common specifications. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (None); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (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 there will be a discrepancy as the DDNEA Main Document will be in misalignment with the current specifications. | | Risk assessment | This RFC entails no business continuity risks since it concerns only documentation updates. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be implemented in the next DDNEA release 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 | Written approval on 14/08/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/2025 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

## Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2 National Domain without impact on the Common Domain

### FESS Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2 National Domain without impact on the Common Domain

#### FESS-321 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following a negative cross-check result (IE537)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | FESS-321 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM643806, IM647114, IM647115, IM647322 | | Known Error | KE24039 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 27/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  Stemming from the issue IM647115, the KE24039 “Clarifications for the procedures after a negative cross-check result (IE537)” was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications for the procedures following the sending of a negative cross-check result IE537 message by the Customs Export Application. The KE24039 was proposed to provide clarifications and a workaround solution, since, although the IE537 message informs about the rejection of the export declaration, it does not include the full list of the ARCs in the export declaration. The logic of the workaround was that the MSA of Export, upon reception of the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 – e-AD Request messages for the export declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that the Customs Export Application sends for the Export declaration.  However, it has been pointed out that certain issues could arise and that the workaround solution is not error-proof. For example, it has been noted that, in principle, there can be cases of more than one export declarations using the same LRN. For Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic. Apart from the IE537 message sent by the Customs Export Application, the IE519 – ‘Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export’ message should be also sent to the MSA of Export, in order to inform about the rejection of the export declaration and to provide the full list of ARCs in the export declaration.  Thus, upon reception of both IE537 and IE519 messages, the MSA of Export will have enough information to proceed to have in the “Accepted” state all the e-ADs in the export declaration. The MSA of Export shall also send to the MSA of Dispatch the IE839 message (with rejection reason equal to “negative cross-checking”), to inform about the rejection of the export declaration due to negative cross-check results and to provide the included ARCs in the export declaration. The e-ADs are at “Accepted” state at the MSA of Dispatch, too.  On the other hand, the issue of the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter. The NAs that prefer so may implement a different approach in their national interface, which does not involve sending additionally the IE519 message. Instead, the IE537 message can be updated to include apart from the list of negative cross-check results, additionally, all the included ARCs in the rejected export declaration. Nevertheless, in this case, the AES part would need to be fully specified by the NA who is interested in the implementation of the alternative solution, as this will not be part of the DDNXA specifications.  In addition, since there is a dependency with the implementation in AES and the interface of AES-EMCS remains a national matter, the updated specifications will also specify the existing solution, which had been described via the related workarounds of Phase 4.1. More specifically, the specifications will be updated to include the workarounds in KE24039 “Clarifications for the procedures after a negative cross-check result (IE537)”, and KE24040 “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request”, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own the respective ARCs via the IE532 messages.  In particular, for the case of rejection of the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, due to negative cross-check, the DDNXA specifications shall not foresee the sending of the IE519 (since the IE519 message serves to inform about an Export Declaration rejection, while in case of rejection of the IE513 message, there is no actual rejection of the Export Declaration). For this case, the EMCS specifications shall foresee that EMCS should retrieve on its own the list of ARCs included in the rejected IE513 message, from the IE532 messages received for the respective LRN (as per the workarounds of Phase 4.1).  The scenarios after an Export Declaration Amendment are further elaborated under the related RFC FESS-322.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the Excise BPMs. It shall be noted that the updates to the text have been marked with yellow highlight.   * The objective of the Process **‘L4-CORE-01-26 Exportation of Goods under Excise Duty Suspension’** will be updated as below, in order to reflect that AES at the Customs Office of Export, will send additionally the IE519 message, apart from the IE537 message, following a rejection of the export declaration (IE515) due to negative cross-check. In this manner, the MSA of Export will be informed about the rejection of the export declaration due to negative cross-check and which are the included ARCs in the export declaration. More specifically:   *“When the MSA of Dispatch is the same as the MSA of Export, the process is as follows: […]*  *At the Customs Office of Export: […]*  *h. If the cross-check is not successful, for the case where the MSA of Dispatch and the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export are the same, the Customs Office of Export notifies the MSA of Dispatch of the e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result (IE537) and sends also the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), due to negative cross-checking (It shall be noted that since the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, alternatively to the sending of the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), the NAs may opt to an updated version of the IE537 message, which is nationally specified to include, apart from the negative cross-check results, all the ARCs in the rejected Export declaration). The flow then leads back to the bullet point of step b. […]*  *At the MSA of Dispatch: […]*  *The MSA of dispatch might “Receive e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result”, where the e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result (IE537) and the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), due to negative cross-check, arrive~~s~~ from the Customs Office of Export. (It shall be noted that in case that in a national interface AES has not implemented either sending the IE519 message, or the updated version of IE537, the workaround solution should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Dispatch, upon receiving the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration (amendment) message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration. The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message rejection, due to negative cross-checking, since the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message for this scenario.*  *o Next, it shall “Perform Validation of e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result”, connected with model L4-CORE-01-04, where the syntactic, coordination protocol and business compliance validation of the e-AD*  *Negative Cross-Check Result and of the export declaration rejection notification, due to negative cross-check, takes place;*  *o “Handle Validation Results of Negative Cross-Check Result” follows, where the validation results of the Negative Cross-Check Result and the export declaration rejection notification, due to negative cross-check, are handled. This is connected with model L4-CORE-01-06;*  *[…]*  *When the MSA of Dispatch is different than the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export, the process is as follows: […]*  *At the Customs Office of Export: […]*  *h. If the cross-check is not successful, for the case where the MSA of Dispatch and the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export are different, the Customs Office of Export notifies the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export of the e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result (IE537) and sends also the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), due to negative cross-check (It shall be noted that since the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, alternatively to the sending of the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), the NAs may opt to an updated version of the IE537 message, which is nationally specified to include, apart from the negative cross-check results, all the ARCs in the rejected Export declaration.). The flow then leads back to the bullet point of step b. […]*  *At the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export: […]*  *The MSA of Destination/MSA of Export might “Receive e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result”, where the e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result (IE537) and the export declaration rejection notification (IE519), due to negative cross-check arrive~~s~~ from the Customs Office of Export. (It shall be noted that in case that in a national interface AES has not implemented either sending the IE519 message, or the updated version of IE537, the workaround solution should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Export, upon receiving the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration (amendment) message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration. The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message rejection, due to negative cross-checking, since the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message for this scenario.*  *o Next, it shall “Perform Validation of e-AD Negative Cross-Check Result”, connected with model L4-CORE-01-04, where the syntactic, coordination protocol and business compliance validation of the e-AD*  *Negative Cross-Check Result and of the export declaration rejection notification, due to negative cross-check, takes place;*  *o “Handle Validation Results of Negative Cross-Check Result” follows, where the validation results of the Negative Cross-Check Result and of the export declaration rejection notification, due to negative cross-check are handled. This is connected with model L4-CORE-01-06; […]*  Lastly, the model diagram of the Process **L4-CORE-01-26** will be updated as applicable to reflect the aforementioned updates.   * Updates in the State Transition diagrams   The following updates will take place in the STDs that are in the FESS BPMs under the directory 03\_EBP L4 Functional Requirement BPM>EMCS>Core, 06\_States. It shall be noted that the messages on the conditional flows will be depicted in this RFC, as well as on the STDs, in the form (received IE).(received IE) ^(sent IE).(sent IE).  STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is same as MS of Export   * Update of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted”, with IE537[Negative cross-checking], to IE537[Negative cross-checking].IE519 [Negative cross-checking].   STD at Destination - Export operation at Office of Export when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Update of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted”, with IE537^IE839[Negative cross-checking] to IE537.IE519[Negative cross-checking]^IE839 [Negative cross-checking]. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * FESS Excise BPMs (Medium); * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (…).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of Not Implementing the Change | If the proposed change with IE519 is not implemented, then FESS specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how EMCS can obtain all the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration (IE515) message via IE519, in case of negative cross-check results. On the other hand, since the issue of the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, the NAs that prefer so may implement alternatively the update of the IE537 message, to include apart from the list of negative cross-check results, additionally, all the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. If either of the two approaches is followed, the workarounds of Phase 4.1 should still be applicable, for the MSA to obtain on its own the included ARC number(s) in the rejected export declaration (amendment) due to negative cross-check results. | | Risk assessment | There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC since it concerns only a documentation update. | | Deployment approach | The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** **-**; * **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-360; * **Other RFCs:** FESS-322. | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[40]](#footnote-41) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | v4.20 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/26 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

### DDNEA Change Requests for EMCS Phase 4.2 National Domain without impact on the Common Domain

#### DDNEA-P4-360 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following a negative cross-check result (IE537)/Rev1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4- 360 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM647115 | | Known Error | KE24039 | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 27/11/2023 | | Requester | NA-BE | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  As described in its parent RFC FESS-321, stemming from the issue IM647115, the KE24039 “Clarifications for the procedures after a negative cross-check result (IE537)” was registered, which was applicable for Phase 4.1. This Known Error provided clarifications for the procedures following the sending of a negative cross-check result IE537 message by the Customs Export Application. The KE24039 was proposed to provide clarifications and a workaround solution, since, although the IE537 message informs about the rejection of the export declaration, it does not include the full list of the ARCs in the export declaration. The logic of the workaround was that the MSA of Export, upon reception of the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 – e-AD Request messages for the export declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that the Customs Export Application sends for the Export declaration.  However, it has been pointed out that certain issues could arise and that the workaround solution is not error-proof. For example, it has been noted that, in principle, there can be cases of more than one export declarations using the same LRN. For Phase 4.2, it is proposed to revisit the topic. Apart from the IE537 message sent by the Customs Export Application, the IE519 – ‘Export Declaration Rejection Notification to MSA of Export’ message should be also sent to the MSA of Export, in order to inform about the rejection of the export declaration and to provide the full list of ARCs in the export declaration.  Thus, upon reception of both IE537 and IE519 messages, the MSA of Export will have enough information to proceed to have in the “Accepted” state all the e-ADs in the export declaration. The MSA of Export shall also send to the MSA of Dispatch the IE839 message (with rejection reason equal to “negative cross-checking”), to inform about the rejection of the export declaration due to negative cross-check results and to provide the included ARCs in the export declaration. The e-ADs are at “Accepted” state at the MSA of Dispatch, too.  On the other hand, the issue of the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter. The NAs that prefer so may implement a different approach in their national interface, which does not involve sending additionally the IE519 message. Instead, the IE537 message can be updated to include apart from the list of negative cross-check results, additionally, all the included ARCs in the rejected export declaration. Nevertheless, in this case the AES part would need to be fully specified by the NA who is interested in the implementation of the alternative solution, as this will not be part of the DDNXA specifications.  In addition, since there is a dependency with the implementation in AES and the interface of AES-EMCS remains a national matter, the updated specifications will also specify the existing solution, which had been described via the related workarounds of Phase 4.1. More specifically, the specifications will be updated to include the workarounds in KE24039 “Clarifications for the procedures after a negative cross-check result (IE537)” and KE24040 “Clarifications for the procedures following an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) request”, for the MSA of Export to retrieve on its own the respective ARCs via the IE532 messages.  In particular, for the case of rejection of the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, due to negative cross-check, the DDNXA specifications shall not foresee the sending of the IE519 (since the IE519 message serves to inform about an Export Declaration rejection, while in case of rejection of the IE513 message, there is no actual rejection of the Export Declaration). For this case, the EMCS specifications shall foresee that EMCS should retrieve on its own the list of ARCs included in the rejected IE513, from the IE532 messages received for the respective LRN (as per the workarounds of Phase 4.1).  The scenarios after an Export Declaration Amendment are further elaborated under the related RFC DDNEA-361.  **Proposed solution:**  As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA Specifications. The updates have been marked with yellow highlight.   * DDNEA Main Document * Under section II.II.1.3.1 Export Operation at office of export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release, the paragraph below will be updated to become:   *“[…]The Customs Export Application performs a cross-checking between the Export Declaration and the concerned e-AD in order to verify their consistency and as the cross-checking is found unsuccessful, the Export Declaration is rejected and the MSA of Dispatch shall be informed.*  *In addition, the MSA of Dispatch receives the Negative Cross-check Result message (IE537: N\_EAD\_RES) and the export declaration rejection notification (IE519: (N\_EXP\_REJ))\* from the Customs Export Application. The state of the movement is changed to “Accepted” (this is applicable for all the e-ADs included in the rejected export declaration).*  *~~When the cross-checking is negative,~~ Then, the MSA of Dispatch sends a rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) that includes the list of any errors found during the cross-checking, as well as all the included ARCs in the rejected export declaration, that concern the applicable Consignor.*  *\*Since the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, there is is a dependency from the implementation that will take place on the AES side. Alternatively, the NAs that prefer so may implement an approach that does not involve sending additionally the IE519 message, in order to have all the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. Instead, the IE537 message is updated to include, additionally to the list of negative cross-check results, all the ARCs in the rejected Export declaration. In this case the IE537 message should be specified nationally, as this update is not part of the DDNXA specifications. Lastly, it shall be noted that the business flow related to negative cross-check results in this case will remain the same as in Phase 4.1 (i.e. TSD-time sequence diagram, CLD-collaboration diagram and STD- state transition diagrams).*  *In case that in a national interface, AES has not implemented any of the two solutions (i.e. either sending the IE519 message, or the updated version of IE537), the workaround solutions of Phase 4.1 should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Dispatch, upon receiving the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration (amendment) message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration*  *The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of negative cross-checking for an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message. Between the IE532 messages received for an initial Export Declaration and an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, the Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export (IE539) message has been sent by AES for the initial Export Declaration. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends, both for the initial Export Declaration and for the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message […]”*   * Under section II.II.2.3.1 Export Operation at Office of Export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release, the paragraph below will be updated to become:   *“[…] When the cross-checking performed by AES is negative, the Customs Export Application sends the negative cross-check result (IE537: N\_EAD\_RES) and the export declaration rejection notification (IE519: (N\_EXP\_REJ))\* to the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export.*  *The MSA of Destination/MSA of Export builds and sends a rejection message (IE839: C\_CUS\_REJ) to the MSA of Dispatch that includes the list of any errors found during the cross-checking, as well as all the included ARCs in the rejected export declaration that concern the applicable MSA of Dispatch; the state of the e-AD at the MSA of Destination/MSA of Export is changed to “Accepted” (this is applicable for all the e-ADs included in the rejected export declaration).*  *\*Since the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, there is is a dependency from the implementation that will take place on the AES side. Alternatively, the NAs that prefer so may implement an approach that does not involve sending additionally the IE519 message, in order to have all the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. Instead, the IE537 message is updated to include, additionally to the list of negative cross-check results, all the ARCs in the rejected Export declaration. In this case the IE537 message should be specified nationally, as this update is not part of the DDNXA specifications. Lastly, it shall be noted that the business flow related to negative cross-check results in this case will remain the same as in Phase 4.1 (i.e. TSD-time sequence diagram, CLD-collaboration diagram and STD- state transition diagrams).*  *In case that in a national interface, AES has not implemented any of the two solutions (i.e. either sending the IE519 message, or the updated version of IE537), the workaround solutions of Phase 4.1 should be in place. The workaround solution entails that the MSA of Export, upon receiving the IE537 message, finds on its own the included ARCs in the export declaration (amendment) message that was rejected. This is by getting all received IE532 messages for the declaration and retrieving the ARC included in each IE532. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends for the respective declaration.*  *The workaround solution is also applicable for the case of negative cross-checking for an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, as in this scenario the AES specifications do not foresee the sending of the IE519 message. Between the IE532 messages received for an initial Export Declaration and an Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message, the Export Declaration Acceptance Notification to MSA of Export (IE539) message has been sent by AES for the initial Export Declaration. The LRN – Local Reference Number is used as the link between the IE532 messages that AES sends, both for the initial Export Declaration and for the Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message. It is considered that AES sends a separate IE532 for each included ARC in the IE513 message […]*   * The changes proposed above in sections II.II.1.3.1 and II.II.2.3.1 will be reflected in the respective TSD-Time Sequence Diagrams and in the CLD-Collaboration Diagrams of the DDNEA Main Document. The respective TSD and CLD diagrams for section II.II.2.3.1 are provided in Annex 4.3. * In addition, the following updates in the STD-State Transition Diagrams of Sub-Section II.IV STATE-TRANSITION DIAGRAMS FOR EXPORT SCENARIOS are proposed.   It shall be noted that the messages on the conditional flows will be depicted in this RFC as well as on the STDs are described in the form (received IE). (received IE) ^(sent IE).  STD at Dispatch under section II.IV.1.1.1 When MS of Dispatch is MS of Export as well   * Update of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted”, with IE537[Negative cross-checking], to IE537[Negative cross-checking].IE519 [Negative cross-checking]   STD at Destination under section II.IV.1.2.2 When MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export   * Update of the state transition from state “e-AD Request Accepted for Export” to “Accepted”, with IE537^IE839[Negative cross-checking] to IE537.IE519[Negative cross-checking]^IE839 [Negative cross-checking]   The respective STDs when MS of Dispatch is different than MS of Export (STD at Destination) are provided in Annex 4.4. | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Medium); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   CDEAs:   * Central SEED v1 application (None); * CTA (None); * CS/MISE (None).   NEAs:   * Impact on NEAs (Medium). | | Effect of Not Implementing the Change | If the proposed change with IE519 is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by RFC FESS-321. Moreover, the DDNEA specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding how EMCS can obtain all the included ARC number(s) in the export declaration message (IE515) via IE519, in case of negative cross-check results. On the other hand, since the issue of the AES-EMCS interface remains a national matter, the NAs that prefer so may implement alternatively the update of the IE537 message, to include apart from the list of negative cross-check results, additionally, all the ARCs in the rejected export declaration. If either of the two approaches is followed, the workarounds of Phase 4.1 should still be applicable, for the MSA to obtain on its own the included ARC number(s) in the rejected export declaration (amendment) due to negative cross-check results. | | Risk assessment | Regarding the interaction between the NEAs in the Common Domain, this RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update in DDNEA Main Document only.  Regarding the interaction between AES and EMCS in the National Domain, it shall be noted that the goal is to have a synchronized deployment on production of the related changes in AES and EMCS. Nevertheless, if that is not possible, there are measures in place to overcome incompatibilities. It is considered that that there will be no impact on business continuity of EMCS, if the respective MSA can also support the existing workaround solution up to the moment when both AES and EMCS deployments have been completed. | | Deployment approach | The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. | | Reference to other RFCs | * **Parent RFCs:** FESS-321; * **Children RFCs:** -; * **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P4-361. | |
| **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 | CAB #212 on 22/07/2024[[41]](#footnote-42) | |
| **Release information**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | TBD | | Release date | Q1/2025 | TBD | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | 12/02/2026 | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

#### DDNEA-P4-374 – Implementation of the control messages in the exchanges between EMCS and AES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RFC Information   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RFC number | DDNEA-P4-374 | | RFC status | ~~Accepted~~Scheduled | | Reason for Change | Increase of functionality | | Incidents | IM650445 | | Known Error | N/A | | Date at which the Change was proposed | 07/12/2023 | | Requester | NA-LU | |
| **Change Assessment**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Change priority | Medium | | Change Description | **Problem statement:**  [Note: This RFC was presented for discussion to the Fiscalis workshop in Stockholm on 30-31/05/2024.]  In issue IM650445 raised by NA.LU AES, it was pointed that it is not foreseen by the EMCS specifications that the messages CC917C/CC906C are to be received by EMCS, while this is mentioned in the DDNXA specifications.  More specifically, the DDNXA Main Document v5.15, in Note 30, mentions that the error messages CC917C and CC906C are used to report errors for the National Domain message exchanges, regarding messages sent from AES to EMCS (i.e. IE519, IE532, IE534, IE535, IE536, IE537, IE539, IE598) and regarding messages sent from EMCS to AES (i.e. IE801, IE832). The CC917C is used for reporting syntactic XML errors and CC906C is used for reporting business validation errors (e.g. rules/conditions violations).  For the next phase of the AES-EMCS interface, the Common Specifications should specify that such error/control messages are nationally defined and that the actual implementation is a national matter. Indeed, several MSAs have already implemented their national validations/control messages in the National Domain.  Regarding AES, even a Known Error should be registered for the update of Note 32 in the DDNXA specifications, to reflect the above. Regarding the validations on AES side, AES receives the IE801/IE832 messages, but only syntactic validations for IE832 are suggested.  **Proposed solution:**  The issues reported in the [Problem Statement] were discussed with AES Central Project Team and AES National Project Managers and the agreement is to update both DDNXA for AES and FESS&DDNEA for EMCS. Thus, there is a dependency. The following updates shall be performed in the DDNEA Specifications:   * DDNEA Main Document   Under sections ‘II.II.1 Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is MSA of export as well’, and under section ‘II.II.2 Export Operation at Office of Export when MSA of Dispatch is different from MSA of export’, a new bullet point will be added with the following note:   * *The validations in the messages exchanged in the AES-EMCS interface, as well as any related error/control messages exchanged should be nationally defined. It is suggested that EMCS applies syntactic and certain semantic validations upon reception of the Goods under Excise duty suspension arrangement national messages sent by the Customs Export Application (i.e. IE519, IE532, IE534, IE535, IE536, IE537, IE539, IE598).* | | Impact assessment | Specification Documents:   * DDNEA for EMCS Phase 4.2 (Low); * CTP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...); * TRP for EMCS Phase 4.2 (...).   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 specifications will not be in alignment with the proposed update regarding the implementation of validations and error/control messages in the exchanges between EMCS and AES. | | 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 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 | CAB #211 on 02/07/2024 | |
| **Release information**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Release number | ~~v3.20~~v3.25 | | Release date | Q1/2025 | | Deadline for alignment in Production | 12/02/2026 (Milestone Mr) | |
| **Change Review**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Review date | TBD | | Review results | TBD | |

# Annexes

## Annex: FESS-311 – Update of business codelist CL Packaging Codes/Rev1



## Annex: DDNEA-P4-359 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832)/Rev1



Figure 1: TSD - Export Operation at Office of Export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection

A diagram of a company

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

Figure 2: CLD - Export Operation at Office of Export and Export Declaration Rejection due to e-AD Request Rejection

## Annex: DDNEA-P4-360 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following a negative cross-check result (IE537)/Rev1



Figure 3: TSD - Export Operation at Office of Export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release



Figure 4: CLD - Export Operation at Office of Export followed by negative cross-checking before the export release

## Annex: State-Transition Diagrams for Export Operation at Office of Export, when NA of Dispatch is different than NA of Export

### STD at Dispatch (Part 1)

A diagram of a computer

Description automatically generated

Figure 5: STD at Dispatch - Export operation at Office of Export when NA of Dispatch is different than NA of Export (Part 1)

### STD at Destination (Part 1)

A diagram of a computer

Description automatically generated

Figure 6: STD at Destination - Export operation at Office of Export when NA of Dispatch is different than NA of Export (Part 1)

## Annex: Wording of C212

The finalised proposed wording for C212 can be found below and takes into account all the following RFCs:

* DDNEA-P4-359 – Rejection of the Export Declaration message following an e-AD request rejection (IE532^IE832);
* DDNEA-P4-375 – Update of C212 for a IE839 with Rejection Reason Code = ‘Negative Cross-check result’ that includes only positively cross-checked e-ADs;
* DDNEA-P4-384 – Use of IE839 to inform the MSA of Dispatch for a removed ARC from the Export Declaration Amendment;
* DDNEA-P4-389 – Inclusion of the IE839 message in the scenario of Export Declaration Rejection due to Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration.

IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Negative Cross-check result'

THEN

~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> is 'R' AND~~

<C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND

<N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND

<N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply

ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code> is 'Unsatisfactory Control Result at OoExp'

THEN

~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~

<C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND

<N\_NON\_DES> is 'R' AND

<N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply

ELSE IF <REJECTION.Rejection Reason Code*> is in* (*'e-AD Request Rejection*', *‘Pre-Lodged Export Declaration Cancellation/Timer Awaiting for Export Presentation Notification Expiration', ‘ARC removed from Export Declaration Amendment (IE513) message’*)

THEN

<C\_EAD\_VAL> is 'R' AND

<N\_NON\_DES> does not apply

<N\_EAD\_SUB> does not apply

ELSE

~~<NEGATIVE CROSS CHECK VALIDATION RESULTS> does not apply AND~~

<C\_EAD\_VAL> does not apply AND

<N\_NON\_DES> does not apply AND

<N\_EAD\_SUB> is 'R'
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