OWNER:	ISSUE DATE:	VERSION:
DG TAXUD	09/11/2018	2.20

TAXATION AND CUSTOMS UNION DG

EMCS Project

Subject:

EMCS Phase 3.4 FESS and DDNEA Release

Release Scope Document

Document History

Edi.	Rev.	Date	Description	Action (*)	Pages
0	0	24/04/2018	First draft for Internal Review	I	All
0	10	24/04/2018	Submitted for Information to DG TAXUD	I,R	All
0	20	03/05/2018	Re-submitted for Information to DG TAXUD	I,R	All
0	30	14/05/2018	Submitted for Review to DG TAXUD	I,R	All
1	00	22/05/2018	Submitted for Acceptance to DG TAXUD	I,R	All
1	10	06/08/2018	Submitted for Information to DG TAXUD upon implementing MSAs' comments	I,R	All
1	20	17/08/2018	Submitted for Review to DG TAXUD upon implementing MSAs' comments	I,R	All
2	00	24/08/2018	Submitted for Acceptance to DG TAXUD	I,R	All
2	10	05/11/2018	Submitted for Review to DG TAXUD upon implementing corrections that arose during RFC implementation	I,R	All
2	20	09/11/2018	Submitted for Acceptance to DG TAXUD	I,R	All

(*) **I**: Insert, **R**: Replace

Table of Contents

1 Introduction 7
1.1 Purpose 7
1.2 Scope 7
1.3 Applicability 10
1.4 Structure of this Document 11
2 Reference and Applicable Documents 12
2.1 Reference Documents 12
2.2 Applicable Documents 12
3 Terminology 13
3.1 Abbreviations and Acronyms 13
3.2 Definitions 13
4 Overview of Changes for this Release 14
5 Change Requests 20
5.1 FESS Change Requests 20
FESS-201 – Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence 20
FESS-210 – Removal of Cn Code “1509 10 90” included in Sections "2.3 CN Codes" and “2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B 23
~~FESS-211 – Update of description of the Excise product code “E920” in Section “2.2 Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B~~ 26
FESS-212 – Invalid connection of Cn Code “2204 21 84” with Product “S200” in Section “2.4 Correspondences Cn Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B 29
FESS-213 – Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL 32
FESS-214 – Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality 35
FESS-215 – Remove from FESS the references to the pre-defined scheduling for reference data dissemination 38
FESS-216 – Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data 41
FESS-217 – Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios 44
FESS-218 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1 48
FESS-219 – Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105 / Rev1 53
FESS-220 – Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1 56
FESS-221 – Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1 59
FESS-222 – Update of Rule130 in IE802 62
FESS-223 – Update of Rule026 65
FESS-224 – Update structure of <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> data group 68
FESS-225 – Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2 72
FESS-226 – Update the description of a code ‘8’ in the code list 'REFUSAL REASONS 77

FESS-227 – Update the format of 'Request Correlation Identifier' 81

FESS-228 – Updates in the IE701 message in relation to the <REF_REQUEST> data group 84

FESS-229 – Update the format of the data item 'Commercial Description of Goods'..... 87

FESS-230 – Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the “RA_PRIMARY Value” data item 90

FESS-231 – Adding clarifications on Common Specifications about ship supplies treatment / Rev2 93

FESS-232 – Update the ‘COUNTRY CODES’ code list to be aligned with IE734 96

FESS-233 – Update the rule applied on ‘Sequence Number’ in IE803/IE818 99

FESS-234 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-Ads / Rev1 102

FESS-235 – Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism 105

FESS-236 – Update the optionality of “Reference of Evidence_LNG” Data Item in FESS ... 109

FESS-237 – Update the description of condition ‘Cond201’ 112

FESS-238 – Update the description of rule ‘Rule210’..... 115

FESS-239 – Update the description of the rule ‘Rule248’..... 118

FESS-240 – Structured information on attachments..... 121

FESS-241 – Extending the Manual Closure functionality/ Rev1 126

FESS-242 – Update of Excise Product Codes and CN Codes 134

FESS-243 – Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message 141

5.2 DDNEA Change Requests..... 145

DDNEA-P3-228 – Propagate to the .xsds the validation that the value of several Data Items must be greater than zero 145

DDNEA-P3-229 – Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence .. 150

DDNEA-P3-241 – Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL 158

DDNEA-P3-242 – Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality 161

DDNEA-P3-243 – Correction in DDNEA "X.I.2.2.11 Opening a queue" section..... 164

DDNEA-P3-244 – Update regarding the ‘CorrelId’ structure in cases where ARC and Sequence Number are missing 166

DDNEA-P3-245 – Add the erroneously removed error codes on TC49/Rev1 169

DDNEA-P3-246 – Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data 174

DDNEA-P3-247 – Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios 177

DDNEA-P3-248 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1 181

DDNEA-P3-249 – Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1..... 183

DDNEA-P3-250 – Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1..... 188

DDNEA-P3-251 – Updates in order to allow zero values in specific numerical data items of IE742 message..... 193

DDNEA-P3-252 – Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2 196

DDNEA-P3-254 – Changes in the types.xsd to allow leading zeroes for CN Codes 204

DDNEA-P3-255 – Update code list mapping of TC10 207

DDNEA-P3-256– Adding clarifications on Common Specifications about ship supplies treatment / Rev2 210

DDNEA-P3-257 – Update the rules applied on 'Sequence Number' in IE803/IE818 213

DDNEA-P3-258 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-ADs / Rev1 216

DDNEA-P3-259 – Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism 218

DDNEA-P3-260 – Update the description of condition 'C201' 221

DDNEA-P3-261 – Extending the maximum length of "DescriptionType" to allow more characters in the descriptions of codes / Rev1 224

DDNEA-P3-262 – Add missing values in the 'Primary Criterion Type Code' code list 228

DDNEA-P3-263 – Update XML tag for the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> data item 232

DDNEA-P3-264 – Consultation of registration information by economic operators/Rev1 236

DDNEA-P3-265 – Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the "RA_PRIMARY Value" data item 239

DDNEA-P3-266 – Allowing zero values in specific numerical data items 243

DDNEA-P3-267 – Update the description of rule 'Rule248' 246

DDNEA-P3-268 – Adding clarifications in the Common Specifications about the use of UTC for 'Date' fields 250

DDNEA-P3-269 – Structured information on attachments 253

DDNEA-P3-270 – Extending the Manual Closure functionality/ Rev1 260

DDNEA-P3-271 – Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message 274

DDNEA-P3-273 – Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105 280

DDNEA-P3-274 – Update of Rule026 282

6 Annex – FESS RFCs 285

6.1 Annex 1: FESS-240 – Structured information on attachments 285

6.2 Annex 2: FESS-241 – Extending the Manual Closure functionality 285

Annex 2-1: Manual closure of a movement (UC3.06) 285

Annex 2-2: e-AD: Manual closure of a movement 285

7 Annex – DDNEA RFCS 286

7.1 Annex 1: DDNEA-P3-228 – Propagate to the .xsds the validation that the value of several Data Items must be greater than zero 286

7.2 Annex 2: DDNEA-P3-244 – Update regarding the 'CorrelId' structure in cases where ARC and Sequence Number are missing 286

7.3 Annex 3: DDNEA-P3-248 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data 286

7.4 Annex 4: DDNEA-P3-258 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-ADs/Rev1 286

7.5 Annex 5: DDNEA-P3-264 – Consultation of registration information by economic operators 286

7.6 Annex 6: DDNEA-P3-270 – Manual Closure of Movements 286

Annex 6-1: Manual Closing of the Movement (UC3.06) 286

Annex 6-2: Update of Figures 110, 113-117 287
Annex 6-3: In-Scope Messages Exchanged from/to NDEA 287

List of Tables

Table 1: Reference Documents 12
Table 2: Applicable Documents 12
Table 3: Abbreviations and Acronyms 13
Table 4: Overview of Changes for this Release 19

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 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 3.4 corrective and evolutive release.

1.2 SCOPE

This document records the RFCs that will be implemented in FESS and in DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3.4 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 Phase 3 List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations" [R05].

The full list of the RFCs that will be implemented in FESS and DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3.4 corrective and evolutive release is the following:

1. ~~35~~34 FESS RFCs

- FESS-201
- FESS-210
- ~~FESS-211~~
- FESS-212
- FESS-213
- FESS-214
- FESS-215
- FESS-216
- FESS-217
- FESS-218
- FESS-219
- FESS-220
- FESS-221
- FESS-222
- FESS-223
- FESS-224

- FESS-225
- FESS-226
- FESS-227
- FESS-228
- FESS-229
- FESS-230
- FESS-231
- FESS-232
- FESS-233
- FESS-234
- FESS-235
- FESS-236
- FESS-237
- FESS-238
- FESS-239
- FESS-240
- FESS-241
- FESS-242
- FESS-243

2. 34 DDNEA RFCs

- DDNEA-P3-228
- DDNEA-P3-229
- DDNEA-P3-241
- DDNEA-P3-242
- DDNEA-P3-243
- DDNEA-P3-244
- DDNEA-P3-245
- DDNEA-P3-246

- DDNEA-P3-247
- DDNEA-P3-248
- DDNEA-P3-249
- DDNEA-P3-250
- DDNEA-P3-251
- DDNEA-P3-252
- DDNEA-P3-254
- DDNEA-P3-255
- DDNEA-P3-256
- DDNEA-P3-257
- DDNEA-P3-258
- DDNEA-P3-259
- DDNEA-P3-260
- DDNEA-P3-261
- DDNEA-P3-262
- DDNEA-P3-263
- DDNEA-P3-264
- DDNEA-P3-265
- DDNEA-P3-266
- DDNEA-P3-267
- DDNEA-P3-268
- DDNEA-P3-269
- DDNEA-P3-270
- DDNEA-P3-271
- DDNEA-P3-273
- DDNEA-P3-274

The EMCS Phase 3.4 corrective and evolutive release of FESS and of DDNEA, implements corrective and evolutive RFCs on the already agreed scope for changes that have been revealed during the central and national development activities and some documentation RFCs.

1.3 APPLICABILITY

This document is applicable to the previous versions of FESS and DDNEA for Phase 3, FESS v3.82 and DDNEA v1.92.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THIS DOCUMENT

Chapter 1 – Introduction: Introduces the purpose and scope of this document.

Chapter 2 – Reference and Applicable Documents: Lists the references that have been used to prepare this RFC list.

Chapter 3 – Terminology: Explains the terminology.

Chapter 4 – Overview of Changes for this Release: Groups RFCs by release number.

Chapter 5 – Change Requests: Lists and describes the RFCs in sequential order.

Chapter 6 – Annex - FESS RFCs: Provides a series of files with more information about the FESS RFCs.

Chapter 7 – Annex - DDNEA RFCs: Provides a series of files with more information about the DDNEA RFCs.

2 REFERENCE AND APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

2.1 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Ref.	Title	Reference	Version
R01	Excise Glossary of Terms (GLT)	ITSM2_LOT2-SC04-QTM-10-Excise-GLT	2.09
R02	Functional Excise System Specifications (FESS)	ECP1-ESS-FESS-CP	3.82
R03	Functional Excise System Specification (FESS) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations	TES-List of RFCs-029-FESS	6.25
R04	DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3	ECP3-FITSDEV2-SC03-DDNEA	1.92
R05	Design Documentation for National Excise Applications for EMCS Phase 3 (DDNEA for Phase 3) List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations	TES-List of RFCs-018-DDNEA-P3-RFC List	3.64
R06	SEEDv1 List of Requests for Change and EMCS Change Advisory Board Recommendations	ITSM2_LOT2-SC05-RPT-010-SEEDv1-RFC List	3.90

Table 1: Reference Documents

2.2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

Ref.	Title	Reference	Version
A01	EMCS Change Management Process	QAC-EMCSChangeMan	2.00

Table 2: Applicable Documents

3 TERMINOLOGY

3.1 ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Abbreviation	Meaning
AAD	Administrative Accompanying Document
ARC	AAD Reference Code
CD	Common Domain
CDEA	Centrally Developed Excise Application
CTA	Conformance Testing Application
DDNEA	Design Document for National Excise Applications
DG TAXUD	Directorate-General Taxation and Customs Union
DI	Data Item
e-AD	Electronic Administrative Accompanying Document
ECWP	Excise Computerisation Working Party
ECP	Excise Computerisation Project
ECS	Export Control System
ED	External Domain
EMCS	Excise Movement and Control System
EMCS CAB	EMCS Change Advisory Board
FAD	Fallback Accompanying Document
FESS	Functional Excise System Specifications
IE	Information Exchange
MSA	Member State Administration
N/A	Not Applicable
NEA	National Excise Applications
ND	National Domain
RFC	Request for Change
SEED	System for Exchange of Excise Data
STD	State Transition Diagram
TA	Testing Application
UC	Use Case
XML	eXtensible Mark-up Language
XSD	XML Schema Definition

Table 3: Abbreviations and Acronyms

3.2 DEFINITIONS

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

4 OVERVIEW OF CHANGES FOR THIS RELEASE

Release	RFC	RFC Label	Category of Change	Status	Release Date
v3.90	FESS-201	Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-210	Removal of Cn Code “1509 10 90” included in Sections "2.3 CN Codes" and “2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
~~v3.90~~	~~FESS-211~~	~~Update of description of the Excise product code “E920” in Section “2.2 Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B~~	~~Review~~	~~Accepted~~	~~11/2018~~
v3.90	FESS-212	Invalid connection of Cn Code “2204 21 84” with Product “S200” in Section “2.4 Correspondences Cn Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-213	Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-214	Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-215	Remove from FESS the references to the pre-defined scheduling for reference data dissemination	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-216	Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-217	Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-218	Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

v3.90	FESS-219	Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105 / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-220	Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-221	Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-222	Update of Rule130 in IE802	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-223	Update of Rule026	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-224	Update structure of <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> data group	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-225	Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-226	Update the description of a code ‘8’ in the code list 'REFUSAL REASONS	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-227	Update the format of 'Request Correlation Identifier'	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-228	Updates in the IE701 message in relation to the <REF_REQUEST> data group	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-229	Update the format of the data item 'Commercial Description of Goods'	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-230	Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the “RA_PRIMARY Value” data item	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-231	Adding clarifications on Common Specifications	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

		about ship supplies treatment / Rev2			
v3.90	FESS-232	Update the 'COUNTRY CODES' code list to be aligned with IE734	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-233	Update the rule applied on 'Sequence Number' in IE803/IE818	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-234	Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-Ads / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-235	Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-236	Update the optionality of "Reference of Evidence_LNG" Data Item in FESS	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-237	Update the description of condition 'Cond201'	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-238	Update the description of rule 'Rule210'	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-239	Update the description of the rule 'Rule248'	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-240	Structured information on attachments	Objection	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-241	Extending the Manual Closure functionality/ Rev1	Objection	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-242	Update of Excise Product Codes and CN Codes	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v3.90	FESS-243	Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-228	Propagate to the .xsds the validation that the value of several Data Items must be greater than zero	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

v2.00	DDNEA-P3-229	Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-241	Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-242	Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-243	Correction in DDNEA "X.I.2.2.11 Opening a queue" section	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-244	Update regarding the 'CorrelId' structure in cases where ARC and Sequence Number are missing	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-245	Add the erroneously removed error codes on TC49/Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-246	Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-247	Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-248	Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-249	Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-250	Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-251	Updates in order to allow zero values in specific numerical data items of IE742 message	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

v2.00	DDNEA-P3-252	Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-254	Changes in the types.xsd to allow leading zeroes for CN Codes	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-255	Update code list mapping of TC10	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-256	Adding clarifications on Common Specifications about ship supplies treatment / Rev2	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-257	Update the rules applied on ‘Sequence Number’ in IE803/IE818	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-258	Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-ADs / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-259	Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-260	Update the description of condition ‘C201’	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-261	Extending the maximum length of "DescriptionType" to allow more characters in the descriptions of codes / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-262	Add missing values in the ‘Primary Criterion Type Code’ code list	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-263	Update XML tag for the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> data item	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-264	Consultation of registration information by economic operators / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

v2.00	DDNEA-P3-265	Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the “RA_PRIMARY Value” data item	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-266	Allowing zero values in specific numerical data items	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-267	Update the description of rule ‘Rule248’	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-268	Adding clarifications in the Common Specifications about the use of UTC for ‘Date’ fields	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-269	Structured information on attachments	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-270	Extending the Manual Closure functionality / Rev1	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-271	Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-273	Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018
v2.00	DDNEA-P3-274	Update of Rule026	Review	~~Accepted~~Implemented	11/2018

Table 4: Overview of Changes for this Release

5 CHANGE REQUESTS

5.1 FESS CHANGE REQUESTS

FESS-201 – Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-201
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Increase of Functionality
Incidents	IM17655
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	11/05/2016
Requester	MSA-FI

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** In the current situation of EMCS, the Control Report IE717 has a placeholder only for the evidence (and attachments) of a movement event in <IE717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT>. Moreover, the evidence (and attachments) of a movement event in <IE717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT> is applicable only when the reason for the control is "Event signalled" (as per condition C090). The current situation appears to be too restrictive. Supporting evidence (possibly accompanied by attached images) could provide useful information for all movement controls independently of the reason they are conducted. The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in the IE717 message for accommodating supporting evidence. **Proposed Solution:** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates will be implemented in FESS: 1. Appendix D: Functional Messages: • The Data Group <IE717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT> shall be updated as follows: *<IE717.CONTROL REPORT.SUPPORTING EVIDENCE>* • Cond090 included in the list of Conditions:

	IF <Reason for Control> is "Event signalled" *THEN <EVIDENCE OF EVENT> is 'R'* *ELSE <EVIDENCE OF EVENT> does not apply* shall be updated as follows: *IF <Reason for Control> is "Event signalled"* *THEN <SUPPORTING EVIDENCE> is 'R'* *ELSE <SUPPORTING EVIDENCE> is 'O'*
Impact assessment	Specification documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) Excise BPM (Low): • The 'Description/Definition' of the class 'Cond090' will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	The effect of not performing the updates in FESS will be to retain current strict situation of EMCS in which useful information for all movement controls independently of the reason they are conducted, could not be provided with IE717 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-P3-229 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	Annex of Implementing Regulation 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #148 on 20/05/2016

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-210 – Removal of Cn Code “1509 10 90” included in Sections "2.3 CN Codes" and “2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-210
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Legislation Alignment
Incidents	IM186463
Known Error	KE16299
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/01/2017
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem statement:** A misalignment between FESS and “ANNEX I COMBINED NOMENCLATURE” that amended through the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1821 of 6 October 2016 has been identified regarding the CN Code 15091090. More specifically, the CN Code 15091090 should be removed based on the annual updates of the CN Codes for 2017 and CN codes 15091020 and 15091080 to be introduced instead. As per FESS-205 RFC, CN Code 15091090 was included in Sections "*2.3 CN Codes*" and “*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product”* of FESS Appendix B:

Code	Description
...	....
15091090	Virgin olive oil other than lampante, but not chemically modified
15091020	Extra virgin olive oil
15091080	Virgin olive oil other than lampante and extra virgin, but not chemically modified
...	....

Code	Description
...	....
E200	15091020

E200	15091080
E200	15091090
...	...

The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align FESS Appendix B with the amendments performed in "ANNEX I COMBINED NOMENCLATURE" via Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1821 of 6 October 2016.

Proposed solution:

As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix B:

- Removal of the below entry from the table of Section "*2.3 CN Codes*":

15091090	Virgin olive oil other than lampante, but not chemically modified

- Removal of the below entry from the table in Section "*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product*":

E200	15091090

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) Excise BPM (Low): • The 'CL CN Codes' matrix model will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section *Note: The aforementioned updates will also be performed in the IE734. The updated IE734 will be created and made available to the MSAs*
Effect of not implementing the Change	The effect of not performing the updates in FESS will be the misalignment between "ANNEX I COMBINED NOMENCLATURE" and FESS Appendix B
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC
Deployment approach	N/A
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** IE734-021 • **Other RFCs:** FESS-205

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	Annex II of IR 684/2009

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #158 on 31/03/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

~~FESS-211 – Update of description of the Excise product code "E920" in Section "2.2 Excise Product" of FESS Appendix B~~

~~RFC Information~~

~~RFC number~~	~~FESS-211~~
~~RFC status~~	~~Accepted~~
~~Reason for Change~~	~~Specification Defect~~
~~Incidents~~	~~IM186565~~
~~Known Error~~	~~KE16300~~
~~Date at which the Change was proposed~~	~~16/01/2017~~
~~Requester~~	~~MSA-HR~~

~~Change Assessment~~

~~Change priority~~	~~Medium~~
~~Change Description~~	~~**Problem statement:**~~ ~~According to FESS 205 RFC the following CN Codes were updated as follows:~~ ~~• CN Code "38249092" to "38249992"~~ ~~• CN Code "38249093" to "38249993"~~ ~~• CN code "38249096" to "38249996"~~ ~~The aforementioned updates were implemented in Sections "*2.3 CN Codes*" and "*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product*" of FESS Appendix B, but they were not implemented in Section "*2.2 Excise Product*" of FESS Appendix B.~~ ~~Therefore, the description of the Excise Product "E920" is erroneously presented as follows:~~

~~E920~~	~~E~~	~~2~~	~~Chemical products or preparations, predominantly composed of organic compounds falling within CN codes 3824 90 92, 3824 90 93 and 3824 90 96, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel~~

~~**Proposed solution:**~~

~~As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following entry of Section "*2.2 Excise Product*" of FESS Appendix B:~~

~~E920~~	~~E~~	~~2~~	~~Chemical products or preparations, predominantly composed of organic compounds falling within CN codes 3824 90 92, 3824 90 93 and 3824 90 96, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel~~	

~~will be updated as follows:~~

~~E920~~	~~E~~	~~2~~	~~Chemical products or preparations, predominantly composed of organic compounds falling within CN codes 3824 99 92, 3824 99 93 and 3824 99 96, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel~~

~~Impact assessment~~	~~Specification Documents:~~ ~~• FESS (Medium)~~ ~~Excise BPM (Low):~~ ~~• The 'CL Excise Product' matrix model will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section~~ ~~*Note: The aforementioned updates will also be performed in the IE734. The updated IE734 will be created and made available to the MSAs.*~~
~~Effect of not implementing the Change~~	~~If the proposed change is not implemented, then the erroneous CN codes "3824 90 92", "3824 90 93" and "3824 90 96" will be retained in Section "2.2 *Excise Product*" of FESS Appendix B~~
~~Risk assessment~~	~~There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC~~
~~Deployment approach~~	~~N/A~~
~~Reference to other RFCs~~	~~• **Parent RFCs: -**~~ ~~• **Children RFCs:** IE734-022~~ ~~• **Other RFCs:** FESS-205~~

~~Indicative changes to legislation~~

~~Draft recital for information~~	~~N/A~~
~~Location of change in Legislation~~	~~Annex II of IR 684/2009~~

~~Approval Process~~

~~CAB recommendation~~	~~• **Category of the Change: Review**~~ ~~• **Approval process:**~~

	~~o The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB~~
~~ECWP position~~	~~N/A~~
~~Authorisation date and process~~	~~EMCS CAB #158 on 31/03/2017~~

~~Release information~~

~~Release number~~	~~v3.90~~
~~Release date~~	~~11/2018~~
~~Deadline for alignment in Production~~	~~After Milestone Mj~~

~~Change Review~~

~~Review date~~	
~~Review results~~	

FESS-212 – Invalid connection of Cn Code “2204 21 84” with Product “S200” in Section “2.4 Correspondences Cn Code - Excise Product” of FESS Appendix B

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-212
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM188223
Known Error	KE16298
Date at which the Change was proposed	25/01/2017
Requester	MSA-BG

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem statement:** As per FESS-205 RFC, CN Code 22042184 was included in Sections "*2.3 CN Codes*" and “*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product”* of FESS Appendix B as follows:

Code	Description
...	....
22042184	Non varietal wine, other than white, produced in the Community, of an actual alcoholic strength by volume not exceeding 15% vol. in containers holding 2 litres or less
...	....

Code	Description
...	....
W200	22042184
...	....
S200	22042184
...	...

The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to remove the connection between the CN Code “22042184” with the Excise Product “S200”: “Spirituous beverages” from Section “*2.4 Correspondences Cn Code - Excise Product*” of FESS Appendix B.

	Proposed solution: As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix B: • Removal of the below entry from the table in Section "*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product*": S200 | 22042184 • Addition of the below entry in the table in Section "*2.4 Correspondences CN Code - Excise Product*": I000 | 22042181
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • Excise BPM (None) *Note: The aforementioned updates will also be performed in the IE734. The updated IE734 will be created and made available to the MSAs*
Effect of not implementing the Change	N/A
Risk assessment	N/A
Deployment approach	N/A
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** IE734-023 • **Other RFCs:** FESS-205

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #158 on 31/03/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-213 – Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-213
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM197330
Known Error	KE16442
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/03/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement** According to FESS Section III, Sub-section "5.1 Maintenance and dissemination of the EOL (UC1.11)" EMCS is not responsible for the maintenance and dissemination of the Excise Office List (EOL). Instead, the maintenance and dissemination of the Customs Office List (COL) (which includes the EOL) is performed by the NCTS CS/RD application via the IE931 message. SEED receives the IE931 from the NCTS CS/RD application, it filters the Offices that are enabled to handle EMCS operations and saves them into the SEED central repository. These Offices are used by SEED for internal application purposes (such as validation). However, it was observed that in FESS v3.82, Rule126 which applies to the "Request Type" data item in IE701 message, the value '- 3 = Request for EOL" exists but is never used. This value was inserted in the past for supporting a relevant functionality which however was not implemented. The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in Rule126. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be implemented in FESS: • Appendix D – Functional Messages Rule126: *"The possible values of <Request Type> are:* *- 1 = (reserved)* *- 2 = Request for reference data*

	- 3 = Request for EOL *- 4 = (reserved)* *- 5 = Request for re-synchronization of the register of economic operators* *- 6 = Request for retrieval of a list of e-ADs* *- 7 = Request for SEED statistics "* will be updated as follows: *"The possible values of <Request Type> are:* *- 1 = (reserved)* *- 2 = Request for reference data* ***- 3 = (reserved)*** *- 4 = (reserved)* *- 5 = Request for re-synchronization of the register of economic operators* *- 6 = Request for retrieval of a list of e-ADs* *- 7 = Request for SEED statistics"*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) Excise BPM (Low): • The 'TC Common Request Type' matrix model will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	The effect of not implementing the change is the preservation of the value "- 3 = Request for EOL" in Rule126 which is never used
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-241
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-241 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	Annex of IR 612/2013

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-214 – Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-214
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM210832, IM214515
Known Error	KE16816
Date at which the Change was proposed	10/07/2017
Requester	MSA-LT, MSA-BE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** As part of RFC 'FESS-187' and RFC 'DDNEA-P3-218', a new Data Item 'National Case Reference Identifier' was added in the <FOLLOW UP> data group of the ACO and MVS messages. Additionally, rules Rule240 and Rule241 as well as conditions Cond184 and Cond185 were introduced and applied on the newly added data item. However, as noted in the RFC 'FESS-187', "*If RFC FESS-198 is approved, then Cond185 and Rule241 will need to be amended (similarly to Cond184 and Rule240, respectively), due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality".* The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in Rule241 and Cond185 due to the insertion of MVS spontaneous information functionality, in FESS v3.82. **Proposed Solution:** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following update shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: Functional Messages: • Cond185 will be updated as follows: "*IF <MV Correlation ID> does not match with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message* *THEN <National Case Reference Identifier> is 'O'* *ELSE IF <MV Correlation ID> matches with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message AND <National Case Reference Identifier> is present in the request message* *THEN <National Case Reference Identifier> is 'R'* *ELSE <National Case Reference Identifier> does not apply*."

	• Rule241 will be updated as follows: *"IF <MV Correlation ID> matches with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message AND <National Case Reference Identifier> is present in the request message* *THEN* *<National Case Reference Identifier> must be equal to the value of <National Case Reference Identifier> in the request message."*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) Excise BPM (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, Cond185 and Rule241 will not be updated (similarly to Cond184 and Rule240, respectively) to consider the insertion of MVS spontaneous information functionality
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-P3-242 • **Other RFCs:** FESS-187, FESS-198

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact in the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90

Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-215 – Remove from FESS the references to the pre-defined scheduling for reference data dissemination

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-215
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM197329
Known Error	KE16443
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/03/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** In the context of RfA#393 “Production of EMCS 3.3 BPMs” it was observed that according to FESS v3.82 (Sub-section "5.3.3 General conditions" of "5.3 Dissemination of other reference data (UC1.05)"of FESS 3.82), the dissemination of the IE734 (from SEED to MSAs) can be triggered upon a pre-defined scheduling, with no other information mentioned regarding this pre-defined process (e.g. its frequency). However, such pre-defined scheduling is not described in DDNEA and it is also not implemented in the current system (SEED). The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to remove from FESS the references to the pre-defined scheduling for reference data dissemination. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section and upon DG TAXUD’s confirmation, the following updates shall be implemented in FESS, SECTION III SEED: In the sub-section"5.3.3 General conditions" of "5.3 Dissemination of other reference data (UC1.05)" the sentence: *“upon a pre-defined scheduling or upon an explicit request, the MSA central services receive a signal for update of the reference data in a particular Member State or in a group of Member States”* will be updated as follows: *“upon **any update of the reference data to the central SEED repository** or upon an explicit request, the MSA central services receive a signal for update of the reference*

	data in a particular Member State or in a group of Member States".
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the misalignment between FESS and DDNEA, regarding the supposed pre-defined scheduling for reference data dissemination will be retained
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC
Deployment approach	N/A
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

FESS-216 – Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-216
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM197332
Known Error	KE16441
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/03/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** According to DDNEA v1.92 (Sub-section "V.I.2.1 Introduction" of "V.I.2 Exchange of Reference Data"), changes to the EMCS Reference Data are disseminated by SEED to each MSA according to their dissemination profile preferences. This is also in alignment with the current system behaviour, i.e. the IE734 is disseminated to the MSAs that are registered for receiving IE734 disseminations. However, in the context of RfA#393 “Production of EMCS 3.3 BPMs” it was observed that in FESS v3.82 it is not clarified that, in the aforementioned scenario, SEED sends the IE734 only to the MSAs who are registered to receive IE734 disseminations. The present RFC proposes the required updates in order to align FESS with DDNEA concerning the dissemination of reference data. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be implemented in FESS, SECTION III SEED: • The following sentence of Section “5.3.1 Overview”: *“The Common Domain sends to all Member States the updates of the reference data.”* will be updated as follows: *“The Common Domain sends **the updates of the reference data to all Member States that are registered for receiving reference data disseminations**.”* • In the description of the process “UC-105-110” included in the sub-section"5.3.7 Processes" of "5.3 Dissemination of other reference data (UC1.05)":

	○ The sentence: *"The Common Domain central services put the update message at the disposal of all MSAs."* will be updated as follows: *"The Common Domain central services put the update message at the disposal of all MSAs* ***that are registered for receiving reference data disseminations."*** ○ The sentence: "the reference data are available to all MSAs." will be updated as follows: "the reference data are available to all MSAs ***that are registered for receiving reference data disseminations."***
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) Excise BPM (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the misalignment between FESS, DDNEA and the current system behaviour, concerning IE734 disseminations will be retained
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-246
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-246 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-217 – Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-217
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM207257, IM181989, IM214532, IM221370
Known Error	KE17841
Date at which the Change was proposed	06/07/2017
Requester	MSA-AT, MSA-LT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to include in FESS the required clarifications in relation to the Feedback process for 'Administrative Cooperation' and 'Movement Verification for Duty Paid Movements' scenarios. More specifically, clarifications are required in relation to the data that shall be used when an MSA provides feedback in the aforementioned scenarios, as well as the applicability of the feedback process in the MVS spontaneous information scenarios. **Proposed Solution:** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following update shall be performed in FESS Main document: o Section '2.1 Administrative cooperation' will be updated as described below in bold: *"Spontaneous information* *Upon Risk Assessment (following for instance the receipt of an e-AD or a change of destination), or upon any other event, an issuing MSA (typically, the MSA of destination) selects consignments it considers at risk, performs the relevant verifications and controls and sends the results to an addressed MSA (typically, the MSA of dispatch) if an irregularity or an infringement has been established or for any other reason.* *The same mechanism allows a MSA to send any information other than results of verifications and actions, if found relevant.* ***The issuing MSA does not have the possibility to request feedback from the addressed MSA."***

- Section '5 Administrative cooperation' will be updated as described below in bold:

  "Spontaneous information
  Without being solicited, the issuing MSA sends a message to the addressed MSA without waiting for any further action; it is up to the addressed MSA to undertake actions if their own analysis determines so.
  The contents of the message may be the summary of a situation or the results of prior actions that could be of interest for the addressed MSA.
  There may be several addressed MSAs to which the issuing MSA sends the same message.
  The issuing MSA may not request feedback from the addressed MSA on the follow up actions taken based on the input provided."

- Section '5.2.1 Overview' will be updated as described below in bold:

  "*Via the results message, the requested ELO may request the requesting ELO to provide feedback on the follow-up action taken by the requesting MSA, on the basis of the provided results (see Articles 8(5), 15(2) and 16(2) of Regulation (EU) 389/2012, Articles 8, 15 and 16). In case such feedback is requested, the requesting ELO shall send back their feedback as soon as possible via another results message,* ***that shall include information which is relevant to the requested feedback****."*

- Section '5.2.7 Processes', process 'UC-307-140' will be updated as described below in bold:

  "In order to provide the feedback on the follow-up action(s) taken by the requesting MSA, on the basis of the results received from the requested ELO (UC-307-130 – Receive results message), the requesting ELO prepares a message (IE867:C_COO_RES) including ***information which is relevant to the requested feedback****:"*

- Section '7 Movement Verification for Duty Paid Movements' will be updated as described below in bold:

  "Spontaneous information
  Without being solicited, the issuing MSA sends a message to the addressed MSA without waiting for any further action; it is up to the addressed MSA to undertake actions if their own analysis determines so.
  The contents of the message may be the summary of a situation or the results of prior actions that could be of interest for the addressed MSA.
  There may be several addressed MSAs to which the issuing MSA sends the same message.
  The issuing MSA may not request feedback from the addressed MSA on the follow up actions taken based on the input provided.
  Request

	The requesting MSA sends a request to a single identified requested MSA with as much information as possible on a situation and possibly a list of requested actions of which the results are to be communicated back by a given deadline. The requested MSA has the opportunity to delay that deadline through an answer message. *In all cases, the requested MSA is committed to give the results of their actions, possibly that they could not perform all or part of the requested actions or that they could not retrieve the requested information.* ***The requested MSA may request feedback from the requesting MSA on the follow up action taken based on the results provided, to which the requesting MSA should reply back by sending the feedback.*** *If the results are not received back by the deadline, the requesting MSA sends a reminder to the requested MSA."* o Section '7.1.1 Overview' will be updated as described below in bold: *"Via the results message, the requested ELO may request the requesting ELO to provide feedback on the follow-up action taken by the requesting MSA, on the basis of the provided results (see Articles 8(5), 15(2) and 16(2) of Regulation (EU) 389/2012, Articles 8, 15 and 16). In case such feedback is requested, the requesting ELO shall send back their feedback as soon as possible via another results message**, that shall include information which is relevant to the requested feedback.**"* o Section '7.1.7 Processes', process 'UC-315-140' will be updated as described below in bold: *"In order to provide the feedback on the follow-up action(s) taken by the requesting MSA, on the basis of the results received from the requested ELO (UC-315-130 – Receive results message), the requesting ELO prepares a message (IE725:C_MVS_RES) including **information which is relevant to the requested feedback**:"*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) Excise BPM (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	The proposed changes are introduced to include the clarifications in FESS in relation to the feedback processes in ACO and MVS scenarios. Multiple queries from MSAs have been raised regarding those processes and these clarifications aim to address any relevant ambiguities.
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-P3-247 • **Other RFCs:** FESS-190

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-218 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-218
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM176183, IM176182, IM176181
Known Error	KE16214, KE16215, KE16218
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/11/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** It was observed that there are some discrepancies between current system behavior (SEED) and the Common Specifications for EMCS Phase 3 (FESS v3.82 and DDNEA v1.92). More specifically, according to FESS ((Sub-section “4.2.3 General conditions” of 4.2 Dissemination of registration data (UC1.15)”), the dissemination of the IE713 (from SEED to MSAs) can be triggered upon a pre-defined scheduling, with no other information mentioned regarding this pre-defined process (e.g. its frequency). However, such pre-defined scheduling is not described in DDNEA or in the Legislation and is also not implemented in SEED. Moreover, according to DDNEA (Sub-section “V.I.3.1.2 Dissemination of SEED data (UC1.14)”), after receiving a valid notification of modification (IE713) from a MSA (MSA central services), SEED (Common Domain central services) disseminates this valid IE713 to all MSAs that opted for receiving IE713 disseminations. This is also in alignment with the current system behaviour as well as with Legislation. On the other hand, in FESS (EBP UC-115-110 “Disseminate changes” of Section III), it is not clarified that, in the aforementioned scenario, SEED sends the IE713 only to the MSAs who are registered to receive IE713 disseminations. Finally, according to the current system behaviour, after receiving a valid IE713 from a MSA, SEED disseminates the valid IE713 to all MSAs (that are registered to receive IE713 disseminations) without building a consolidated message. That is, the disseminated IE713 includes only the updates submitted via the specific notification of modification (received from the MSA), hence it does not include consolidated updates submitted previously by the MSAs.

The present RFC proposes the required updates in order to align FESS with the current system behaviour concerning the dissemination of registration data.

Proposed Solution

As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section the following updates shall be implemented in FESS, SECTION III SEED:

• In the sub-section "4.2.3 General conditions " of " 4.2 Dissemination of registration data (UC1.15) " the sentence:

> *"upon integration of any updates submitted by the MSAs to the central SEED repository or upon a pre-defined scheduling or upon an explicit request, the MSA central services receive a signal for update of the registration data in a particular Member State or in a group of Member States"*

will be updated as follows:

> *"upon integration of any updates submitted by the MSAs to the central SEED repository* ~~***or upon a pre-defined scheduling***~~ *or upon an explicit request, the MSA central services receive a signal for update of the registration data in a particular Member State or in a group of Member States".*

• The following sentence of Section "4.1.1 Overview":

> *"The Common Domain sends back to all Member States the updates of the register."*

will be updated as follows:

> *"The Common Domain sends back to all Member States,* ***that are registered for receiving registration data disseminations****, the updates of the register."*

• The following sentence of Section "4.2.1 Overview":

> *"The Common Domain sends back to all Member States the updates of the register, as soon as they are integrated to the central SEED repository."*

will be updated as follows:

> *"****After receiving a valid notification of modification from a MSA****, the Common Domain sends back to all Member States,* ***that are registered for receiving registration data disseminations****, the updates of the register, as soon as they are integrated to the central SEED repository.* ***It shall be noted that the disseminated updates of the register include only these updates submitted via the specific notification of modification, hence they do not include consolidated updates submitted previously by the MSAs.****"*

	• The process "UC-115-110" included in the sub-section "4.2.7 Processes": "***Description***: *The application of the Common Domain central services disseminates the current update (IE713:C_QRO_DAT) to all MSAs, or send a notification of available updates.* *The application of the Common Domain applies the contents of the update to the reference registration data base."* ***"Final situation:*** *the update information is available to all Member States."* will be updated as follows: "***Description***: *The application of the Common Domain central services disseminates the current update (IE713:C_QRO_DAT) to all MSAs* ***that are registered for receiving registration data disseminations****, or send a notification of available updates.* *The application of the Common Domain applies the contents of the update to the reference registration data base."* ***"Final situation:*** *the update information is available to all Member States,* ***that are registered for receiving registration data disseminations****.* • The following text of Section "4.2.8 Major result": *"• the update information is available to all Member States"* will be updated as follows: *"• the update information is available to all Member States* ***that are registered for receiving registration data disseminations****"*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • Further Clarifications in alignment with the details outlined in the 'Proposed Solution' section will be added in the 'Notes' section of L4-RADM-01-03-Dissemination of registration data'. It shall be noted that the 'Notes' section in this process already includes clarifications about the discrepancies analysed in this RFC • A note will be added in the description of ""L3-RADM-01-04-Prepare an extract from the Central Register of all active records"" as follows: The respective L4 model is not provided since the preparation of an extract from the Central Register of all active records and the

	relative communication with SEED-on-EUROPA is part of CA SEED specifications • A note will be added in the description of ""L4-RADM-01-05-Consultation of registration information by Economic Operators' as follows: The preparation of an extract from the Central Register of all active records and the relative communication with SEED-on-EUROPA is already part of CA SEED specifications. The legal requirement (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 612/2013 (Article 6 (1)) has been covered through the creation of ""L3-RADM-01-04-Prepare an extract from the Central Register of all active records"" model."
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the misalignment between FESS, DDNEA and the current system behaviour, concerning the dissemination of registration data will be remained
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-248
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-248 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[1]

Release information

Release number	v3.90

[1] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-219 – Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105 / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-219
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM223691
Known Error	KE17831
Date at which the Change was proposed	01/09/2017
Requester	MSA-FR

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the development of EMCS Phase 3.3 by the MSAs, it was observed that there is a misalignment between FESS v3.82, Appendix D and DDNEA v1.92, Appendix D. More specifically, the rule Rule245, which is applied on the "Other Accompanying Document" Data Item of the Data Group <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> both in IE717 and IE840 messages is described as below in FESS: *"The possible values of <Other Accompanying Document Type> are:* *- 0 = Other* *- 1 = SAAD "* However, according to TC105 the possible values of the "Other Accompanying Document" Data Item are the following: - 0 = Other - 2 = SAAD The present RFC proposes the necessary updates in Rule245. Please note that the corresponding downstream DDNEA-P3-RFC includes the required alignments in the TC mapping in Appendix B of DDNEA. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates will be implemented in the Appendix D of FESS: • The wording of Rule245: *"The possible values of <Other Accompanying Document Type> are:*

	- 0 = Other *- 1 = SAAD"* will be updated as below: *"The possible values of <Other Accompanying Document Type> are:* *- 0 = Other* ***- 2 = SAAD"***
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The 'Description/Definition' of Rule245 will need to be updated as detailed in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the misalignment between FESS, DDNEA and the current system behaviour, concerning the values that are applicable to the "Other Accompanying Document" Data Item will be retained
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC
Deployment approach	N/A
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-273 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[2]

[2] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-220 – Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-220
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM218327, IM228124
Known Error	KE17126
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** During the development of EMCS Phase 3.3., it was observed that the Rule025 that applies on IE701. <LIST OF CODES>. Requested List of Codes is not correctly updated based on the code list changes described in: - FESS-188/ FESS-189 - DDNEA-P3-219/ DDNEA-P3-220/ DDNEA-P3-235 The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align FESS with the code list changes described in the aforementioned RFCs. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in FESS (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: Functional Messages, Section '5 List of Rules'

Code	Description
Rule 025	The possible values of <Requested List of Code> are: - 1 = Units of measure - 2 = Events types - 3 = Evidence types - 4 = (reserved) - 5 = (reserved) - 6 = Language codes - 7 = Member states - 8 = Country codes - 9 = Packaging codes - 10 = Reasons for unsatisfactory receipt or control report - 11 = Reasons for interruption - 12 = (reserved) - 13 = Transport modes

	- 14 = Transport units - 15 = Wine-growing zones - 16 = Wine operation codes - 17 = Excise product categories - 18 = Excise products - 19 = CN codes - 20 = Correspondences CN code - Excise product - 21 = Cancellation reasons - 22 = Alert or rejection of e-AD reasons - 23 = Delay explanations - 24 = (reserved) - 25 = Event submitting persons - 26 = Refusal reasons - 27 = Reasons for delayed result ***- 28 = Request actions*** ***- 29 = Request reasons*** - 30 = (reserved) - 31 = (reserved) - 32 = (reserved) - 33 = (reserved) - 34 = Administrative cooperation action not possible reasons **- 35 = *(reserved)*** ***- 36 = Type of document*** ***- 37 = (reserved)*** ***- 38 = (reserved)***
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) Excise BPM (Medium): • The values codelist (Matrix Model) 'TC Requested List of Codes (full)' will need to be updated as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the list of codes included in Rule025 will continue not being up to date in FESS
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-P3-249 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 612/2013

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[3]

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[3] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

FESS-221 – Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-221
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM218324
Known Error	KE17002
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) message. More specifically, the retrieval operation for reference data is performed with the usage of Central SEED application via an IE701 (C_REQ_SUB) message. The application should return via an IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) all the values concerning the specific parameters in the provided time period (from date - to date). According to FESS v3.82 Appendix D, the <System Parameters> data group has no multiplicity. Nonetheless, the IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) that will be returned for EMCS Phase 3.3 for a request of retrieval will be invalid, since it will contain more than one <System Parameters> data groups (One required for the information for EMCS Phase 3.2 and one the updated value for EMCS Phase 3.3). This happens due to the required migration action described in Migration Plan for EMCS Phase 3.3 (Section A.1 MESSAGE TRANSFORMATION ACTIONS DUE TO SEED RFCS) concerning FESS-197/DDNEA-P3-226. In order to avoid similar issues in the future, the multiplicity of <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> should also be updated (current multiplicity: x8). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D:

	The IE734. operations on the reference data base (C_RDD_DAT) message structure consist on the following messages: • IE732. common list of codes (C_COD_DAT); • IE709. common system parameters (C_PAR_DAT). Therefore, the structure of IE709. common system parameters C_PAR_DAT shall be updated: **From:** SYSTEM PARAMETERS 1x O ACTION 1x R MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS 8x O ACTION 1x R EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS for Splitting 999x O ACTION 1x R **To:** SYSTEM PARAMETERS **999x** O ACTION 1x R MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS **999x** O ACTION 1x R EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS for Splitting 999x O ACTION 1x R
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) Excise BPM (Medium): • The attribute 'Multiplicity Upper Limit' for the <SYSTEM PARAMETERS> and <MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS> data groups in IE709 will be updated as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	The effect of not implementing the change is that the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) message will not be correctly updated
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-250
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs: -** • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-250 • **Other RFCs:** FESS-197

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[4]

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[4] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

FESS-222 – Update of Rule130 in IE802

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-222
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249170
Known Error	KE17832
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/18
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** It was identified during the Technical Annexes Activity that the description of Rule130 in FESS Appendix D needs to be updated and be aligned with the details outlined in the corresponding TC48 in DDNEA Appendix D. More specifically, there is a discrepancy between TC48 of DDNEA Appendix B and Rule130 of FESS Appendix D, concerning value “3” from the list of possible values. The description of this value should be updated in FESS Appendix D, in order to be aligned with the DDNEA and the current system behaviour. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: The Rule130 in FESS Appendix D should be changed as follows: *From*: **Rule130** The possible values of <Message Type> are: -1 = Reminder message at expiry of time to change destination (or split) -2 = Reminder message at expiry of time to send the report of receipt/export -3 = Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (Article 22) *To*:

	Rule130 The possible values of <Message Type> are: -1 = Reminder message at expiry of time to change destination (or split) -2 = Reminder message at expiry of time to send the report of receipt/export -3 = Reminder message at expiry of time to give destination information (***Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC***)"
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (None): • None, since the corresponding technical term in 'TC Reminder Message Type' is already aligned as per the proposed solution
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancies concerning the Rule130 and TC48 between FESS and DDNEA will remain
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-223 – Update of Rule026

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-223
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249175
Known Error	KE17833
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** It was identified during the Technical Annexes Activity that the description of Rule026 in FESS Appendix D needs to be aligned with the corresponding description of R026 in DDNEA Appendix D (i.e. adding the clarification of "Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC" instead of "Article 22 of the Directive". **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: The **Rule026** shall be updated as follows: *From:*

Rule026	The possible values of <Operator Role Code> are: - 1 = Allowed to practise direct delivery - 2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of the Directive The couplings <Operator Type / Operator Role Code> are as follows:

OPERATOR TYPE / OPERATOR ROLE	AUTHORISED WAREHOUSE KEEPER	REGISTERED CONSIGNEE	REGISTERED CONSIGNOR
Allowed to practise	X	X	

	direct delivery			
	Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of the Directive	X		X

To:

Rule026 The possible values of <Operator Role Code> are:

- 1 = Allowed to practise direct delivery
- 2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to ***Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC***

The couplings <Operator Type / Operator Role Code> are as follows:

OPERATOR TYPE / OPERATOR ROLE	AUTHORISED WAREHOUSE KEEPER	REGISTERED CONSIGNEE	REGISTERED CONSIGNOR
Allowed to practise direct delivery	X	X	
Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to ***Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC***	X		X

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- FESS (Low)

Excise BPM (None):

- None, since the corresponding value in 'TC Operator Role Code' is aligned with the proposed solution

Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancy in the description of Rule026 in FESS Appendix D and DDNEA Appendix D will not be resolved
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-274 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-224 – Update structure of <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> data group

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-224
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249174
Known Error	KE17835
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the review of the Excise BPMs, a discrepancy between FESS Appendix D and DDNEA Appendix D was identified in relation to the message structure of the IE717 and IE840 messages. More specifically, in FESS Appendix D, data group <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> is not placed under the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group in IE717 and IE840 messages which is not aligned with the corresponding message structure in DDNEA Appendix D. The structure of the aforementioned messages in relation to the <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> data group should be aligned with the structured described in DDNEA Appendix D. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the structure of the IE717 and IE840 messages in FESS Appendix D should be updated so that "MEANS OF TRANSPORT" Data Group is located under the "OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT" Data Group in order to be aligned with DDNEA and the Excise BPMs: • The structure of IE717 message shall be updated as follows: *From:*

IE717. control report C_CCR_DAT

control report

Used in: UC3.03
Similar functional messages under NCTS: IE17-N_DEP_CON; IE18-C_DES_CON

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
CONTROL REPORT HEADER	**1x**	**R**	
CONTROL OFFICE	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**C**	**Cond191**
OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond191**
TRADER Person Involved in Movement	**9x**	**O**	
GOODS ITEM	**999x**	**O**	
MEANS OF TRANSPORT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond200**
CONTROL REPORT	**1x**	**R**	
PERFORMED CONTROL ACTION	**99x**	**R**	
EVIDENCE OF EVENT	**9x**	**C**	**Cond090**
UNSATISFACTORY REASON	**9x**	**O**	
TRANSPORT DETAILS	**99x**	**O**	
CONTROL REPORT Body	**99x**	**O**	
UNSATISFACTORY REASON	**9x**	**O**	

To:

IE717. control report C_CCR_DAT

control report

Used in: UC3.03
Similar functional messages under NCTS: IE17-N_DEP_CON; IE18-C_DES_CON

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
CONTROL REPORT HEADER	**1x**	**R**	
CONTROL OFFICE	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**C**	**Cond191**
OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond191**
TRADER Person Involved in Movement	**9x**	**O**	
GOODS ITEM	**999x**	**O**	
MEANS OF TRANSPORT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond200**
CONTROL REPORT	**1x**	**R**	
PERFORMED CONTROL ACTION	**99x**	**R**	
EVIDENCE OF EVENT	**9x**	**C**	**Cond090**
UNSATISFACTORY REASON	**9x**	**O**	
TRANSPORT DETAILS	**99x**	**O**	
CONTROL REPORT Body	**99x**	**O**	
UNSATISFACTORY REASON	**9x**	**O**	

- The structure of IE840 message shall be updated as follows:

From:

IE840. event report C_EVT_DAT

event report

Used in: UC3.24

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
EVENT REPORT HEADER	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**C**	**Cond196**
OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond196**
TRADER Person Involved in Movement	**9x**	**O**	
GOODS ITEM	**999x**	**O**	
MEANS OF TRANSPORT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond200**
EVENT REPORT	**1x**	**R**	
EVIDENCE OF EVENT	**9x**	**O**	
TRADER New Transport Arranger	**1x**	**C**	**Cond120**
TRADER New Transporter	**1x**	**O**	
TRANSPORT DETAILS	**99x**	**O**	
EVENT REPORT Body	**99x**	**C**	**Cond121**

To:

IE840. event report C_EVT_DAT

event report

Used in: UC3.24

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
EVENT REPORT HEADER	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**C**	**Cond196**
OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond196**
TRADER Person Involved in Movement	**9x**	**O**	
GOODS ITEM	**999x**	**O**	
MEANS OF TRANSPORT	**1x**	**C**	**Cond200**
EVENT REPORT	**1x**	**R**	
EVIDENCE OF EVENT	**9x**	**O**	
TRADER New Transport Arranger	**1x**	**C**	**Cond120**
TRADER New Transporter	**1x**	**O**	
TRANSPORT DETAILS	**99x**	**O**	
EVENT REPORT Body	**99x**	**C**	**Cond121**

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (None): • None, since the structure of the IE717 and IE840 messages is aligned with the proposed solution (i.e. data group <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> is a sub-data group of <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT>
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancies concerning the structure of the <MEANS OF TRANSPORT> Data Group between FESS and DDNEA will not be resolved
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks

Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-225 – Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-225
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM149918, IM257521, IM257253, IM253110
Known Error	KE15758, KE15759, KE17854
Date at which the Change was proposed	27/09/2016
Requester	MSA-SK, MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the submission or split of an e-AD, in case the excise goods of two or more body records in the e-AD are included in the same package, then the first body record can mention the actual number of the packages and the rest of the body records can mention a zero number of packages to indicate this dependency. Therefore, business wise a zero number of packages shall be acceptable. However, based on the current Common Specifications, such IE801 messages will be rejected due to missing number of countable packages. In order to overcome these cases and support the aforementioned scenario, the introduction of a new Rule is suggested which will be applied to the “Number of packages” Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages. The specific rule will mandate that if there are one or more body records in the e-AD, then the value of the “Number of packages” Data Item should be greater than zero in at least one of the data item’s occurrences. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed: • SECTION II CORE BUSINESS ○ The following clarification (bold and underlined) will be added in section ‘3.1.7 Processes’:

"description of packages: one or several groups:

- *kind of packages; if the kind of packages is countable, number of packages **and shipping marks**;*
- *optional commercial description (free text);*
- *optional brand name of product (free text);*
- *identity and description of commercial seals, if any;"*

- APPENDIX D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES
  - A new rule ('Rule251') shall be added as described below:

Rule251	In case the 'Number of Packages' is set to '0', then there should exist at least one PACKAGE with the same 'Shipping Marks' and 'Number of Packages' with value greater than '0'

  - A new condition ('Cond203') shall be added as described below:

Cond203	IF <Number of Packages> is set to '0' THEN <Shipping Marks> is 'R' ELSE <Shipping Marks> is 'Optional' *Note*: Shipping marks should be used as an identifier for goods which are packed together and will only be provided for packaged goods where applicable, in a free form of description of the marks and numbers on transport units or packages.

  - A new data item 'Shipping Marks' will be added under the 'Package' data group in the IE815, IE801 and IE825 messages. Therefore, the data group 'PACKAGE' will be updated as shown below:

IE801. e-AD C_EAD_VAL

From:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**		**Cond073**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

To:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**	**Rule251**	**Cond073**
Shipping Marks	**C**	**an..999**		**Cond203**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

IE815. submitted draft of e-AD N_EAD_SUB

From:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**		**Cond073**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

To:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**	**Rule251**	**Cond073**
Shipping Marks	**C**	**an..999**		**Cond203**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

IE825. submitted draft of splitting operation E_SPL_SUB

From:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**		**Cond073**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

To:

PACKAGE

Kind of Packages Code	R	an2	Rule061	
Number of Packages	**C**	**n..15**	**Rule251**	**Cond073**
Shipping Marks	**C**	**an..999**		**Cond203**
Identity of Commercial Seal	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA(Medium) Excise BPM (Medium): • A new class (i.e. Rule) will be created and linked to the technical term 'Number of Packages' under the 'PACKAGE' data group diagram. The newly created class will be named 'Rule251' and the 'Description/Definition' of the class should be aligned with description of the rule as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section • A new technical term 'Shipping Marks' will be created and added under the 'PACKAGE' data group diagram as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section • A new class (i.e. Condition) will be created and linked to the technical term 'Shipping Marks' under the 'PACKAGE' data group diagram. The newly created class will be named 'Cond203' and the 'Description/Definition' of the class should be aligned with description of the rule as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the Common Specifications will not be updated to support the business scenario where the excise goods of two or more body records in the e-AD are included in the same package, resulting in the first body record to mention the actual number of the packages and the rest of the body records to mention a zero number of packages to indicate this dependency
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-252
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-252 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 684/2009

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**

ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018[5]

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[5] FESS-225 RFC was first discussed in CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

FESS-226 – Update the description of a code ‘8’ in the code list 'REFUSAL REASONS

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-226
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM228222
Known Error	KE17118
Date at which the Change was proposed	27/09/2017
Requester	MSA-SK

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** As described in RFC FESS-189 and the relevant legislation (Council Directive 389/2012, Article 25(5)), the requested MSA shall be able to refuse a request for Administrative Cooperation. However, as identified by MSA-SK, the description of code “8” in the Code List BC09: Refusal Reasons in IE734 is not defined correctly. More specifically, code value ‘8’ in the ‘BC09’ code list in the Appendix B of FESS v3.82 includes the following description: 8 – The requesting Member State is unable, for legal reasons, to provide similar information In order to align the Common Specifications with the relevant legislation, the relevant code description should be updated. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the description of code “8” in codelist BC09 shall be updated as follows: In Appendix B of FESS, the code list BC09 will be changed: *From:* **REFUSAL REASONS** (BC09) Segment corresponding: REFUSAL REASON

Used in the rule094 in the message IE868 and IE723.

Code	Description
0	Other
1	The enquiry or information requested could not be authorised under the laws or administrative practices of the requested Member State for its own use (e.g. Confidential information)
2	(reserved)
3	Disclosure contrary to the public policy of the state - The provision of information would lead to the disclosure of a commercial, industrial or professional secret or of a commercial process, or where its disclosure would be contrary to public policy
4	A judicial authority of the requested Member State has refused to allow the transfer of information under its control
5	The request concerns information that is no longer available due to national rules of data retention (5 years or more minimum)
6	The requesting authority has not exhausted the usual sources of information which it could have used in the circumstances
7	The number and the nature of the requests for information made by the requesting authority within a specific period impose a disproportionate administrative burden on that requested authority
8	**The requesting Member State is unable, for legal reasons, to provide similar information**
9	The consignor has not exhausted all the means available to him to obtain proof that the movement of excise goods between Member States has ended
10	No check performed
11	Out of scope of 389/2012 (e.g. Naples II)
	[Other as necessary]

To:

REFUSAL REASONS (BC09)

Segment corresponding: REFUSAL REASON

Used in the rule094 in the message IE868 and IE723.

Code	Description
0	Other

1	The enquiry or information requested could not be authorised under the laws or administrative practices of the requested Member State for its own use (e.g. Confidential information)
2	(reserved)
3	Disclosure contrary to the public policy of the state - The provision of information would lead to the disclosure of a commercial, industrial or professional secret or of a commercial process, or where its disclosure would be contrary to public policy
4	A judicial authority of the requested Member State has refused to allow the transfer of information under its control
5	The request concerns information that is no longer available due to national rules of data retention (5 years or more minimum)
6	The requesting authority has not exhausted the usual sources of information which it could have used in the circumstances
7	The number and the nature of the requests for information made by the requesting authority within a specific period impose a disproportionate administrative burden on that requested authority
8	**The requested Member State is unable, for legal reasons, to provide similar information**
9	The consignor has not exhausted all the means available to him to obtain proof that the movement of excise goods between Member States has ended
10	No check performed
11	Out of scope of 389/2012 (e.g. Naples II)
	[Other as necessary]

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM: • In the matrix model 'CL Refusal Reason', the name of the technical term "The requesting Member State is unable, for legal reasons, to provide similar information" will be updated as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the Common Specifications will not be aligned with the corresponding legislation and it may also lead to misconceptions in relation to the use of this specific refusal reason code

Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** IE734-~~xxx~~030 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-227 – Update the format of 'Request Correlation Identifier'

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-227
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249169
Known Error	KE17836
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the review of the Excise BPMs and Technical Annexes Activity, a discrepancy in relation to the format of the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item was identified between FESS and DDNEA. More specifically, the format of the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be changed to “an..44” in all the occurrences of this Data Item in FESS Appendix D. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the “IE701_CommonRequest” message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 Cond108 **To:** Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 Cond108 • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the “IE713_Operations on the register of economic operators” message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 ~~Cond108~~Cond136

	To: Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 ~~Cond108~~Cond136 • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the "IE734_Operations on the reference data base" message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 ~~Cond108~~Cond137 **To:** Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 ~~Cond108~~Cond137 • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the "IE742_SEED statistics" message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 ~~Cond108~~ **To:** Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 ~~Cond108~~ • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the "IE821_List of e-AD as result of a general query" message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 ~~Cond108~~ **To:** Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 ~~Cond108~~ • In the Data Group <Attributes> of the "IE838_History of a movement" message the <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item should be updated as follows: **From:** Request Correlation Identifier C an..16 Rule193 ~~Cond108~~ **To:** Request Correlation Identifier C **an..44** Rule193 ~~Cond108~~
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low)

	Excise BPM (None): • None, since the format of the technical term 'Request Correlation Identifier' is already set as 'an..44' in the aforementioned cases
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancies concerning the format of <Request Correlation Identifier> Data Item between FESS and DDNEA will remain
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-228 – Updates in the IE701 message in relation to the <REF_REQUEST> data group

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-228
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249172
Known Error	KE17848
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** It was identified during the Technical Annexes Activity that the <REFERENCE REQUEST> Data Group and relevant <Common Risk Assessment Criteria flag> Data Item have been erroneously removed from IE701 in FESS Appendix D. This action caused a discrepancy between FESS Appendix D and DDNEA Appendix D in relation to the respective Data Group/Data Item. Therefore, the aforementioned Data Group and Data Item need to be added in the structure of IE701 in alignment with DDNEA Appendix D. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: The structure of IE701_CommonRequest message shall be updated as follows: *From:* **STA_PERIOD** Year R n4 Rule232 Semester C n1 Rule200 Cond133 Quarter C n1 Rule201 Cond133 Month C n..2 Rule202 Cond133 **LIST OF CODES Code** Requested List of Code O n..2 Rule025

	To: **STA_PERIOD** Year R n4 Rule232 Semester C n1 Rule200 Cond133 Quarter C n1 Rule201 Cond133 Month C n..2 Rule202 Cond133 **REF_REQUEST** **Common Risk Assessment Criteria flag O n1 Rule004** **LIST OF CODES Code** Requested List of Code O n..2 Rule025
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The data item <Common Risk Assessment Criteria flag> will be added under the <REF_REQUEST> data group and it will be linked with 'TC Flag' (TC27)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancy concerning the <REF_REQUEST> Data Group between FESS and DDNEA will remain
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:**

	○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-229 – Update the format of the data item 'Commercial Description of Goods'

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-229
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249177
Known Error	KE17849
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the review of the Excise BPMs and Technical Annexes Activity a discrepancy in relation to the format of the <Commercial Description of the Goods> Data Item was identified between FESS and DDNEA. More specifically, the format of the <Commercial Description of the Goods> Data Item should be changed to “an..999” in all the occurrences of this Data Item in FESS Appendix D. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the format of the <Commercial Description of the Goods> Data Item needs to be updated to "an..999" in both IE717 and IE840 messages in FESS Appendix D: In both messages the Data Group <Goods Item> which includes the Data Item <Commercial Description of Goods> shall be updated as follows: *<u>From:</u>*

GOODS ITEM

Description of the Goods	O	an..55		
CN Code	C	n8	Rule232	Cond20
Commercial Description of the Goods	**O**	**an..350**		
Additional code	O	an..35		
Quantity	C	n..15,3	Rule232	Cond20
Unit of Measure Code	C	n..2	Rule021	Cond20
Gross Weight	O	n..15,2	Rule219, Rule232	
Net Weight	O	n..15,2	Rule219, Rule232	

To:

GOODS ITEM

Description of the Goods	O	an..55		
CN Code	C	n8	Rule232	Cond201
Commercial Description of the Goods	**O**	**an..999**		
Additional code	O	an..35		
Quantity	C	n..15,3	Rule232	Cond201
Unit of Measure Code	C	n..2	Rule021	Cond201
Gross Weight	O	n..15,2	Rule219, Rule232	
Net Weight	O	n..15,2	Rule219, Rule232	

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (None): • None, since the format of the technical term 'Commercial Description of the Goods' in IE717 and IE840 is defined as 'an..999' in alignment with the proposed solution
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancies concerning the format of the <Commercial Description of Goods> Data Item between FESS and DDNEA will remain
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-230 – Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the "RA_PRIMARY Value" data item

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-230
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM165746
Known Error	KE15690
Date at which the Change was proposed	10/10/2016
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement** A misconception in relation to the use of <RA_PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item in message IE701 was observed in the Common Specifications. In more details, as it was observed by MSA-DE, in cases where the < Primary Criterion Type Code> Data Item in IE701 is filled with the value "46= Type of Transport", then the corresponding value of the <RA PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item shall be a code from the business code list "Transport modes". Additionally, it shall be noted that the actual code value and not the description of the code shall be used, for instance, "1" for Sea Transport, "2" for Rail transport, "8" for Inland waterway transport etc. The present RFC proposes the creation of a new Rule, which will apply to <RA PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item in IE701 and will specify the code values that shall be used in the aforementioned case. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed. • In FESS Appendix D a new Rule shall be added as follows: Rule250: If <Primary Criterion Type Code> is '46' (Type of transport), then an existing <Transport Mode Code> in the list of <TRANSPORT MODES> shall be used

	• In FESS Appendix D, the IE701 message shall be updated as follows: *From*: **IE701. common request C_REQ_SUB** RA_PRIMARY CRITERION Primary Criterion Type Code R n..2 Rule008 **RA_PRIMARY VALUE** **Value R an..255** *To:* **IE701. common request C_REQ_SUB** RA_PRIMARY CRITERION Primary Criterion Type Code R n..2 Rule008 **RA_PRIMARY VALUE** **Value R an..255 Rule250**
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA(Medium) Excise BPM (Medium): • A new class (i.e. Rule) will be created and linked to the technical term 'Value' under the 'RA_PRIMARY VALUE' data group in IE701. The newly created class will be named 'Rule250' and the 'Description/Definition' of the class should be aligned with description of the rule as described in the 'Proposed Solution' section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, it may cause misunderstandings in relation to the values that should be used in the <RA_PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item in IE701, in the cases where the <RA_PRIMARY CRITERION> Data Item includes the value "46= Type of Transport"
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-265
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC

Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-265 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of implementing regulation 612/2013

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-231 – Adding clarifications on Common Specifications about ship supplies treatment / Rev2

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-231
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM149654
Known Error	KE15665
Date at which the Change was proposed	26/09/2016
Requester	MSA-IE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** It was identified that further clarifications are needed in the Common Specification in relation to the way that EMCS treats the ship supplies. According to Annex B "Guidelines for Ship Supplies" of UCC, the ship supplies are stores, supplies and spare delivered on board of vessels that are exempted from VAT and where applicable excise, under Article 14(2) of Directive 2008/118/EC. More specifically, the UCC specifies that the delivery of exempted ship supplies should be treated as an export and that EMCS also applies to ship supplies. Therefore, it is suggested to amend the Common Specifications in order to clearly state that where excise goods to be supplied to ships have been exempted from paying the excise duty, their delivery on board the ship must be proved in order to properly close the movement in the EMCS. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed. • In the SECTION II CORE BUSINESS of FESS, the following paragraph shall be added in the end of section "4 Core Business: exportation of goods" as shown below: "*This chapter describes the part of the EMCS core business that specifically concerns the interconnection with the export Customs procedure.* *The lifecycle of such consignments is managed for a part with the use cases of the central circuit and for a part with the specific use cases of this Chapter.*

	The monitoring of the physical exit of the excise goods from the territory of the EC relies on the Customs system called "Export Control System (ECS)". Confirmation of exit is received back from ECS and serves as a basis for EMCS to build the report of export. *When the Member State of Dispatch is the same as the Member State of Export, the 'MSA export application' refers to the EMCS application at the MSA of Dispatch. When the Member State of Dispatch is a different Member State than the Member State of Export, the 'MSA export application' refers to the EMCS application at the MSA of Destination.* ***Note: Based on Union Customs Code, ship supplies are not regular exports and therefore are not subject to the regular export procedure (Article 269 (2) (c) & Article 269 (1) of UCC). However, an export declaration must be lodged and all export formalities related to the export customs procedure remain applicable (Article 269 (2) UCC). The purpose of the respective legal rules is to ensure that where a tax-exempt supply has been granted for ship supplies the delivery of those supplies could be proven and the export movement can be closed once ship supplies are delivered on board the vessel. Where excise goods to be supplied to ships have been exempted from paying excise duty, their delivery on board the ship must be proven in order to properly close the movement in the EMCS.*** ***Although ship supplies are not subject to the regular export procedure the competent customs office must establish that they have left the customs territory of the Union. It must then inform the customs office of export about the exit of the goods once they have been loaded onto the vessel. The office of export shall then certify the exit to the declarant or the exporter and to EMCS in the Member State of export. EMCS in the Member State of export will then inform EMCS in the Member State of dispatch.*** ***In case of indirect exports, Union goods under excise duty suspension move from the Member State/Office of export to the Office of exit, then an exit result message and the derived Report of Export are needed for the EMCS movement to be closed.*** ***In case of direct exports, the Member State on which territory the movement takes place could be allowed to use national simplifications (Article 30 Directive (EC) No 2008/118) instead of EMCS, including use of entry into the declarant records.***
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA(Low) Excise BPM (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, it may cause misconceptions in relation to the treatment of ship supplies in EMCS. This is a documentation RFC to enhance the Common Specification and clarify how EMCS handle ship supplies.
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-256

Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-256 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018[6]

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[6] FESS-231 RFC was first discussed in EMCS CAB#175 on 20/03/2018

FESS-232 – Update the 'COUNTRY CODES' code list to be aligned with IE734

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-232
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM99732
Known Error	KE15238
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/04/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the Workshop on EMCS Reference Data it has been decided that IE734 will include the CS/RD content of central SEED (country codes, language codes and member state descriptions). Therefore, some discrepancies have been observed between FESS and IE734 message. Based on the above, Appendix B of FESS will be updated by adding references to CS/RD for the codes pointing to the NCTS domain. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed in FESS: • Appendix B: LIST OF CODES In section '2.11 COUNTRY CODES' the following updates shall be performed: • The entry for country code "**AN**" should be removed from the 'COUNTRY CODES' table • The following country codes and the corresponding descriptions shall be added in the 'COUNTRY CODES': **Code** / **Description** **BL** / Saint Barthélemy **BQ** / Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba

	SX | Sint Maarten (Dutch part) **Note**: *The newly added codes will be inserted in alphabetical order in the existing code list*.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The technical term with Name='Netherlands Antilles' will be removed from the 'CL Country Codes' matrix model • New technical terms for codes 'BL', 'BQ' and 'SX' (as per the [Proposed Solution]) will be added in the 'CL Country Codes' matrix model
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the misalignment between FESS and IE734 will remain in relation to the aforementioned country codes
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	~~• **Parent RFCs: -**~~ ~~• **Children RFCs:** IE734-xxx~~ ~~• **Other RFCs: -**~~ There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-233 – Update the rule applied on ‘Sequence Number’ in IE803/IE818

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-233
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM131658
Known Error	KE14509
Date at which the Change was proposed	27/10/2015
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** Currently, in the Technical Annexes of the legislation (COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 684/2009), the attribute ‘Sequence Number’ is linked with the following text in column F: “Set to 1 at initial validation of the e-AD and then incremented by 1 upon each change of destination.” This is applicable for the occurrences of the ‘Sequence Number’ attribute in ‘Draft electronic administrative document and electronic administrative document’ (Table 1), ‘Change of Destination’ (Table 3), ‘Notification of change of destination/Notification of splitting’ (Table 4) and ‘Report of receipt/Report of export’ (Table 6). In the Common Specifications, the aforementioned text refers to the definition of the FESS Rule059. However, in the current Common Specifications this rule does not apply on the ‘Sequence Number’ data item of the IE803 and IE818 messages, but only on the corresponding data items in IE801 and IE813. Hence, the current RFC proposes the required updates in order to align the Common Specifications with the Technical Annexes of the legislation and to also apply tighter rules on the ‘Sequence Number’ data item. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix D: List of Rules A new rule, ‘Rule255’, will be updated as shown below:

Code	Description
Rule255	Provide the latest sequence number of the related e-AD

- Appendix D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES

The 'Sequence Number' data item in IE803 will be updated by applying Rule255 to the 'Sequence Number' data item as shown below:

From:

EXCISE NOTIFICATION

Notification Type	R	n1	Rule069
Notification Date and Time	R	dateTime	
ARC	R	an21	Rule030
Sequence Number	R	n..2	Rule232

To:

EXCISE NOTIFICATION

Notification Type	R	n1	Rule069
Notification Date and Time	R	dateTime	
ARC	R	an21	Rule030
Sequence Number	R	n..2	Rule232, ***Rule255***

The 'Sequence Number' data item in IE818 will be updated by applying Rule255 to the 'Sequence Number' data item as shown below:

From:

EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD

ARC	R	an21	Rule030	BR020
Sequence Number	R	n..2	Rule232	

To:

EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD

ARC	R	an21	Rule030	BR020
Sequence Number	R	n..2	Rule232, ***Rule255***	

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- FESS (Low)

Excise BPM (Low):

- A new class named 'R255' will be created as per the details described in the [Proposed Solution] section
- The 'Excise Notification' data group diagram, included in the IE803 Message allocation diagram, will be updated by creating a new relationship between the 'Sequence Number' technical term and the 'R255' class

	• The 'Excise Movement e-AD for IE818' data group diagram, included in the IE818 Message allocation diagram, will be updated by creating a new relationship between the 'Sequence Number' technical term and the 'R255' class
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the Common Specifications will not be aligned with the Technical Annexes of the Legislation in relation to the applicable rules on data item 'Sequence Number' on the IE803 and IE818 messages
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-257
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-257 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	TBD
Location of change in Legislation	TBD

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB#175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-234 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-Ads / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-234
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM184400
Known Error	KE17904
Date at which the Change was proposed	04/12/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the Excise Service management training held in Athens (22-23/11/2016), a question was raised regarding the duration that the rejected movements should be kept in an EMCS system. After checking the Common Specifications and the relative Excise Legislation, there is not an explicit section providing guidelines about the storage and archiving of rejected e-ADs (or of other messages). Upon DG TAXUD's confirmation, it was suggested that any invalid message that requires an EO (consignor or consignee) to be informed, should be stored and archived for the same duration as valid messages; same interpretation for the information provided to the EO. This RFC proposes the corresponding clarifications to be added in FESS to specify that invalid or rejected messages should be stored and archived for the same duration as valid messages. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed: In the section "IV FOLLOW UP AND COLLABORATION" of FESS, the following paragraph shall be added: **6.1.1.1 Storage, archive and retrieval of invalid or rejected messages** There is no obligation for the Member States to store and archive messages that were rejected due to a syntactic error. However, when technically possible (e.g. valid IT structure and format), rejected messages might represent decisions of Member States Administration and should be stored and archived in the same way as valid messages. In particular, the information concerning movements of excise goods should be stored and

	archived for the same duration as valid messages. Rejected messages do not have be automatically retrievable (i.e. they could be retrieved only via an ACO request). • In the section "Download of an e-AD (UC3.31)" the following sentence shall be added in the last paragraph: For storage, archive and retrieval of invalid or rejected messages, see section 6.1.1.1
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA(Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The 'Description/Definition' field of the 'L4-ACO--01-21-Download of an e-AD (Query)' process will be updated by adding a clarification regarding rejected e-ADs, as this is described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, it may cause misunderstandings to MSAs regarding the period that invalid/rejected messages should be stored and archived, since in the current version of the Common Specifications there is no clarification about rejected messages, but only about valid ones
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-258
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs: -** • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-258 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB#176 on 13/04/2018[7]

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[7] FESS-234 RFC was first discussed in CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

FESS-235 – Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-235
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM182366, IM214532, IM181989
Known Error	KE17905
Date at which the Change was proposed	06/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the implementation of Phase 3.3, it was reported that further clarifications are required in the Common Specifications in relation to the use of the feedback process for MVS Spontaneous information. The raised ambiguities were related to the use of the IE725 message when this message is sent as a reply to a IE722 request against the cases where the IE725 message is used in the context of the spontaneous information. As a general principle, a condition on a data item/group defines the optionality of the data item/group (i.e. if it is Required, Optional or Dependent), while a rule is related to the applicable values for the specific item and it is only applicable if the corresponding data item/group is present. Based on the above, if the IE725 message is used in the context of the spontaneous information process, then based on condition C189, the <ACTIONS RESULT> data group is not relevant and shall therefore not be used. Consequently, since the <ACTIONS RESULT> data group will not be available, then the relevant rule R229 which is linked to the <Actions Result> data group, is not applicable. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following clarifications shall be added in the Common Specifications. • In the SECTION IV FOLLOW-UP AND COLLABORATION of FESS, the respective use case will be updated: *From:*

Prepare results message	**Process: UC-317-110**
Actor: ELO of the issuing MSA	
Location: premises of the issuing MSA	
Processing mode: Semi-automatic	
Constraint: none	
Description: The ELO of the issuing MSA summarises their findings concerning a movement (duty paid B2B movement, duty paid B2C movement or an undocumented movement), into a movement verification results message (IE725:C_MVS_RES). If relevant, they may attach supporting document(s) to the results message. The message is sent to the competent ELO of the addressed MSA(s). **Final situation:** the information has been sent to the addressed MSA(s)	

To:

7.3.1 Processes

Prepare results message	**Process: UC-317-110**
Actor: ELO of the issuing MSA	
Location: premises of the issuing MSA	
Processing mode: Semi-automatic	
Constraint: none	
Description: The ELO of the issuing MSA summarises their findings concerning a movement (duty paid B2B movement, duty paid B2C movement or an undocumented movement), into a movement verification results message (IE725:C_MVS_RES). **In this case, since the feedback mechanism is not applicable for spontaneous information cases, only the relevant details (Data Groups/Items) shall be present.** If relevant, they may attach supporting document(s) to the results message. The message is sent to the competent ELO of the addressed MSA(s). **Final situation:** the information has been sent to the addressed MSA(s)	

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) • DDNEA(Low) Excise BPM (Low):

	• The description/definition of task 'Build Movement Verification Results' in the L4-ACO-01-25 (Movement Verification for Duty Paid Movements-Spontaneous Information) process will be updated by adding the following note: "**In this case, since the feedback mechanism is not applicable for spontaneous information cases, only the relevant details (Data Groups/Items) shall be present.**"
Effect of not implementing the Change	This is a documentation RFC to enhance the Common Specifications in relation to the use of the feedback process for spontaneous information. If the proposed change is not implemented, ambiguities regarding the use of the feedback process in the case of spontaneous information may arise
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-259
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-259 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

FESS-236 – Update the optionality of “Reference of Evidence_LNG” Data Item in FESS

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-236
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM254672
Known Error	KE17906
Date at which the Change was proposed	05/03/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** During the review of the Excise BPMs, a discrepancy between FESS Appendix D and DDNEA Appendix D was identified in relation to the “Reference of Evidence_LNG” Data Item in IE861. More specifically the optionality of the “Reference of Evidence_LNG” Data Item in IE861 was erroneously defined as “Required” and additionally that the aforementioned data item is not linked with the condition “Cond002”. This RFC proposes the required updates to be performed in FESS Appendix D in relation to the “Reference of Evidence_LNG” Data Item in order to be aligned with DDNEA Appendix D. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES The optionality of the 'Reference of Evidence' data item in the IE861 message should be updated as follows: **From:** Reference of Evidence R an..350 **To:** Reference of Evidence **O** an..350 • The optionality of the 'Reference of Evidence_LNG' data item as well as the applicable conditions in the IE861 message should be updated as follows:

	From: Reference of Evidence_LNG R a2 Rule018 **To:** Reference of Evidence_LNG **C** a2 Rule018 **Cond002**
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The optionality of <Reference of Evidence> in the 'DOCUMENT EVIDENCE' data group diagram shall be changed from 'Required' to 'Optional'. In addition, the optionality of <Reference of Evidence_LNG> shall be updated from 'Required' to 'Dependent' and the condition "Cond002" shall be applied in the aforementioned data item
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the discrepancies concerning the optionality of < Reference of Evidence_LNG > Data Item between FESS and DDNEA will remain
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-237 – Update the description of condition ‘Cond201’

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-237
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM207234
Known Error	KE17907
Date at which the Change was proposed	22/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** Condition ‘Cond201’ was created as part of 'EMCS phase 3.3 FESS AND DDNEA Corrective Release' (ITSM2_LOT2-SC05-RPT-FESS-DDNEA-Phase3.3-Corrective-RSD v1.00). This condition was created on the back of condition ‘Cond168’ with similar content, but excluding the conditional part that refers to the 'MV Request Type' data item. Condition ‘C168’ is applied on data items included in the <GOODS ITEM> data group based on the presence of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group and the corresponding data items. In message IE722 though, the repetition of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group is defined as ‘4x’. However, condition ‘Cond201’ is applied on messages IE717 and IE840 where in both cases the corresponding <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group has a repetition of '1x'. Therefore, the wording in the 'IF' clause of the ‘Cond201’ condition (i.e. the wording "is not present in at least one instance of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group") will be updated as there can only be one instance of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group in messages IE717 and IE840. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS Appendix D: The description of condition **‘Cond201’** shall be updated as follows: *From:* Cond201 | IF <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT.Image of Other Accompanying Document> is not present in at least one instance of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group

	THEN <CN Code> is 'R' <Quantity> is 'R' <Unit of Measure Code> is 'R' ELSE <CN Code> does not apply <Quantity> does not apply <Unit of Measure Code> does not apply

To:

Cond201	IF <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT.Image of Other Accompanying Document> ***is not present in the*** <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group THEN <CN Code> is 'R' <Quantity> is 'R' <Unit of Measure Code> is 'R' ELSE <CN Code> does not apply <Quantity> does not apply <Unit of Measure Code> does not apply

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The description of class 'Cond201' will be updated as per the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the erroneous description of 'Cond201' on FESS Appendix D will not be updated, leading to misconceptions in relation to how the aforementioned condition shall be applied
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-260
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-260 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	Annex I of IR 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-238 – Update the description of rule 'Rule210'

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-238
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Legislation Alignment
Incidents	IM256138
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/03/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** A discrepancy regarding the description of 'Rule210' was identified between FESS (Appendix D) and the updated legislation (2016/323). More specifically, in the description of 'Rule210', values '4', '7' and '12' are defined as 'reserved' in FESS Appendix D, which is not aligned with the actual values as defined in the corresponding legislation. Thus, the description of 'Rule210' in FESS needs to be updated to be aligned with the corresponding legislation (2016/323). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS: • Appendix D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES The description of 'Rule210' shall be updated as follows (highlighted in bold/italic): *From:* Rule210 — The possible values of <Status> are: - X01 = Accepted - X02 = Cancelled - X03 = Delivered - X04 = (reserved) - X05 = Rejected - X06 = Replaced - X07 = (reserved) - X08 = Refused - X09 = None - X10 = Partially Refused - X11 = Exporting

	- X12 = (reserved) - X13 = Stopped

To:

Rule210	The possible values of <Status> are: - X01 = Accepted - X02 = Cancelled - X03 = Delivered - X04 = ***Diverted*** - X05 = Rejected - X06 = Replaced - X07 = ***e-AD Manually Closed*** - X08 = Refused - X09 = None - X10 = Partially Refused - X11 = Exporting - X12 = ***Accepted for Export*** - X13 = Stopped

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (None): • The 'TC Status Type' matrix model is already aligned with changes described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the erroneous description/code values of 'Rule210' on FESS Appendix D will not be aligned with the updated legislation, leading to misconceptions in relation to the specific code values (as described in 'Rule210') that shall be used
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs Note: DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 is already aligned with the updated legislation. Therefore, there is no need to add Child RFC in DDNEA RFC List

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-239 – Update the description of the rule 'Rule248'

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-239
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Legislation Alignment
Incidents	IM256140
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/03/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** A discrepancy regarding the description of 'Rule248' was identified between FESS (Appendix D) and the corresponding updated legislation (684/2009 Annex II). More specifically, in the description of 'Rule248' which applies in the <Maximum Journey Time> data item in IE709, the text of supporting notes ('Note 1' and 'Note 2') added in the description should be updated in order to be aligned with the relevant legislation (684/2009 Annex II). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS: • Appendix D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES The notes added in the description of 'Rule248' shall be updated as follows (highlighted in bold/italic): *From:* Rule248: The format of <Maximum Journey Time> is expressed in hours or in days, with the format P99, where: - "P" is a letter in ("H" = Hours or "D" = Day) - "99" is a two digits number If P is "H" then the number is less or equal to 24 if P is "D" then the number is less or equal to the possible values of <Maximum Journey Time> per <Transport Mode Code> as described in the following table: Transport Mode Code Maximum Journey Time 0 - Other D45 1 - Sea Transport D45 2 - Rail transportD35

	3 - Road transport D35 4 - Air transport D20 5 - Postal consignment D30 7 - Fixed transport installations D15 8 - Inland waterway transport D35 Note 1: The value “Other” refers to multimode transport (where there is unload and reload of cargo) and covers the cases of Groupage, Export, Split and Change of destination. Note 2: In case of export, the journey time is the estimated duration of the journey up to the exit of the EU customs territory.

To:

Rule248	The format of <Maximum Journey Time> is expressed in hours or in days, with the format P99, where: - "P" is a letter in ("H" = Hours or "D" = Day) - "99" is a two digits number If P is "H" then the number is less or equal to 24 if P is "D" then the number is less or equal to the possible values of <Maximum Journey Time> per <Transport Mode Code> as described in the following table: Transport Mode Code Maximum Journey Time 0 - Other D45 1 - Sea Transport D45 2 - Rail transportD35 3 - Road transport D35 4 - Air transport D20 5 - Postal consignment D30 7 - Fixed transport installations D15 8 - Inland waterway transport D35 Note 1: The value “Other” refers to multimode transport (where there is unload and reload of cargo) and covers the cases of ***Group Consignments***, Export, Split and Change of destination. Note 2: In case of export, the journey time is the estimated duration of the journey up to the exit of the ***customs territory of the Union***.

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The field ‘Description/Definition’ of the class named ‘Rule248’ will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the supporting notes included in the description of ‘Rule248’ in FESS Appendix D will not be aligned with the updated legislation

Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-267
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-267 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-240 – Structured information on attachments

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-240
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Increase of functionality
Incidents	IM259111
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	15/01/2018
Requester	DG TAXUD

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Currently, EMCS does not have a standard way of referring to electronic attachments and/or accompanying paper documents. This means that finding the link between an e-AD and an attachment is not clear and has to be done manually. Additionally, a significant amount of information that could potentially be stored in separate documents (i.e. in paper form or electronic attachments) is actually incorporated within the e-AD. As an improvement for this case, the structure of the e-AD should allow information stored in attachments and other accompanying documents to be linked with the e-AD effectively and unambiguously, leading to both a simplified structure of the e-AD as well as allowing the document information to evolve separately. Moreover, this would also allow easier and even potentially automated cross-checks of references in an e-AD. **Proposed Solution** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to update the Common Specifications with an enhanced functionality of adding structured information for electronic attachments and/or accompanying documents. The proposed solution is based on the customs declarations where the document is given a standard document/certificate type number referenced in TARIC and an ID number for the individual document. As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in FESS: • Main Document: Section 3 Core Business: Central Circuit The 'Submission and registration of an e-AD (UC2.01)' use case will be updated as described in the attached **'Annex 1: FESS-240 – Structured information on attachments'**.

- Appendix D: Functional Messages, IE815:

The following new data items will be added under the <DOCUMENT Certificate> data group in IE815.

DOCUMENT Certificate

Document Type	***C***	***an..4***	***Rule249***	***Cond006***
Document Reference	***C***	***an..35***		***Cond202***
Short Description of Document	C	an..350		Cond006
Short Description of Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Reference of Document	C	an..350		Cond006
Reference of Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

- Appendix D: Functional Messages, IE801:

The following new data items will be added under the <DOCUMENT Certificate> data group in IE801.

DOCUMENT Certificate

Document Type	***C***	***an..4***	***Rule249***	***Cond006***
Document Reference	***C***	***an..35***		***Cond202***
Short Description of Document	C	an..350		Cond006
Short Description of Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Reference of Document	C	an..350		Cond006
Reference of Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

- Appendix D: Functional Messages, IE732:

In the structure of the IE732 message, the new data item <Document Type> will replace the <Supporting Document Type> data item under the <TYPE OF DOCUMENT> data group, so that the corresponding TARIC code values (i.e. having 'an..4' format) are allowed to be included in the IE732 message.

- Appendix D: Section '4 List of conditions'

The existing condition 'Cond006' will be updated to include the <Document Type> data item. The description of 'Cond006' will be updated to:

Code	Description
Cond006	At least one, among these three fields: - ***<Document Type>*** - <Short Description of Document> - <Reference of Document>

A new condition 'Cond202' will be added as described below:

Code	Description
Cond202	IF <Document Type> is used THEN <Document Reference> = 'R' ELSE <Document Reference> does not apply

- Appendix B: List of Codes

The introductory text of section '2.27 TYPE OF DOCUMENT' will be updated as follows:

Segment corresponding: TYPE OF DOCUMENT

Used in the rule242 in the messages IE721 and IE867 and in rule249 in the messages IE815 and IE801

Code	Description
0	Other
1	e-AD
2	SAAD
3	Invoice
4	Delivery note
5	CMR
6	Bill of lading
7	Way Bill
8	Contract
9	Trader's Application
10	Official record
11	Request
12	Answer
13	Fallback documents, Fallback Printout
14	Photo
15	Export Declaration
16	Anticipated Export Record
17	Exit Results
18	SAD (Single Administrative Document)
<TARIC code>	***Any TARIC code used in 'box 44' of the SAD*** ***<u>Note</u>: Guidance shall be provided to Economic Operators in relation to the TARIC codes which are relevant to EMCS purposes***
	[Other as necessary]

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Medium) • DDNEA (Medium) Excise BPM (Medium): • A new technical term named 'Document Type' with specified format 'an..4' will be created • A new technical term named 'Document Reference' with specified format 'an..35' will be created • The description of condition 'Cond006' will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new condition 'Cond202' (i.e. type=class) will be created as described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new technical term having name as 'Any TARIC code used in 'box 44' of the SAD', remark/example as 'TARIC code' and reference ID as 'BC106' will be added in the 'CL Type of Document' • The 'DOCUMENT Certificate' data group diagram (whcih is included in the 'IE801 e-AD C_EAD_VAL' and 'IE815 submitted draft of e-AD N_EAD_SUB' message allocation diagrams) will be updated to include the newly created 'Document Type' and 'Document Reference' technical terms • The 'DOCUMENT Certificate' data group diagram will be updated by adding a new relationship of type 'depicts' from the technical term 'Document Type' to 'Cond006' • The 'DOCUMENT Certificate' data group diagram will be updated by adding a new relationship of type 'depicts' from the technical term 'Document Reference' to 'Cond202' • The structure of the IE732 data group diagram will be updated by replacing the <Supporting Document Type> data elements with the <Document Type> data element as described in the [Proposed Solution] section • The 'Document Certificate' data group diagram will be updated by adding the following note in the 'Description/Definition' field: "*Document Type and its related data element Document Reference are the preferred way of referring to certificates in an e-AD. For backwards compatibility purposes, it is however also possible to refer to certificates in an e-AD by using data elements Reference of Document and/or Short Description of Document*"
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the newly introduced functionality of having a standard way of referring to electronic attachments and/or accompanying paper documents would not be included in the Common Specifications. Therefore, it would be difficult for the MSAs to link together an e-AD with electronic attachments and/or accompanying documents in a structured way
Risk assessment	The risk associated with this RFC is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC

Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-269, IE734-~~xxx~~033 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Annexes of implementing regulation 684/2009

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Objection** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is recommended by the CAB for approval and subject to an Objection Period**
ECWP position	The change was reviewed during Objection Period via written procedure
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018 End of Objection Period: 15/06/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-241 – Extending the Manual Closure functionality/ Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-241
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Increase of functionality
Incidents	IM166904
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	20/09/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	High
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Currently in EMCS, the functionality of manual closing of movements is supported through the utilisation of multi-domain, technical messages (i.e. IE905). In more details, the MSA of Dispatch application may set the state of the e-AD to “e-AD Manually Closed” and sends the status of the movement along with the sequence number of the last business message sent to the MSA of Destination. As a result, an excise movement can be manually closed, but this is currently achieved by using a multi-domain technical message. This process violates the nature of these technical messages and is not currently underpinned by the appropriate functionality. As an improvement in EMCS, the functionality of manual closure could be expanded, allowing movements to be closed manually with the use of the appropriate messages and ensuring the required information is communicated to the involved parties. **Proposed Solution** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to enhance the Common Specifications with the required functionality to support the manual closing of movements. The proposed solution introduces two ‘Manual Closure’ specific messages (i.e. request/response). The newly introduced messages include the relevant information about the manual closure of the movement, such as, justification about the closure, relevant documentation etc. which are communicated to the involved parties. Based on the proposed solution, an Excise Officer at the MSA of Dispatch or at the MSA of Destination may request a manual closure, but only the MSA of Dispatch has the authority to confirm a manual closure of a movement.

As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in FESS:

- FESS Section IV - FOLLOW UP AND COLLABORATION:

A new use case titled, '3.4 Manual closure of a movement (UC3.06)' will be added in order to cover the manual closure of movements functionality.

Details of the aforementioned use case are described in the attached **'Annex 2-1: Manual closure of a movement (UC3.06)'**.

A new state-transition diagram named, '11.4. e-AD: Manual closure of a movement' will be added under section '11 State-transition diagrams' to cover the applicable state transitions for Manual Closure cases.

Details of the aforementioned state-transition diagram are described in the attached **'Annex 2-2: e-AD: Manual closure of a movement'**.

- APPENDIX D – FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES:

Two new messages will be created to handle the functionality of 'Manual Closure' as described below:

IE880. Manual Closure Request C_MNC_SUB

Manual Closure Request
Used in: UC3.06

ATTRIBUTES	***1x***	***R***
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	***9x***	***O***
MANUAL CLOSURE Body	***999x***	***O***

The data groups of the newly added IE880 message will include the following data items:

ATTRIBUTES

Administrative Reference Code	R	an21	Rule030	
Sequence Number	R	n..2		
Manual Closure Request Reason Code	R	n1	Rule252	
Manual Closure Reason Complement	C	an..999		Cond204
Manual Closure Reason Complement_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Short Description of Supporting Document	C	an..999		Cond186
Short Description of Supporting Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Reference of Supporting Document	C	an..999		Cond142
Reference of Supporting Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Image of Document	C			Cond142
Supporting Document Type	C	n..2	Rule242	Cond142

MANUAL CLOSURE Body

Body Record Unique Reference	O	n..3	Rule058 Rule232	
Indicator of Shortage or Excess	O	a1	Rule036	
Observed Shortage or Excess	C	n..15,3	Rule232	Cond067
Excise Product Code	O	an4	Rule049	
Refused Quantity	O	n..15,3	Rule232	
Complementary Information	O	an..350		
Complementary Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

IE881. Manual Closure Response C_MNC_RES

Manual Closure Response
Used in: UC3.06

ATTRIBUTES	***1x***	***R***
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	***9x***	***O***
MANUAL CLOSURE Body	***999x***	***O***

The data groups of the newly added IE881 message will include the following data items:

ATTRIBUTES

Administrative Reference Code	R	an21	Rule030	
Sequence Number	R	n..2		
Date of Arrival of Excise Products	O	date		BR023
Global Conclusion of Receipt	O	n..2	Rule046	
Complementary Information	O	an..350		
Complementary Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Manual Closure Request Reason Code	R	n1	Rule252	
Manual Closure Reason Complement	C	an..999		Cond204
Manual Closure Reason Complement_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Manual Closure Request Accepted	R	n1	Rule004	
Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code	C	n1	Rule253	Cond205
Manual Closure Rejection Complement	C	an..999		Cond206
Manual Closure Rejection Complement_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Short Description of Supporting Document	C	an..999		Cond186
Short Description of Supporting Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Reference of Supporting Document	C	an..999		Cond142
Reference of Supporting Document_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002
Image of Document	C			Cond142
Supporting Document Type	C	n..2	Rule242	Cond142

MANUAL CLOSURE Body

Body Record Unique Reference	O	n..3	Rule058 Rule232	
Indicator of Shortage or Excess	O	a1	Rule036	
Observed Shortage or Excess	C	n..15,3	Rule232	Cond067

Excise Product Code	O	an4	Rule049	
Refused Quantity	O	n..15,3	Rule232	
Complementary Information	O	an..350		
Complementary Information_LNG	C	a2	Rule018	Cond002

Additionally, the structure of the IE732 message will be updated to include the <Manual Closure Request Reason> and <Manual Closure Rejection Reason> data groups following the standard structure of the IE732 message.

- Appendix D: List of Rules

The description of 'Rule246' should be updated by:

1) Removing the value 'IE905=STATUS RESPONSE' along with the corresponding note 'The IE905 should be included only when the e-AD is manually closed'
2) Adding a new entry as 'IE880=Manual Closure request'
3) Adding a new entry as 'IE881=Manual Closure response'

A new rule, 'Rule252' will be added with the following description:

Code	Description
Rule252	An existing <Manual Closure Request Reason Code> in the list of <MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASONS>

A new rule, 'Rule253' will be added with the following description:

Code	Description
Rule253	An existing <Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code> in the list of <MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASONS>

Note: The values included in 'Rule210' are updated based on RfC FESS-238, which already foresees an entry for manually closed movements.

The following new rules, 'Rule256' and 'Rule257' will be added with the following description:

Code	Description
Rule256	For the detailed code values, see the list of codes "MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASONS" in "Appendix B-LIST OF CODES"
Rule257	For the detailed code values, see the list of codes "MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASONS" in "Appendix B-LIST OF CODES"

- Appendix D: List of Conditions

A new condition, 'Cond204' applied on data item <Manual Closure Reason Complement>, will be added with following description:

Code	Description

Cond204	IF <Manual Closure Reason Code> is "Other" THEN <Manual Closure Reason Code Complement> is 'R' ELSE < Manual Closure Reason Code Complement > is 'O'

A new condition, ‘Cond206’ applied on data item <Manual Closure Rejection Complement>, will be added with following description:

Code	Description
Cond206	IF <Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code> is "Other" THEN <Manual Closure Rejection Complement> is 'R' ELSE < Manual Closure Rejection Complement > is 'O'

A new condition, ‘Cond205’ applied on data item <Manual Closure Rejection Reason code>, will be added with following description:

Code	Description
Cond205	IF <Manual Closure Request Accepted> is "0" THEN < Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code > is 'R' ELSE < Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code > is not applicable

- Appendix B: List of Codes

A new codelist will be added as described below:

2.28 MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASONS

Segment corresponding: MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASON CODE

Used in the Rule252 in the messages IE880 and IE881.

Code	Description
0	Other
1	Export closed but no IE518 available
2	Consignee no longer connected to EMCS
3	Exempted consignee
4	Exit confirmed but no IE829 submitted (IE818 out of sequence)
5	No movement but cancellation no longer possible
6	Multiple issuances of e-ADs for a single movement

7	e-AD does not cover actual movement
8	Erroneous report of receipt
9	Erroneous rejection of an e-AD

A new codelist will be added as described below:

2.29 MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASONS

Segment corresponding: MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASON CODE

Used in the Rule253 in the message IE881.

Code	Description
0	Other
1	Evidence provided does not justify manual closure
2	Request Reason provided does not justify manual closure

It shall be noted that everything that applies to the MSA of Destination applies also to the MSA of Export in case the movement's destination is "Export"; in the latter case, there is no consignee to be informed.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- FESS (High)
- DDNEA (High)

Excise BPM (High):

- A new L4 Business Process Model will be created to cover the 'Manual Closure of a Movement' use case, as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
- The 'TC Technical Message Type' matrix will be updated by removing the technical term named 'STATUS RESPONSE'
- The 'TC Technical Message Type' matrix will be updated adding two new technical terms named 'MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST' and 'MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE'
- The data group diagram for IE732 message will be updated to include the <MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASON> and <MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASON> data groups as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
- Two new 'Message allocation diagrams' (including the corresponding 'Data Group Diagrams') will be created in alignment with the newly introduced manual closure messages as described in the [Proposed Solution] section

	• A new matrix model named 'CL Manual Closure Request Reasons' including the codelist values described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new matrix model named 'CL Manual Closure Rejection Reasons' including the codelist values described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new class for 'Cond204' will be created as described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new class for 'Cond205' will be created as described in the [Proposed Solution] section • A new class for 'Cond206' will be created as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, the introduced functionality of manual closing of movements would not be included in the Common Specifications. Therefore, the MSAs that would require to manually close a movement would continue to use the multi-domain, technical messages for such purposes.
Risk assessment	The risk associated to this RFC is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-270, IE734-~~xxx~~029 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact in the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	Implementing Regulation 2016/323

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Objection** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is recommended by the CAB for approval and subject to an Objection Period**
ECWP position	The change was reviewed during Objection Period via written procedure
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018[8] End of Objection Period: 15/06/2018

Release information

[8] FESS-241 RFC was first discussed in EMCS CAB#176 on 13/04/2018

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-242 – Update of Excise Product Codes and CN Codes

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-242
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Legislation Alignment
Incidents	IM259110, IM255124
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	04/04/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** A discrepancy regarding the description of specific Excise Product codes was identified between FESS (Appendix B) and the corresponding updated legislation (Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 684/2009) in relation to the updated EPC and CN codes for energy products. More specifically, in FESS Appendix B, the rows with excise products with codes from 'E410' to 'E490' and codes 'E910' and 'E920' shall be updated in alignment with the updated EPC and CN codes description for energy products as outlined in Regulation (EU) 2018/550. **Proposed Solution** *The changes described in this RfC shall be applicable as of 15/09/2018.* As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed in FESS: • APPENDIX B: LIST OF CODES The description of the following Excise Product codes shall be updated as described below in section '2.2 EXCISE PRODUCT' (highlighted in bold/italic): *From:*

EPC	CAT	UNIT	Description	A	P	D
….	…	…	…	…	…	…
E410	E	2	Leaded petrol	N	N	Y
E420	E	2	Unleaded petrol	N	N	Y

E430	E	2	Gasoil, unmarked	N	N	Y
E440	E	2	Gasoil, marked	N	N	Y
E450	E	2	Kerosene, unmarked	N	N	Y
E460	E	2	Kerosene, marked	N	N	Y
E470	E	1	Heavy fuel oil	N	N	N
E480	E	2	Products falling within CN codes 2710 12 21, 2710 12 25, 2710 19 29 in bulk commercial movements	N	N	Y
E490	E	2	Products falling within CN codes 2710 12 to 2710 19 68, not specified above	N	N	Y
…	…	…	…	…	…	…
E910	E	2	Fatty-acid mono-alkyl esters (FAMAE) and mixtures thereof, not containing or containing less than 70 % by weight of petroleum oils or oils obtained from bituminous minerals falling within CN codes 3826 00 10 and 3826 00 90, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel	N	N	Y
E920	E	2	Chemical products or preparations, predominantly composed of organic compounds falling within CN codes 3824 90 92, 3824 90 93 and 3824 90 96, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel	N	N	Y
…	…	…	…	…	…	…

To:

EPC	CAT	UNIT	Description	A	P	D
….	…	…	…	…	…	…
E410	E	2	Leaded petrol ***falling within CN codes 2710 12 31, 2710 12 51 and 2710 12 59 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E420	E	2	Unleaded petrol ***falling within CN codes 2710 12 31, 2710 12 41, 2710 12 45 and 2710 12 49 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E430	E	2	Gas oil, unmarked ***falling within CN codes 2710 19 43, 2710 19 46, 2710 19 47, 2710 19 48, 2710 20 11, 2710 20 15, 2710 20 17 and 2710 20 19 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E440	E	2	Gas oil, marked ***falling within CN codes 2710 19 43, 2710 19 46, 2710 19 47, 2710 19 48, 2710 20 11, 2710 20 15, 2710 20 17 and 2710 20 19 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E450	E	2	Kerosene, ***falling within CN code 2710 19 21 and unmarked kerosene falling within CN code 2710 19 25***	N	N	Y

			(Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)			
E460	E	2	Kerosene, marked ***falling within CN code 2710 19 25 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E470	E	1	Heavy fuel oil ***falling within CN codes 2710 19 62, 2710 19 64, 2710 19 68, 2710 20 31, 2710 20 35 and 2710 20 39 (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	N
E480	E	2	Products falling within CN codes 2710 12 21, 2710 12 25, 2710 19 29 and 2710 20 90 ***(only for products of which less than 90 % by volume (including losses) distils at 210 °C and 65 % or more by volume (including losses) distils at 250 °C by the ISO 3405 method (equivalent to the ASTM D 86 method)) in bulk commercial movements (Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E490	E	2	Products falling ***within CN codes 2710 12 11, 2710 12 15, 2710 12 70, 2710 12 90, 2710 19 11, 2710 19 15, 2710 19 31, 2710 19 35, 2710 19 51 and 2710 19 55.***	N	N	Y

			(Article 20(1)(c) of Directive 2003/96/EC)			
…	…	…	…	…	…	…
E910	E	2	***Fatty-acid mono-alkyl esters, containing by weight 96,5 % or more of esters (FAMAE) falling within CN code 3826 00 10 (Article 20(1)(h) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
E920	E	2	***Products falling within CN codes 3824 99 86, 3824 99 92 (excluding anti-rust preparations containing amines as active constituents and inorganic composite solvents and thinners for varnishes and similar products), 3824 99 93, 3824 99 96 (excluding anti-rust preparations containing amines as active constituents and inorganic composite solvents and thinners for varnishes and similar products) and 3826 00 90, if these are intended for use as heating fuel or motor fuel (Article 20(1)(h) of Directive 2003/96/EC)***	N	N	Y
…	…	…	…	…	…	…

The following entries shall be added in section '2.4 CORRESPONDENCES CN CODE – EXCISE PRODUCT' following the existing sorting of the table:

Code	Description
E460	27101921
E9~~1~~20	38260090
E480	27102090

The following new entry for CN code '27102090' will be added in section '2.3 CN CODES' as shown below:

Code	Description
27102039	Fuel oil with a sulphur content exceeding 1% by weight, containing biodiesel
27102090	***Petroleum oils and oils obtained from bituminous minerals (other than crude) and preparations not elsewhere specified or included, containing by weight 70 % or more of petroleum oils or of oils obtained from bituminous minerals, these oils being the basic constituents of the preparations, containing biodiesel, other than waste oils, gas oils and fuel oils***
27111211	Liquefied Propane of a purity not less than 99 % for use as a power or heating fuel

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • FESS (Low) Excise BPM (Low): • The description of the corresponding 'Technical Terms' assigned to the 'CL Excise Product' matrix will be updated as described in the [Proposed Solution] section
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the description of the aforementioned Excise Product codes outlined in FESS Appendix B will not be aligned with the updated legislation
Risk assessment	There is no risk associated with the implementation of the present RFC, since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	See downstream RFC IE734-027, IE734-032
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** IE734-027, IE734-032 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	Impact on 2018/550 in Annex II of IR 684/2009

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

FESS-243 – Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message

RFC Information

RFC number	FESS-243
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM260359
Known Error	KE17969
Date at which the Change was proposed	13/04/2018
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement** Currently, there are cases where an e-AD is related to an unknown destination or that is submitted for export (local clearance). In such cases, the data group <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> is not applicable as per condition 'Cond116' which is applied on the aforementioned data group on both IE815 and IE801. However, 'Cond116' is not applied on the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group in message IE821 where this data group is defined as 'Required'. Consequently, there might be cases where an MSA is ought to send an IE821 message in response to a query for an e-AD with unknown destination or submitted for local clearance, hence the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group cannot be filled in, since such information is not available. The current RFC proposes the required updates in order to update the optionality of the data group <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> in IE821 so that IE821 messages can be send as a response to a query for an e-AD with unknown destination or submitted for local clearance. The same changes will be performed to the IE819 message for consistency reasons. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix D: FUNCTIONAL MESSAGES

The structure of the IE821 message will be updated by applying 'Cond116' to the <(CONSINGEE) TRADER> data group as shown below:

From:

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
E-AD LIST ITEM	**99x**	**O**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Consignor	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Place of Dispatch	**1x**	**C**	**Cond012**
OFFICE of Dispatch - Import	**1x**	**C**	**Cond012**
TRADER Consignee	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Place of Delivery	**1x**	**C**	**Cond013**
OFFICE Place of Delivery - Customs	**1x**	**C**	**Cond013**
EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY Code	**9x**	**R**	
TRADER Transport Arranger	**1x**	**C**	**Cond102**
TRADER First Transporter	**1x**	**O**	

To:

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
E-AD LIST ITEM	**99x**	**O**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Consignor	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Place of Dispatch	**1x**	**C**	**Cond012**
OFFICE of Dispatch - Import	**1x**	**C**	**Cond012**
TRADER Consignee	***1x***	***C***	***Cond116***
TRADER Place of Delivery	**1x**	**C**	**Cond013**
OFFICE Place of Delivery - Customs	**1x**	**C**	**Cond013**
EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY Code	**9x**	**R**	
TRADER Transport Arranger	**1x**	**C**	**Cond102**
TRADER First Transporter	**1x**	**O**	

The structure of the IE819 message will be updated by applying 'Cond116' to the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group as shown below:

From:

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Consignee	**1x**	**R**	
OFFICE of Destination	**1x**	**R**	
ALERT	**1x**	**R**	
ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD REASON Code	**9x**	**C**	**Cond032**

To:

ATTRIBUTES	**1x**	**R**	
EXCISE MOVEMENT e-AD	**1x**	**R**	
TRADER Consignee	***1x***	***C***	***Cond116***
OFFICE of Destination	**1x**	**R**	
ALERT	**1x**	**R**	
ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD REASON Code	**9x**	**C**	**Cond032**

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- FESS (Low)

Excise BPM (Low):

- The 'E-AD LIST ITEM' data group diagram, included in the IE821 Message allocation diagram, will be updated by replacing the relationship for the 'TRADER Consignee for IE821' technical term with a '(D)dependent' relationship
- The 'TRADER Consignee for IE821' technical term' will be linked with class 'Cond116' in the 'E-AD LIST ITEM' data group diagram

	• The 'TRADER Consignee for IE819' data group diagram, included in the IE819 Message allocation diagram, will be updated by replacing the relationship for the 'TRADER Consignee for IE819' technical term with a '(D)dependent' relationship • The 'TRADER Consignee for IE819' technical term' will be linked with class 'Cond116'
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the Common Specifications will not be updated to support cases where an IE821 message needs to include e-ADs with unknown (CONSIGNEE) Trader details
Risk assessment	See downstream RFC DDNEA-P3-271
Deployment approach	The deployment approach is addressed in the downstream DDNEA RFC
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-271 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact on the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018

Release information

Release number	v3.90
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

5.2 DDNEA CHANGE REQUESTS

DDNEA-P3-228 – Propagate to the .xsds the validation that the value of several Data Items must be greater than zero

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-228
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specifications
Incidents	IM97895
Known Error	KE17844
Date at which the Change was proposed	11/05/2016
Requester	MSA-AT, MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** During the production of EMCS Phase 3 the Member States raised issues about the business validity zero values in certain numeric DIs. For example, the IE818.XSD allows the value 0 in the refused quantity (DI <(BODY) REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT.Refused Quantity>) even though business wise this is not correct. If there is no refused quantity the DI should not be filled (exist) in the IE818 instead of assigning a zero value to it. The present RFC examines the need for zero values in the numeric DIs and proposes consequent updates in their XML Schema definition (XSD). It should be noted that: • *The term 'numeric DIs' refers to DIs that according to Appendix D are numeric. This distinction is necessary since there are DIs that are numeric in Appendix D but have a string data type in their XML Schema definition. For example, the DI <Body Record Unique Reference> is numeric in appendix D but has a String type in the XML Schema definition.* • *The scope of the present analysis does not include the numeric DIs taking value from a Technical or Business Code List i.e. from a specific list of values. These DIs are specifically handled at the syntactic and semantic layer respectively as defined by the DDNEA.* • *In the current DDNEA (v1.92) the XML Schema definition for the numeric DIs allow the zero value. A change for a DI is proposed only if the examination concludes that the DI should not take a zero value. If this is the case, the proposed update in the DI's XML Schema definition also includes the following updates:* • *If the DI's XML Schema definition is based on a string data type (and needs to be updated for disallowing zero values) it is replaced by a numeric Data Type;*

- *The XML Schema definition includes enhancements for disallowing leading and trailing zeros.*

The DIs that are examined are the following:

1. **<Year> (IE701 and IE742)**

   The Data Item <Year> in the IE701 and IE742 defines the year for which statistics are requested and returned from SEED through the IE701 and IE742 respectively and should at least be greater than 999 (i.e. use all the four digits).

2. **<Quantity> (IE713, IE722, IE801, IE815, IE825)**

   In the IE713 the DI <Quantity> denotes the quantity of the goods that can be received in a temporary authorisation. Article 19.3 of Council Directive 2008/118/EEC describes that a temporary authorisation shall be limited to a specified quantity of excise goods. Therefore, legal temporary authorisations should mention to exclude the zero value quantity.

   A MV Request IE722 may not concern (depending on the MV Request type) the quantity of the excise goods moving under the excise duty paid regime. In this case the DI <Quantity> should be omitted instead of filling it with a zero value. Therefore, the DI <Quantity> can be specified as to exclude the zero value DI.

   The DI <Quantity> in the IE801, IE815 and IE825 should not take a zero value since there is no business need to support it.

   As per the above the DI <Quantity> in the IE713, IE722, IE801, IE815, IE825 IE messages shall be updated to take to exclude the zero value.

3. **<Body Record Unique Reference> (IE717, IE801, IE815, IE818, IE825, IE839, IE840, IE861, IE871)**

   In the IE801, IE815, IE825 IE messages the DI <Body Record Unique Reference> is a number identifying each of the goods items in an e-AD. The <Body Record Unique Reference> should be a positive to exclude the zero value number.

   In the IE717, IE818, IE839, IE840, IE861 and IE871 IE messages the <Body Record Unique Reference> should always reference a <Body Record Unique Reference> in an e-AD (IE801).

   Therefore the <Body Record Unique Reference> should be updated to exclude the zero value.

4. **<Observed Shortage or Excess> (IE717, IE840)**

   When the DI <Observed Shortage or Excess> is present in an IE717 or IE840 then it should exclude the zero value. Otherwise the DI should not be present. Therefore, the DI should be updated to exclude the zero values.

5. **<Gross Weight> (IE722, IE801, IE815, IE825)**

   The <Gross Weight> in the IE722, IE801, IE815, IE825 IE messages should have a non zero value. There is no business need to disclose a zero <Gross Weight>.

   The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

6. **<Net Weight> (IE722, IE801, IE815, IE825)**

As for the <Gross Weight> there is no business need to disclose a zero <Net Weight>

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

7. <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> (IE801, IE815)

The <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> is important for taxing alcohol and beer and its optionality (as well as the <Degree Plato> optionality) is ruled by conditions C047, C048 and C152. The Member States have not expressed any business need to disclose a zero <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> and/or <Degree Plato>.

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

8. <Degree Plato> (IE801, IE815)

As in the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> case the <Degree Plato> should not be allowed a zero value.

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

9. <Density> (IE801, IE815, IE825)

The optionality of the <Density> is defined by condition C049. The Member States have not expressed any business need to disclose a zero.

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

10. <Refused Quantity> (IE818)

As defined by conditions C095 and C119, if the global conclusion of receipt in the RoR (IE818) is '4 = Receipt partially refused' then at least one <Refused Quantity> must be declared. Business wise it is not rational to partially refuse a movement and not mention a refused quantity.

Therefore, the DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

11. <Observed Shortage> (IE861)

The DI is Optional ('O') so it does not merit to allow a zero value since the DI can be omitted instead.

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

12. <Basis Quantity for Recovery of Duties> (IE861)

The <Basis Quantity for Recovery of Duties> indicates the quantity of a body record (provided in DI <Body Record Unique Reference>) for which the claiming MSA intends to claim duties on. If the <Basis Quantity for Recovery of Duties> for a body record is zero it makes no sense to include the body record in the IE861.

Therefore the <Basis Quantity for Recovery of Duties> should not bear a zero value and the DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

13. <Quantity Initially Dispatched> (IE861)

The DI is Optional ('O') there is no merit allowing a zero value since the DI can be omitted instead.

The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value.

14. <Actual Quantity> (IE871)

	The DI is Optional ('O') so it can be omitted instead of filling it with a zero value. The DI shall be updated to exclude the zero value. **Proposed Solution:** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] the following updates will be performed in the Appendices of DDNEA: 1. Appendix H: Directory with XML Schemas (XSDs): The updates detailed in **'Annex 1: DDNEA-P3-228 – Propagate to the .xsds the validation that the value of several Data Items must be greater than zero'** shall be performed. These updates affect only the types.xsd. 2. Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLS): • The changes applicable to Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I
Impact assessment	Specification documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (High) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (~~High~~None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (High) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (Medium) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Medium)
Effect of not implementing the Change	There is no effect of not implementing the proposed change as the applicability of rule R232 on the aforementioned DIs is equivalent with the restrictions that will be imposed to these Data Items by the updated .xsds
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level. More specifically, concerning the .xsd changes, namely the updates proposed for the types.xsd, it is considered to have no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically: • If the sending application is aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates while the receiving application is not, the respective messages will be validated successfully by the receiving application. The reason is that the restriction that will be imposed by the sending application on the aforementioned Data Items via the updated types.xsd is equivalent with the validation currently performed to these Data Items via R232 and at the same time will result in values that will also be acceptable by the old .xsds.

	If the sending application is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates, while the receiving application has already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will be validated successfully by the receiving application. The reason is that the validation currently performed on the aforementioned Data Items via R232 is equivalent with the restrictions that will be imposed to these Data Items in the receiving application by the updated types.xsd. Therefore, it is expected that the values that will be used for the aforementioned Data Items by the sending application will be aligned with the updated types.xsd.
Deployment approach	This change has no impact on business continuity, and can therefore be deployed in production in a **Migration Period**
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-~~XXX~~145~~, CTP-P3-XXX~~ • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~XXX~~ 072

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #148 on 20/05/2016

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-229 – Update IE717 Control Report for accommodating supporting evidence

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-229
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM17655
Known Error	KE17845
Date at which the Change was proposed	11/05/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA v1.92 with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-201 RFC. More specifically, the FESS-201 RFC proposed the updates of FESS v3.82 to update the structure of the IE717 message in order to accommodate supporting evidence referring to useful information for all movement controls independently of the reason they are conducted. **Proposed solution:** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates will be performed: 1. APPENDIX C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES The following updates shall be performed: • <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT> Data Group shall be updated as follows: *<MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE>* • <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Issuing Authority> Message Element shall be updated as follows: *<MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Issuing Authority>* • <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Issuing Authority_LNG> Message Element shall be updated as follows:

<MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Issuing Authority_LNG>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence Type Code> Message Element

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Code>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence Type Complement> Message Element

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Complement>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence Type Complement_LNG> Message Element

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Complement_LNG>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Reference of Evidence> Message Element:

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Reference of Evidence>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Reference of Evidence_LNG> Message Element:

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Reference of Evidence_LNG>

- <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Image of Evidence> Message Element:

  shall be updated as follows:

  <MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Image of Evidence>

2. DDNEA Appendix D:

   - The Data Group <E717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT> shall be updated as follows:

<IE717.CONTROL REPORT.SUPPORTING EVIDENCE>

- C090 included in the list of Conditions:

  IF <Reason for Control> is "Event signalled"
  THEN <EVIDENCE OF EVENT> is 'R'
  ELSE <EVIDENCE OF EVENT> does not apply

  shall be updated as follows:

  IF <Reason for Control> is "Event signalled"
  THEN <SUPPORTING EVIDENCE> is 'R'
  ELSE <SUPPORTING EVIDENCE> is 'O'

3. APPENDIX E: XML MAPPING:

The following entries:

Data-group or Data-item	Data Type	XML-Tag
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT		EvidenceOfEvent
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Issuing Authority	an..35	IssuingAuthority
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Issuing Authority_LNG	a2	IssuingAuthorityLng
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence Type Code	n..2	EvidenceTypeCode
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence Type Complement	an..350	EvidenceTypeComplement
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Evidence	a2	EvidenceTypeComplementLng

Type Complement_LNG		
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Reference of Evidence	an..350	ReferenceOfEvidence
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Reference of Evidence_LNG	a2	ReferenceOfEvidenceLng
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT.Image of Evidence	Base64Binary	ImageOfEvidence

shall be updated as follows:

Data-group or Data-item	**Data Type**	**XML-Tag**
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE		SupportingEvidence
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Issuing Authority	an..35	IssuingAuthority
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Issuing Authority_LNG	a2	IssuingAuthorityLng
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Code	n..2	EvidenceTypeCode
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Complement	an..350	EvidenceTypeComplement
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Evidence Type Complement_LNG	a2	EvidenceTypeComplementLng

MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Reference of Evidence	an..350	ReferenceOfEvidence
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Reference of Evidence_LNG	a2	ReferenceOfEvidenceLng
MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.Image of Evidence	Base64Binary	ImageOfEvidence

4. Appendix F: Data Groups:

The following entry:

Data Group	Identifier
------EVIDENCE OF EVENT	EOE

shall be updated as follows:

Data Group	Identifier
------SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	EOE

5. EMCS Phase 3.4 FESS and DDNEA Release DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)

- The complex type “EvidenceOfEventType” included in ie717.xsd:

```
<xs:complexType name="EvidenceOfEventType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="EVIDENCE OF EVENT" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="IssuingAuthority" type="ie:LSDIssuingAuthorityType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="EvidenceTypeCode" type="emcs:EvidenceTypeCodeType" />
    <xs:element name="EvidenceTypeComplement" type="ie:LSDEvidenceTypeComplementType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="ReferenceOfEvidence" type="ie:LSDReferenceOfEvidenceType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="ImageOfEvidence" type="xs:base64Binary" minOccurs="0" />
  </xs:sequence>
```

```
</xs:complexType>
```

Shall be updated as follows:

```
<xs:complexType name="SupportingEvidenceType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="SUPPORTING EVIDENCE " />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="IssuingAuthority" type="ie:LSDIssuingAuthorityType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="EvidenceTypeCode" type="emcs:EvidenceTypeCodeType" />
    <xs:element name="EvidenceTypeComplement" type="ie:LSDEvidenceTypeComplementType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="ReferenceOfEvidence" type="ie:LSDReferenceOfEvidenceType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="ImageOfEvidence" type="xs:base64Binary" minOccurs="0" />
  </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>
```

6. Appendix K: Rules and Conditions Mapping:

The following entry:

C/R	IE path
C090	IE717.MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT - EVIDENCE OF EVENT

shall be updated as follows:

C/R	IE path
C090	IE717.MESSAGE - CONTROL REPORT – SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium)
- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium)
- TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-201 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes both at semantic and syntactic level. **Changes at semantic level** **----------** Concerning the changes at semantic level, namely, the update of the condition C090 that applies on the existing data group <E717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT>, the update can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, will be validated only at the sending side of the IE717 message (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with this update while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. **Changes at syntactic level** **----------** Concerning the .xsd changes, namely, the update of the name of the <IE717.CONTROL REPORT.EVIDENCE OF EVENT> Data Group, it is considered to have no impact on business continuity; thus, this RFC can be deployed in a Migration period provided that the application that will implement the current RFC before the end of the Migration Period, will also implement a transformation solution until Mh. More specifically: • Assuming that the sending application has implemented the change whereas the receiving application has not, the IE717 message that will be sent will not be validated successfully by the receiving application since it will contain the updated Data Group of the IE717 message. To avoid such rejections, it is proposed as a transformation solution that, the sending application uses the old name (i.e. <EVIDENCE OF EVENT>) for the updated Data Group of the IE717 message. It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any business continuity risk; • Assuming that the receiving application has implemented the changes whereas the sending application has not, the IE717 message that will be sent will contain the old name for the updated Data Group. Hence, the IE717 message will not be validated successfully by the receiving application. To avoid such rejection, it is proposed as a transformation solution that, the receiving application replaces the old name (i.e. <EVIDENCE OF EVENT>) for the updated Data Group of the IE717 message with the new name (i.e. <SUPPORTING EVIDENCE>). It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any business continuity risk. *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE717 message is not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	This change has no impact on business continuity, and can therefore be deployed in production in a **Migration Period**

Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-201 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~XXX~~294 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~XXX~~073

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	No impact in the current legislation
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #148 on 20/05/2016

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-241 – Updates related to the dissemination of the EOL

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-241
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM197330
Known Error	KE16442
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/03/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 v1.92 with the updates proposed for FESS by FESS-213 RFC. More specifically, in DDNEA Appendix B, the Technical Codelist TC04 “Common Request Type” that applies to the “Request Type” data item in IE701 message, includes the value ‘- 3 = Request for EOL’ which is never used. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA: • Appendix B: Codelists The technical codelist TC04:

Code	Description	Remarks
1	(reserved)	
2	Request for reference data	
3	Request for EOL	
4	(reserved)	
5	Request for re-synchronisation of the register of economic operators	
6	Request for retrieval of a list of e-Ads	
7	Request for SEED statistics	

will be updated as follows:

Code	Description	Remarks
1	(reserved)	

2	Request for reference data	
3	**(reserved)**	
4	(reserved)	
5	Request for re-synchronisation of the register of economic operators	
6	Request for retrieval of a list of e-Ads	
7	Request for SEED statistics	

- Appendix H: Directory With XML Schemas (XSDs):

TC49 will be updated in tcl.xsd as follows:

```
"…
<!--==========================================-->
<!--===== Common Request Type =====-->
<!--==========================================-->
…
<xs:enumeration value="3">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:enumeration>…"
```

- Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs):

  The change applicable to tcl.xsd of Appendix H is also applicable to Appendix I.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium)
- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)
- TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)

CDEAs:

- Central SEED v1 application (Low)
- CTA (None)
- CS/MISE (None)

NEAs:

- Impact on NEAs (Low)

Effect of not implementing the Change

If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS in FESS-213 RFC

Risk assessment

This RFC concerns a change in the tcl.xsd related to the code '3' of TC04.

This change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically, the value '3 = Request for EOL', was inserted in the past for supporting a relevant functionality which was finally not implemented. Therefore, the specific value was never used.

	Following the business continuity analysis of the change in the tcl.xsd, it is derived that no message transformation rules are need for this case. *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC do not affect the External Domain, since the IE701 message is not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-213 • **Children RFCs:** SEED-~~xxx~~147 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-048

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-242 – Update of Cond185 and Rule241 due to the insertion of the MVS spontaneous information functionality

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-242
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM210832, IM214515
Known Error	KE16816
Date at which the Change was proposed	10/07/2017
Requester	MSA-LT, MSA-BE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 v1.92 with the updates proposed for FESS by FESS-214 RFC. More specifically, the FESS RFC proposes the update of R241 and C185 due to the insertion of MVS spontaneous information functionality. **Proposed solution:** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates will be performed in DDNEA, Appendix D: Technical Message Structure: ○ C185 will be updated in Section "Conditions" as follows: *"IF <MV Correlation ID> does not match with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message* *THEN <National Case Reference Identifier> is 'O'* *ELSE IF <MV Correlation ID> matches with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message AND* *<National Case Reference Identifier> is present in the request message* *THEN <National Case Reference Identifier> is 'R'* *ELSE <National Case Reference Identifier> does not apply."* ○ R241 will be updated in Section "Rules" as follows: *"IF <MV Correlation ID> matches with <MV Correlation ID> in a request message AND <National Case Reference Identifier> is present in the request message*

	THEN *<National Case Reference Identifier> must be equal to the value of <National Case Reference Identifier> in the request message."*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-214 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes at the semantic level. More specifically the wording of R241 and C185 is updated. These changes can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations are validated only at the sending side of the IE723, IE724 and IE725 messages (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with these updates while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE723, IE724 and IE725 messages are not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-214 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-218, DDNEA-P3-227

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-214
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review**

	• **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-243 – Correction in DDNEA "X.I.2.2.11 Opening a queue" section

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-243
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM199479
Known Error	KE17846
Date at which the Change was proposed	20/04/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Upon request of ITSM2 LOT1 and in agreement with DG TAXUD, it was decided to update the maximum length defined for the Queue Name in "X.I.2.2.11 Opening a queue" section of DDNEA v1.92. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA, Main Document: • The following sentence included in DDNEA, section "X.I.2.2.11 Opening a queue": *"The Queue Name is inserted here. This allows a maximum length of 47 characters for the Queue Name."* will be updated as follows: *"The Queue Name is inserted here. This allows a maximum length of **30** characters for the Queue Name."*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)

Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the actual length that is allowed for the CCN queues
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	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-244 – Update regarding the 'CorrelId' structure in cases where ARC and Sequence Number are missing

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-244
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM207209, IM210768, IM221952
Known Error	KE16704, KE16704, KE17001
Date at which the Change was proposed	18/05/2017
Requester	MSA-AT, MSA-DE, MSA-FR

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low

Change Description	**Problem Statement:**
	
	In EMCS Phase 3.3, the messages IE717 and IE840 can also be used for a duty paid B2B movement or a duty paid B2C movement or any undocumented movement as described in DDNEA 'section IV.1.2.4'.
	
	According to the DDNEA, section X.I.2.2.1*," in order to support ARC nursing, the CorrelId field of the messages exchanged concerning a movement (IE717, ... IE840...) should be equal to the ARC + Sequence Number (in an ASCII format)*".
	
	The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in DDNEA v1.92 in order to support the aforementioned cases where an event report or control report concerning a movement is submitted, but the correlation ID cannot be filled in since the ARC and Sequence Number which construct the correlation ID do not exist.
	
	Proposed Solution
	
	As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA:
	
	• Main document: Section X.I.2.2.1 The message descriptor:
	  ○ A new exception will be added to support the cases where the ARC and Sequence Number are missing and therefore the 'CorrelID' can't be filled in the IE717 and IE840 messages;
	  ○ The decision tree outlining the scenarios of how the 'CorrelID' field is constructed will be updated to include the aforementioned exception;
	
	Detailed description of the changes in DDNEA Section "X.I.2.2.1 The message descriptor" are described in **'Annex 2: DDNEA-P3-244 –**

	Update regarding the 'CorrelId' structure in cases where ARC and Sequence Number are missing'.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (Medium) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Low)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not consider the cases where an event report or a control report message is submitted but the 'CorrelId' data item is left empty since the ARC and Sequence Number are missing
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns an update in DDNEA Section "X.I.2.2.1 The message descriptor", in order to add a guideline that should be followed when defining the value for the 'CorrelId' data item of the IE717 and IE840 messages. The aforementioned update can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since the guideline included in the aforementioned section is provided in order to help the NEAs define the value that should be used for the 'CorrelId' data item of the IE717 and IE840 messages, in the cases that the ARC and the Sequence Number are not present in the message, in the same way that guidelines are provided for all other cases. Yet they have not been defined as rules and should therefore not be implemented as validations in the NEAs. Hence, the violation of these guidelines by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection (IE906) by the receiver. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** CSMISE-137 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-047

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-245 – Add the erroneously removed error codes on TC49/Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-245
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM206064
Known Error	KE16610
Date at which the Change was proposed	01/06/2017
Requester	MSA-LT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** During the development of EMCS Phase 3.3 by the MSAs, it was observed by MSA-LT that the following error codes were missing from the technical codelist TC49 as described in the DDNEA documentation. • Error Code '90 – Unknown ARC' • Error code '12 – Incorrect (code) value' • Error code '15 – Not supported in this position' The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to add in DDNEA for EMCS v1.92 the specific error codes that were found missing from the technical codelist TC49. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA: • Appendix B: Codelists ○ Technical codelist TC49 will be updated as described below in bold:

Code	Description	Remarks
0	Other	This value should be used only when the error does not correspond to any of the following values. It must be stressed that the value of zero should only be used for intra-release migration issues.
12	***Incorrect (code) value***	***Value of an element in a message is outside the applicable business codelist.***

15	***Not supported in this position***	***The element or value is not allowed according to the applicable Rule(s) or Condition(s).***
26	Duplicate detected	The same interchange is received again. Duplication is detected by reception of an interchange reference that has already been received.
90	***Unknown ARC***	***The ARC of the received message is not known, whereas it is expected to be known.***
91	Duplicate LRN	The LRN of the received message is already known and is therefore not unique according to the specified rules.
92	Message out of sequence	The message cannot be processed, because the receiver is not in a proper state.
93	Invalid ARC	The structure of the ARC does not conform to specifications given in FESS [A1] Appendix B.
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 specifications given in FESS [A1] Appendix B.
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.

- Appendix H: tcl.xsd file
  - The tcl.xsd file will be updated by including the following codes (in bold) in the 'Functional Error Codes' section.

```
…
<xs:simpleType name="FunctionalErrorCodes">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>Functional Error Codes</xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:nonNegativeInteger">
    <xs:enumeration value="0">
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>Other</xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:enumeration>
      <xs:enumeration value="12">
          <xs:annotation>
            <xs:documentation>Incorrect (code) value
      </xs:documentation>
          </xs:annotation>
        </xs:enumeration>
      <xs:enumeration value="15">
          <xs:annotation>
```

	<xs:documentation>Not supported in this position </xs:documentation> **</xs:annotation>** **</xs:enumeration>** <xs:enumeration value="26"><xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>Duplicate detected</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration> **<xs:enumeration value="90">** **<xs:annotation>** **<xs:documentation>Unknown ARC** **</xs:documentation>** **</xs:annotation>** **</xs:enumeration>** <xs:enumeration value="91"><xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>Duplicate LRN</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration> … • Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs): ○ The change applicable to tcl.xsd of Appendix H is also applicable to Appendix I
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be missing the aforementioned error codes in the technical codelist
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns an update of the tcl.xsd, in order to add the missing codes “12”, “15” and “90” in the technical codelist TC49.

	This change has no impact on business continuity and can, therefore, be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically: • If the sender has already deployed this RFC in production while the receiver has not, the respective IE906 messages may include the error code “90”; hence they will be not successfully validated by the receiver. To avoid such rejections, it is proposed that, if the error code “90” is included in the IE906 messages sent, the receiving MSA replaces it with the error code "93", by adding a relevant comment, if possible, in the "Error Reason" Data Item of the <FUNCTIONAL ERROR> Data Group, indicating the actual reason for the rejection, i.e. that an unknown ARC was received. It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any business continuity risk • If the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned change when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the respective IE906 messages will not include the error code “90”. However, it will be validated successfully by the receiver *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE704 message is exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.* *However, a similar approach with the one proposed above for the error code “90” can be followed for the error codes “12” and “15”(that are used only in IE704 message). More specifically MSAs can use the code "0" instead, by adding a relevant comment, if possible, in the "Error Reason" Data Item of the <FUNCTIONAL ERROR> Data Group, indicating the actual reason for the rejection.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks. *Due to issues encountered during EMCS Phase 3.3 CT activities, it was decided to implement this in two steps:* ***Step 1*** *The RFC will be partially implemented by providing to the MSAs, before M_h (16/11/2017), an updated tcl.xsd file including **only** the correction for **error codes “12”, “15” and “90”**. The file will be sent to all MSAs without changing the name or the version.* *It shall be noted that the actual implementation of this specific RFC (using the official CSE tool) will be performed in a future DDNEA version. . For this reason, in step 1, the DDNEA Appendix B (Codelists), Appendix H and Appendix I v1.92 will not be currently updated to indicate the aforementioned partial implementation.* ***Step 2*** *Full implementation of the RFC with all updates needed in DDNEA.* *This approach has no impact in the Excise central applications for EMCS Phase 3.3 (SEED v1.11.0, CS/MISE v5.2.0). The updated file will be also*

	included in the EMCS TRP v1.1.11 for consistency reasons (via a revision of TRP-P3-046).
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-046

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #168 on 03/11/2017[9]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[9] DDNEA-P3-045 RFC was first discussed at EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

DDNEA-P3-246 – Clarifications concerning the dissemination of reference data

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-246
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM197332
Known Error	KE16441
Date at which the Change was proposed	16/03/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to explicitly clarify in the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 v1.92 that the IE734 is disseminated to all MSAs that are registered for receiving IE734 disseminations. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA, Main Document: In sub-section "V.I.2.1.1 Dissemination of Reference Data (UC1.06)", of the Section "V CENTRAL SERVICES", the following paragraph: *"The SEED will distribute the Reference Data changes to all MSAs at a given number of days before they become applicable (typically three or four opening days) according to the validity dates stated in the records. These Reference Data changes will be received by each MSA whose responsibility is to apply them as soon as possible and at the latest by the date and time where they become applicable.* *In detail, SEED will prepare the update message IE734: C_RDD_DAT that combines the updates of Reference Data to be applied by the MSAs.* *The update message IE734 prepared by the SEED will be sent to all the MSAs."* will be updated as follows: *"The SEED will distribute the Reference Data changes to all MSAs* ***that are registered for receiving reference data disseminations*** *at a given number of days before they become applicable (typically three or four opening days) according to the validity dates stated in the records. These Reference Data changes will be received by each MSA whose responsibility is to apply them as soon as possible and at the latest by the date and time where they become applicable.*

	In detail, SEED will prepare the update message IE734: C_RDD_DAT that combines the updates of Reference Data to be applied by the MSAs. *The update message IE734 prepared by the SEED will be sent to all the MSAs* ***that are registered for receiving reference data disseminations****."*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then it will not be explicitly clarified in the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 that the IE734 is disseminated to all MSAs that are registered for receiving IE734 disseminations
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-216 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-247 – Clarifications on the Feedback process for ACO and MVS scenarios

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-247
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM207257, IM181989, IM214532, IM221370
Known Error	KE17841
Date at which the Change was proposed	06/07/2017
Requester	MSA-AT, MSA-LT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA v1.92 for EMCS Phase 3 with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-217 RFC. The FESS RFC is about the addition of clarifications in relation to the Feedback process for 'Administrative Cooperation' and 'Movement Verification for Duty Paid Movements' scenarios. **Proposed solution:** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates will be performed in DDNEA Main document: ○ Section 'IV.II.2 Request for assistance' will be updated as described below in bold: *"Via the results message, the requested ELO may request the requesting ELO to provide feedback on the follow-up action taken by the requesting MSA, on the basis of the provided results (see Articles 8(5), 15(2) and 16(2) of Regulation (EU) 389/2012, Articles 8, 15 and 16). In case such feedback is requested, the requesting ELO shall send back their feedback as soon as possible via another results message,* ***that shall include information which is relevant to the requested feedback****."* ○ Section 'IV.II.2.6 Submission of feedback' will be updated as described below in bold: *"The ELO of the Requesting MSA provides feedback on the follow-up action taken, on the basis of the results received from the requested ELO. This*

	feedback is then sent (IE867:C_COO_RES) by the Requesting MSA application to the Requested MSA application ***including only relevant information****. Finally, the Requested MSA application sets the state of the request from "Answered and Feedback Expected" to "Closed"."* o Section 'IV.IV.8 Submission of feedback' will be updated as described below in bold: *"The ELO of the Requesting MSA provides feedback on the follow-up action taken, on the basis of the results received from the requested ELO. This feedback is then sent (IE725:C_MVS_RES) by the Requesting MSA application to the Requested MSA application* ***including only relevant information****. Finally, the Requested MSA application sets the state of the request from "Answered and Feedback Expected" to "Closed"."* o Section 'IV.II.1 Spontaneous information' will be updated as described below in bold: *"No further actions are expected by the addressed MSA in terms of information exchange messages (excluding rejection messages in case of functional errors).* ***It shall be noted that the issuing MSA may not request feedback from the addressed MSA on the follow up actions taken based on the input provided.*** *The scenario does not describe how the Issuing MSA application is triggered in sending the message and it is assumed for a mechanism to exist (possibly a user interface)."* o Section 'IV.IV.9 Spontaneous information' will be updated as described below in bold: *"No further actions are expected by the addressed MSA in terms of information exchange messages (excluding rejection messages in case of functional errors).* ***It shall be noted that the issuing MSA may not request feedback from the addressed MSA on the follow up actions taken based on the input provided.*** *The scenario does not describe how the Issuing MSA application is triggered in sending the message and it is assumed for a mechanism to exist (possibly a user interface)."*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)

	• TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the DDNEA will be in misalignment with the updates described in the parent RFC 'FESS-217'
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns documentation updates of the DDNEA document, in relation to the feedback processes in ACO and MVS scenarios. It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC do not affect the functionality of the aforementioned processes, but includes further clarifications on how these processes and the relevant messages should be used by the MSAs.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-217 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-221

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #163 on 12/09/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-248 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-248
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM176183, IM176182, IM176181
Known Error	KE16214, KE16215, KE16218
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/11/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 v1.92 with the updates proposed for FESS by FESS-218 RFC. More specifically, in DDNEA Main Document, it should be clarified that after receiving a valid IE713 from a MSA, SEED disseminates that valid IE713 to all MSAs (that are registered to receive IE713 disseminations) without building a consolidated message. That is, the disseminated IE713 includes only the updates submitted via the specific notification of modification (received from the MSA), hence it does not include consolidated updates submitted previously by the MSA. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the Section "V.I.3.1.2 Dissemination of SEED data (UC1.15)" in DDNEA will be amended as described in **'Annex 3: DDNEA-P3-248 – Updates related to the dissemination of registration data'**.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)

Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with the changes proposed for FESS-218 for UC 1.15
Risk assessment	This change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period, since it concerns a documentation update. The current system behaviour is in accordance with the change that this RFC proposes.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks.
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-218 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[10]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[10] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

DDNEA-P3-249 – Update of Rule025/TC25 / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-249
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specification
Incidents	IM218327, IM228124
Known Error	KE17126
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA v1.92 for EMCS Phase 3 with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-220 RFC. More specifically, during the development of EMCS Phase 3.3., it was observed that the technical code list TC25 that applies on IE701. <LIST OF CODES>. Requested List of Codes is not correctly updated based on the code list changes described in: - FESS-188/ FESS-189 - DDNEA-P3-219/ DDNEA-P3-220/ DDNEA-P3-235 **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix B: Detail Description of Technical Code lists The technical code list TC25 shall be updated as follows:

Code	Description	Remarks
28	***Request action***	
29	***Request reasons***	
30	(reserved)	
31	(reserved)	
32	(reserved)	
33	(reserved)	
34	Administrative cooperation action not possible reasons	
35	(reserved)	
36	***Type of document***	
37	***(reserved)***	

38	***(reserved)***	

- Appendix B: Section Code list Mapping

The below entries should be deleted:

FESS Rules	DDNEA Codelists
R220	BC101
R221	BC102
R226	BC102
R227	BC101

- Appendix B: Section 'List of Available Business Code lists'

Number	Title	Format
BC57	***Request Action***	n..2
BC58	Reasons for Delayed Result	n..2
BC59	***Request Reasons***	n..2
BC66	Excise Products Categories	a1
BC67	Transport Modes	n..2
~~***BC101***~~	~~***Movement Verification Request Reasons***~~	~~***n..2***~~
~~***BC102***~~	~~***Movement Verification Actions***~~	~~***n..2***~~

- Appendix H:
  - The tcl.xsd file will be updated by including the following codes in the definition of the technical code list "Requested List of Codes (full)":

```
 …
<xs:enumeration value="28">
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>Request action</xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:enumeration>
    <xs:enumeration value="29">
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>Request reasons</xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:enumeration>
…
<xs:enumeration value="36">
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>Type of document</xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:enumeration>
<xs:enumeration value="37">
      <xs:annotation>
        <xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>
      </xs:annotation>
    </xs:enumeration>
```

	<xs:enumeration value="38"> <xs:annotation> <xs:documentation>***(reserved)***</xs:documentation> </xs:annotation> </xs:enumeration> …” • Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs): ○ The changes applicable to tcl.xsd of Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase (Low) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (Low) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Medium)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-220 RFC

Risk assessment	This RFC concerns updates on the tcl.xsd, in relation to the technical code list TC25.
	This change has no impact on business continuity, and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically:
	• Regarding the update of the description of codes “28” and “29”:
	  Even if an MSA has not deployed this RFC in production, the IE701.xml it generates will be validated successfully by Central SEED, since only the description of codes “28” and “29” of TC25 are changed (the codes in TC25 remain intact)
	
	• Regarding the removal of codes “37” and “38”:
	  If an MSA has not deployed this RFC in production, the IE701.xml it generates will not be validated successfully by Central SEED.
	  To avoid such rejections, Central SEED should use the updated tcl.xsd only when communicating with the MSAs in the new phase (i.e. Phase 3.4). When communicating with the Phase 3.3 MSAs, Central SEED should use the existing tcl.xsd.

	It is considered that the aforementioned proposal will enable Central SEED to support both phases (the old and the new one) without entailing any business continuity risk. However, as soon as the new Phase, i.e. EMCS Phase 3.4 is in production, all MSAs as well as Central SEED should be aligned with the new tcl.xsd • Regarding the addition of code "36": If an MSA has deployed this RFC in production, the IE701.xml it generates will be validated successfully by Central SEED, since the updates introduced by the specific RFC will already be implemented in Central SEED at Mj (i.e. at the start of the Migration Period) *However, as an operational workaround solution until the update is performed in the next common specification release, the users are advised to use either the IE701 messages requesting to extract/retrieve all the code lists, including the "Type of document", or to use the Web Interface of CA SEED, in order to retrieve the "Type of document" code list.* *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE701 message is not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-220 • **Children RFCs:** SEED-140 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-050

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-220
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[11]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[11] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

DDNEA-P3-250 – Update the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 message / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-250
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM218324
Known Error	KE17002
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 v1.92 with the updates proposed for FESS by FESS-221 RFC. More specifically the multiplicity of data groups <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> in IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) message should be increased in order to avoid having the creation of an invalid IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) message when a common request is performed for the retrieval of reference data in EMCS Phase 3.3 via Central SEED application. **Proposed Solution:** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following update shall be performed in DDNEA: • Appendix D: Technical Message Structure: ○ *IE709 - COMMON SYSTEM PARAMETERS (C_PAR_DAT):* The structure of the message shall be updated: **From:** MESSAGE 1x R ---SYSTEM PARAMETERS 1x O ------ACTION 1xR ---MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS 8x O ------ACTION 1xR ---(SPLITTING) EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS 999x O ------ACTION 1xR

To:

MESSAGE 1x R

---SYSTEM PARAMETERS **999x** O

------ACTION 1xR

---MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS **999x** O

------ACTION 1xR

---(SPLITTING) EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS 999x O

------ACTION 1xR

- *IE734 - OPERATIONS ON THE REFERENCE DATABASE (C_RDD_DAT):*

From:

MESSAGE 1x R

---C_PAR_DAT 1x O

------SYSTEM PARAMETERS 1x O

---------ACTION 1x R

------MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS 8x O

---------ACTION 1x R

------(SPLITTING) EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS 999x O

---------ACTION 1x R

…….

To:

MESSAGE 1x R

---C_PAR_DAT 1x O

------SYSTEM PARAMETERS **999x** O

---------ACTION 1x R

------MAXIMUM JOURNEY TIME PARAMETERS **999x** O

---------ACTION 1x R

------(SPLITTING) EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY PARAMETERS 999x O

---------ACTION 1x R

……..

- Appendix H: Directory With XML Schemas (XSDs):
  - *IE709.xsd:*

From:

	…<xs:complexType name="CommonSystemParametersType"> <xs:sequence> <xs:element name="SystemParameters" type="ie:SystemParametersType" minOccurs="0" /> <xs:element name="MaximumJourneyTimeParameters" type="ie:MaximumJourneyTimeParametersType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="8" />…. **To:** <xs:complexType name="CommonSystemParametersType"><xs:sequence> <xs:element name="SystemParameters" type="ie:SystemParametersType" minOccurs="0" **maxOccurs="unbounded"** /><xs:element name="MaximumJourneyTimeParameters" type="ie:MaximumJourneyTimeParametersType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="**unbounded**" /></xs:sequence> </xs:complexType> o *IE734.xsd:* **From:** <xs:sequence> <xs:element name="SystemParameters" type="ie:SystemParametersType" minOccurs="0" /><xs:element name="MaximumJourneyTimeParameters" type="ie:MaximumJourneyTimeParametersType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="8" /></xs:sequence> **To:** <xs:sequence> <xs:element name="SystemParameters" type="ie:SystemParametersType" minOccurs="0" **maxOccurs="unbounded"** /><xs:element name="MaximumJourneyTimeParameters" type="ie:MaximumJourneyTimeParametersType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="**unbounded**" /></xs:sequence> </xs:complexType> • Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs): o *The change applicable to IE734.xsd of Appendix H is also applicable to Appendix I.*
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs:

	• Central SEED v1 application (Medium) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	The effect of not implementing the change is the creation of an invalid IE734 (C_RDD_DAT) message, that cannot be sent to the MSA that requests a retrieval of reference data
Risk assessment	According to the proposed changes, the multiplicity of the <System Parameters> and <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> Data Group of both IE709 and IE734 will be updated. If CA SEED uses the updated. xsds when communicating with MSAs that have not yet deployed this RFC in production, the receiving MSAs will reject the IE734 messages received. To avoid such rejections, CA SEED should use the updated ie734.xsd only when communicating with the MSAs in the new phase (Phase 3.4). When communicating with the Phase 3.3 MSAs, CA SEED should use the existing ie734.xsd. It is considered that the aforementioned proposal will enable CA SEED to support both phases (the old and the new one) without entailing any business continuity risk. However, as soon as the new Phase (EMCS Phase 3.4) is in production, all MSAs as well as CA SEED should be aligned with the new ie734.xsd. It shall be noted that the two IE734 (either Phase 3.3 or EMCS Phase 3.4) messages that will also be disseminated to the MSAs will differ both from the .xsd and the context point of view. *Currently, as an operational workaround solution until the updates are performed in the next common specification release, Central SEED application provides only one <System Parameters> data group and more specifically returns the valid <System Parameters> data group at the requested end date on a request for retrieval.* *The multiplicity of data group <Maximum Journey Time Parameters> is only updated for issues that may occur in future changes.* *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE709/IE734 messages are not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-221 • **Children RFCs:** SEED-141 • **Other RFCs:** DDNEA-P3-226

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018[12]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[12] This RFC was firstly discussed in CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

DDNEA-P3-251 – Updates in order to allow zero values in specific numerical data items of IE742 message

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-251
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM218328
Known Error	KE17837
Date at which the Change was proposed	28/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Based on the implementation of DDNEA-P3-211 – "Leading zeroes not allowed for numerical values" for EMCS Phase 3.2., the necessary updates were performed in order to propagate in the .xsds the validation that the leading zeroes shall not be used for numerical values. Therefore, the types.xsd included in Appendix H of DDNEA v1.92 was updated so that leading zeroes are not allowed for the numerical Data Items. In the scenario where a user requests to retrieve statistics via an IE701 message, there is a possibility to have zero values for a specified period in the expected IE742 results message (in specific numerical Data Items). This will result to an invalid IE742 message since zero values are currently not allowed for these numerical Data Items due to the implementation of DDNEA-P3-211 RFC in Appendix H. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the pattern of the following simple types should be updated accordingly so that leading zeroes are not allowed but zero values are allowed for the respective numerical Data Items included in the IE742 message: • NumberOfActiveEconomicOperators • NumberOfEconomicOperators • NumberOfExciseAuthorisationChanges • NumberOfInactiveEconomicOperators • NumberOfPendingExpirations • NumberOfTaxWarehouses • TotalNumberOfActiveEconomicOperators • TotalNumberOfEconomicOperators • TotalNumberOfExciseAuthorisationChanges

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>

TotalNumberOfInactiveEconomicOperators
TotalNumberOfPendingExpirations
TotalNumberOfTaxWarehouses

More specifically, the following updates shall be performed:

Appendix H: types.xsd file

The pattern of the aforementioned simple types will be updated as described below:

<table>
<tr><td>Existing pattern</td><td><xs:pattern value="[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,14}" /></td></tr>
<tr><td>Updated pattern</td><td><xs:pattern value="[0]|[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,14}" /></td></tr>
</table>

Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs):

The changes applicable to types.xsd of Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Impact assessment</td><td>
Specification Documents:

DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium)
CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)
TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)

CDEAs:

Central SEED v1 application (Low)
CTA (None)
CS/MISE (None)

NEAs:

Impact on NEAs (Medium)

</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effect of not implementing the Change</td><td>If the proposed change is not implemented, then the update in the simple types definition that would allow zero values on specific numerical data items will be missing, leading to IE742 messages to be rejected due to the existing validation that does not allow zeroes in numerical values</td></tr>
<tr><td>Risk assessment</td><td>
This RFC concerns changes in types.xsd by proposing the necessary updates in order to allow zero values on specific numerical data items of the IE742 message.

If Central SEED uses the updated .xsds when communicating with MSAs that have not yet deployed this RFC in production, the receiving MSAs will reject the IE742 messages received.

To avoid such rejections, Central SEED should use the updated ie742.xsd only when communicating with the MSAs in the new phase (i.e. Phase 3.3). When communicating with the Phase 3.2 MSAs, Central SEED should use the existing ie742.xsd.
</td></tr>
</table>

	It is considered that the aforementioned proposal will enable Central SEED to support both phases (the old and the new one) without entailing any business continuity risk. However, as soon as the new Phase, i.e. EMCS Phase 3.3 is in production, all MSAs as well as Central SEED should be aligned with the new ie742.xsd. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE742 message is not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-142 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #164 on 03/10/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-252 – Allowing zero values in the "Number of packages" Data Item of the IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages / Rev2

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-252
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specifications
Incidents	IM149918, IM257521, IM257253, IM253110
Known Error	KE15758, KE15759, KE17854
Date at which the Change was proposed	27/09/2016
Requester	MSA-SK, MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA with the updates described in FESS by FESS-225 RFC. In more details, a new rule will be required linked to the <Number of Packages> data item in order to support the cases where the excise goods of two or more body records in the e-AD are included in the same package, resulting in the first body record to mention the actual number of the packages and the rest of the body records to mention a zero number of packages to indicate this dependency. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed. A new rule shall be created and applied to IE801, IE815 and IE825 messages. More specifically: • APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE ○ A new rule (‘R251’) will be added in the ‘Rules’ section as described below: **R251** In case the ‘Number of Packages’ is set to ‘0’, then there should exist at least one ‘PACKAGE’ with the same ‘Shipping Marks’ and ‘Number of Packages’ with value greater than ‘0’. ○ A new condition (‘C203’) will be added in the ‘Conditions’ section as described below:

C203

IF <Number of Packages> is set to ‘0’

THEN

<Shipping Marks> is ‘R’

ELSE

<Shipping Marks> is ‘Optional’

Note: Shipping marks should be used as an identifier for goods which are packed together and will only be provided for packaged goods where applicable, in a free form of description of the marks and numbers on transport units or packages.

- A new data item, <Shipping Marks> will be added under the <PACKAGE> data group in the IE815, IE801 and IE825 messages. Hence, the <PACKAGE> data group will be updated as shown below in the corresponding messages:

IE801 - E-AD (C_EAD_VAL)

From:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**		**C073**
Commercial Seal Identification	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

To:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**	**R251**	**C073**
Shipping Marks	**D**	**an..999**		**C203**
Commercial Seal Identification	O	an..35		
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

IE815 - SUBMITTED DRAFT OF E-AD (N_EAD_SUB)

From:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**		**C073**
Commercial Seal Identification		O	an..35	
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

To:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**	**R251**	**C073**
Shipping Marks	**D**	**an..999**		**C203**
Commercial Seal Identification		O	an..35	
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

IE825 - SUBMITTED DRAFT OF SPLITTING OPERATION (E_SPL_SUB)

From:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**		**C073**
Commercial Seal Identification		O	an..35	
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

To:

------PACKAGE

Kind of packages	R	an2	BC17	
Number of packages	**D**	**n..15**	**R251**	**C073**
Shipping Marks	**D**	**an..999**		**C203**
Commercial Seal Identification		O	an..35	
Seal Information	O	an..350		
Seal Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

- APPENDIX G: DATA ITEMS

The following new data item will be added (following the alphabetical ordering of the table):

Data item	Format
Shipping Marks	an..999

- APPENDIX K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING

The following new entries, including the respective description shall be added in the 'Rules and Conditions mapping to IE paths' table.

R251	IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Number of packages
R251	IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Number of packages
R251	IE825.MESSAGE - (SPLIT DETAILS) E-AD - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Number of packages
C203	IE801.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Shipping Marks
C203	IE815.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Shipping Marks
C203	IE825.MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Shipping Marks

- APPENDIX E: XML MAPPING

The following XML-tag will be created:

Data-group or Data-item	Data Type	XML-Tag
MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Shipping Marks	an..999	ShippingMarks

- APPENDIX C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES

The following new message element will be added in the Correlation tables as described below:

A new Message Element that is: <MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD - PACKAGE.Shipping Marks> will be inserted with:

- The data type set to 'an..999' and
- the optionality set to 'Dependent' (i.e. 'D') for the IE815, IE825 and IE801 messages

- APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)
  - The pattern of "NumberOfPackagesType" in types.xsd shall be updated as follows:

From:

```
<!--==========================================-->
<! --===          NumberOfPackagesType          ===-->
<!--==========================================-->
<xs:simpleType name="NumberOfPackagesType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="Number of packages" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="15" />
    <xs:pattern value="[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,14}" />
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

To:

```
<!--==========================================-->
<! --===          NumberOfPackagesType          ===-->
<!--==========================================-->
<xs:simpleType name="NumberOfPackagesType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="Number of packages" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="15" />
    <xs:pattern value="[0]|[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,14}" />
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

- A new pattern for “ShippingMarksType” in types.xsd shall be added as follows:

```
<!--==========================================-->
<! --===          ShippingMarksType          ===-->
<!--==========================================-->
<xs:simpleType name="ShippingMarksType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="Shipping Marks" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="999" />
    <xs:pattern value=".{1,999}" />
```

```
  </xs:restriction>
 </xs:simpleType>
```

- The following insertion will be performed in the ie815.xsd, ie825.xsd and ie801.xsd:

```
<xs:complexType name="PackageType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="PACKAGE" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="KindOfPackages" type="emcs:KindOfPackagesType" />
    <xs:element name="NumberOfPackages" type="emcs:NumberOfPackagesType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="ShippingMarks" type="emcs:ShippingMarksType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="CommercialSealIdentification" type="emcs:CommercialSealIdentificationType" minOccurs="0" />
    <xs:element name="SealInformation" type="ie:LSDSealInformationType" minOccurs="0" />
  </xs:sequence>
 </xs:complexType>
```

- APPENDIX I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)

The changes applicable to the types.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
- TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)

CDEAs:

- Central SEED v1 application (None)
- CTA (None)
- CS/MISE (None)

NEAs:

- Impact on NEAs (None)

FAD (Low):

- The FAD for the e-AD submission and splitting shall be updated respectively as follows:
  - Main form and Continuation page

	▪ PACKAGE **17.1.c** Shipping Marks **3.8.1.c** Shipping Marks ○ The following Explanatory Note will be added accordingly for each form: **Provide Shipping marks for goods which are packed together and are only applicable for packaged goods**. ○ The numbering of the rest fields should be amended
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-225 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes both at the syntactic and the semantic level. **Changes at semantic level** **----------** Concerning the changes at the semantic level, namely the addition of R251 and C203 in the <Number of Packages> and <Shipping Marks> data items respectively, they can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validation, the newly added rule and condition will be validated only at the sending side of the IE815, IE801 and IE825 messages (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over CD). Hence, any such violation of the added rule or condition by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection (IE906) by the receiver **Changes at syntactic level** **----------** Concerning the changes at the syntactic level, i.e. the addition of the new <Shipping Marks> data item and the update of the types.xsd file in relation to the pattern of 'NumberOfPackagesType' and 'ShippingMarksType', they can be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically: • If the sender is aligned with the new types.xsd as well as the ie815.xsd, ie801.xsd and ie825.xsd, while the receiver is not, any corresponding messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. Therefore, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application removes any occurrences of the <Shipping Marks> data item, as well as only include values greater than 0 in the <Number of Packages> data item in the sent messages • In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new types.xsd as well as the ie815.xsd, ie801.xsd and ie825.xsd when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver. To avoid such rejections, it is proposed that the receiving application fills in the <Shipping Marks> data item with the dummy value 'aa' when this is required as defined by condition 'C203'. In relation to the update of the 'NumberofPackagesType', no rejections are expected in this case, since the sender would not be able to include '0' values in the <Number of Packages> data item since the updated types.xsd would not have been deployed in production by the sender

	The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE815, IE801 and IE825 messages are also exchanged over the ED. Therefore, the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-225 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~299 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~078

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-225
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018[13]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[13] DDNEA-P3-252 RFC was first discussed in CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

DDNEA-P3-254 – Changes in the types.xsd to allow leading zeroes for CN Codes

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-254
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM242810
Known Error	KE17670
Date at which the Change was proposed	26/01/2018
Requester	MSA-FR

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Based on the implementation of DDNEA-P3-211 – “Leading zeroes not allowed for numerical values” for EMCS Phase 3.3., the necessary updates were performed in order to propagate in the. xsds the validation that the leading zeroes shall not be used for numerical values. As part of the aforementioned RFC, the ‘CnCodeType’ changed in EMCS Phase 3.3 so that no leading zeroes are allowed for the <CN Code> data item. However, MSA-FR raised an issue that the “CNCodeType” pattern should be generic in order to allow the insertion of CN Codes including leading zeros, which can be used not only over the common domain, but also at national level. As discussed and agreed with DG TAXUD, the pattern of ‘CNCodeType’ type should be changed to allow leading zeroes for CN Codes. DG TAXUD mentioned that CN Codes are not numbers, they are fixed-length alphanumeric identifiers, which happen to include only digits but they cannot be considered as numbers. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the pattern of the ‘CnCodeType’ should be changed to allow leading zeros for the respective <CN Code> data item. More specifically, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix H: types.xsd file ○ The pattern of ‘CnCodeType’ will be updated as described below: **Existing pattern** <xs:pattern value=" [1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,7} />

	Updated pattern <xs:pattern value=" [0-9]{8} " /> • Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs): ○ The changes applicable to types.xsd of Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (~~None~~Low) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (Low) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Medium)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the update in the simple types definition that would allow zero values on specific numerical data items will not be applied. As a result, the corresponding messages including a CN Code (i.e. IE717, IE722, IE733, IE734, IE801, IE815, IE825 and IE840) will be rejected due to the existing validation that does not allow leading zeroes in the <CN Code> data item
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns change in .xsds by proposing the necessary updates to allow leading zero values on “CN Code Type”. More specifically, the current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to remove in the types.xsd, the validation that the leading zeroes shall not be used for CN Codes. Therefore, the present RFC can be deployed in production in a Migration Period. More specifically: • If the sender is aligned with the new .xsd with respect to the aforementioned update while the receiver is not, then the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver in cases that they include leading zeroes in the <CN Code> data item. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the receiving application removes any leading zeroes from the <CN Code> data item in the messages received. It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any significant business continuity risk, since even though CN codes should not be considered as numerical fields, there are no identified excise CN codes that will fail the existing leading zeroes validation. • If the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned change when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the respective messages will be validated successfully by the receiver, since there is no restriction to the use of leading zeroes for the receiver. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the messages including the <CN Code> Data Items are also exchanged*

	over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-145 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-072 ~~There is no reference to other RFCs~~

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-255 – Update code list mapping of TC10

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-255
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249176
Known Error	KE17847
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** During the review of the Excise BPMs, it was identified that condition TC10 is erroneously linked with R231 instead of R234 in DDNEA Appendix B. In order to avoid any discrepancy or issue that can be caused, the mapping of codelist TC10 should be updated accordingly in DDNEA Appendix B. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the mapping of codelist TC10 in DDNEA Appendix B should be updated by linking TC10 with R234 instead of R231. More specifically, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix B: Code list mapping *From:*

FESS Rules	DDNEA Codelists
R226	BC102
R227	BC101
R228	TC98
R231	**TC10**
R242	BC106
R249	BC106

To:

	<table><tr><th>FESS Rules</th><th>DDNEA Codelists</th></tr><tr><td>R226</td><td>BC102</td></tr><tr><td>R227</td><td>BC101</td></tr><tr><td>R228</td><td>TC98</td></tr><tr><td>R234</td><td>TC10</td></tr><tr><td>R242</td><td>BC106</td></tr><tr><td>R249</td><td>BC106</td></tr></table>
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (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 condition TC10 will be erroneously linked with R231 instead of R234 and the discrepancy will remain
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business risks since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	N/A (this RFC concerns a documentation update)
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #173 on 06/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-256– Adding clarifications on Common Specifications about ship supplies treatment / Rev2

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-256
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM149654
Known Error	KE15665
Date at which the Change was proposed	26/09/2016
Requester	MSA-IE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA with the updates for FESS by FESS-231 RFC. More specifically, it is suggested to be clearly defined in the DDNEA that the delivery of excise goods which are supplied to ships and have been exempted from paying the excise duty, should be treated as an export in EMCS. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed. • The “Sub-Section III.II Export Scenarios” shall be amended as follows: This section aims to specify all possible message exchange protocols involved in the Export cases. The identification of these scenarios has been based on the “exportation of goods” use cases in FESS [A1], which define the exportation of excise goods moving under duty suspension arrangements outside the European Community by triggering: • local clearance at export, where the Consignor submits both the e-AD and the export declaration in his own premises; or • export operation at office of export, where the Consignor submits only the e-AD, whereas the export declaration is submitted at the office of export (possibly in a different Member State).

	It shall be noted that: • These scenarios assume the availability of ECS Phase 3, hence full automation of the Export cases. This is, however, a recommended implementation. The integration of EMCS and ECS and the implementation details remain a national matter (see also the SD [A2]); • Any communication outside the scope of the EMCS application (such as, the information exchanged between the Consignor or forwarding agent and the Customs Export Application) is not in the interest of this document. ***The case of ship supplies are not regular exports and therefore are not subject to the regular export procedure (Article 269 (2) (c) & Article 269 (1) of UCC). However, an export declaration must be lodged and all export formalities related to the export customs procedure remain applicable (Article 269 (2) UCC). The purpose of the respective legal rules is to ensure that where a tax-exempt supply has been granted for ship supplies the delivery of those supplies could be proven and the export movement can be closed once ship supplies are delivered on board the vessel. Where excise goods to be supplied to ships have been exempted from paying excise duty, their delivery on board the ship must be proven in order to properly close the movement in the EMCS.*** ***Although ship supplies are not subject to the regular export procedure the competent customs office must establish that they have left the customs territory of the Union. It must then inform the customs office of export about the exit of the goods once they have been loaded onto the vessel. The office of export shall then certify the exit to the declarant or the exporter and to EMCS in the Member State of export. EMCS in the Member State of export will then inform EMCS in the Member State of dispatch.*** ***In case of indirect exports Union goods under excise duty suspension move from the Member State/Office of export to the Office of exit, then an exit result message and the derived Report of Export are needed for the EMCS movement to be closed.*** ***In case of direct exports, the Member State on which territory the movement takes place could be allowed to use national simplifications (Article 30 Directive (EC) No 2008/118) instead of EMCS, including use of entry into the declarant records.***
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-231 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business risks since it concerns a documentation update. However, the treatment of ship supplies shall be defined in order to avoid erroneous treatment of such cases.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-231 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018[14]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[14] DDNEA-P3-256 RFC was first discussed in EMCS CAB#175 on 20/03/2018

DDNEA-P3-257 – Update the rules applied on 'Sequence Number' in IE803/IE818

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-257
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specifications
Incidents	IM131658
Known Error	KE14509
Date at which the Change was proposed	27/10/2015
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-233 RFC. More specifically, a discrepancy was identified between the Common Specifications with the Technical annexes of the Legislation in relation to the rules which should be applicable for the 'Sequence Number' data item. As described in FESS-233 RFC, R255 should be applied (along with R232) on the <Sequence Number> data item in IE818 and IE803 messages. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: Rules A new rule, 'R255', will be added as shown below: R255 Provide the latest sequence number of the related e-AD • Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE The following update should be performed in the <Sequence Number> data item in IE803 (highlighted in bold/italic): **---EXCISE NOTIFICATION** Notification Type R n1 TC42 Notification Date and Time R dateTime Administrative Reference Code R an21 R030 Sequence Number R n..2 R232 ***R255***

The following update should be performed in the <Sequence Number> data item in IE818 (highlighted in bold/italic):

---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD

Administrative Reference Code	R	an21	BR020 R030
Sequence Number	R	n..2	R232 ***R255***

- Appendix K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING

The following two new entries should be added in the 'Rules and Conditions Mapping to IE Paths' table:

C/R	IE path
R255	IE803.MESSAGE - EXCISE NOTIFICATION.Sequence Number
R255	IE818.MESSAGE - EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD.Sequence Number

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
- TRP for EMCS Phase (None)

CDEAs:

- Central SEED v1 application (None)
- CTA (None)
- CS/MISE (None)

NEAs:

- Impact on NEAs (Low)

Effect of not implementing the Change

If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with FESS in relation to the rules that should be applied on the <Sequence Number> data item in IE803 and IE818 messages

Risk assessment

This RFC concerns changes at the semantic level.

More specifically, it proposes to update apply R255 in the <Sequence Number> data item in IE803 and IE818 in order in order to align DDNEA with the corresponding legislation and the Common Specifications.

It is considered that the aforementioned change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period. More specifically, alike any other semantic validation, R255 is validated only at the sending side of the IE803 and IE818 messages (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over CD). Hence, the violation of this condition/rule by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection (IE906) by the receiver.

It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC affect also the External Domain since the IE803 and IE818 messages are also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.

Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-233 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~297 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-258 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-ADs / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-258
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM184400
Known Error	KE17904
Date at which the Change was proposed	04/12/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA with the updates for FESS by FESS-234 RFC. This RFC proposes the corresponding clarifications to be added in DDNEA to specify that invalid or rejected messages should be stored and archived for the same duration as valid messages. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis in the [Problem Statement] section, the following changes shall be performed: • The section "IV FOLLOW-UP AND COLLABORATION" and "III.I.12 Download of an e-AD (UC3.31)" in DDNEA will be amended as described in **"Annex 4: DDNEA-P3-258 – Clarifications about archiving of Rejected e-ADs/Rev1"**
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-234 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns documentation updates by inserting clarifications about the period that invalid/rejected messages should be stored and archived in EMCS
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-234 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~301 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~080

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018[15]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[15] DDNEA-P3-258 was first discussed in CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

DDNEA-P3-259 – Clarifications on MVS Spontaneous information in relation to the feedback mechanism

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-259
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM182366, IM214532, IM181989
Known Error	KE17905
Date at which the Change was proposed	06/07/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA with the updates for FESS by FESS-235 RFC. More specifically, clarifications concerning the applicability of the feedback mechanism in the MVS Spontaneous Information process shall be added in the respective section of DDNEA to ensure the proper user of the IE725 message in these cases. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed. • The description of “IV.IV.9 Spontaneous information” in the Sub-Section “IV.IV Movement verification for duty paid movement scenarios”, in the DDNEA main document shall be updated as follows: **<u>From:</u>** **IV.IV.9 Spontaneous information** …. The Issuing MSA application sends to the Addressed MSA application a movement verification results (IE725: C_MVS_RES) message, concerning a duty paid B2B movement or a duty paid B2C movement or an undocumented movement (i.e. movement using a non-European Union standard document). The Addressed MSA application validates the received message structure. **<u>To:</u>**

	IV.IV.9 Spontaneous information …. The Issuing MSA application sends to the Addressed MSA application a movement verification results (IE725: C_MVS_RES) message, concerning a duty paid B2B movement or a duty paid B2C movement or an undocumented movement (i.e. movement using a non-European Union standard document). The Addressed MSA application validates the received message structure. **In this case, since the feedback mechanism is not applicable for spontaneous information cases, only the relevant details (Data Groups/Items) shall be present.**
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-235 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business 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-235 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-260 – Update the description of condition 'C201'

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-260
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specification
Incidents	IM207234
Known Error	KE17907
Date at which the Change was proposed	22/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA Appendix D with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-237 RFC. More specifically, during the development of EMCS Phase 3.3., it was observed that the description of condition 'C201' needs to be updated in order to clarify the cases where the condition shall be applied. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: Technical Message Structure In the 'Conditions' section, the description of condition 'C201' will be updated as follows: **From**: C201 IF <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT.Image of Other Accompanying Document> is not present in at least one instance of the <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group THEN <CN Code> is 'R' <Quantity> is 'R' <Unit of Measure Code> is 'R' ELSE <CN Code> does not apply <Quantity> does not apply <Unit of Measure Code> does not apply **To**:

	C201 IF <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT.Image of Other Accompanying Document> ***is not present in the*** <OTHER ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENT> data group THEN <CN Code> is 'R' <Quantity> is 'R' <Unit of Measure Code> is 'R' ELSE <CN Code> does not apply <Quantity> does not apply <Unit of Measure Code> does not apply
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Low)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-237 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns a change at the semantic level. More specifically, it concerns the update of the description of condition 'C201'. The specific RFC can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since: • Alike any other semantic validation, this condition will be validated only at the sending side of the relevant IE717 and IE840 messages (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over CD). Hence, the violation of this rule by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection (IE906) by the receiver *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE840 message is also exchanged over the ED. Therefore, the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-237 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-261 – Extending the maximum length of "DescriptionType" to allow more characters in the descriptions of codes / Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-261
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM100119
Known Error	KE12599
Date at which the Change was proposed	23/01/2015
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** MSA-DE reported an issue about the translated descriptions in some Code List values. More specifically, it was identified that specific German descriptions (i.e. added in the code list values' description) were truncated because of the current format in DDNEA for descriptions which is defined as "an..256". MSA- DE suggested to raise the maximum-character length to be used in CN codes description, since this may cause the loss of important information. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the simple type "DescriptionType" shall be updated from "an..256" to "an..999" in types.xsd file. It shall be noted that the simple type 'DescriptionType' is applicable for the <Description> data item under the <LANGUAGE SPECIFIC DATA> data group in the IE733 and IE734 messages: More specifically, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS) The simple type 'DescriptionType' shall be updated as shown below: **<u>From</u>**: <!--==========--> <! --=== Description ===-->
	<!--==========-->

```
<xs:simpleType name="DescriptionType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="Description" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="256" />
    <xs:pattern value=".{1,256}" />
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

To:

```
<!--=====================================================-->
<! --===                Description                ===-->
<!--=====================================================-->
<xs:simpleType name="DescriptionType">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>
      <doc:description value="Description" />
    </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
    <xs:maxLength value="999" />
    <xs:pattern value=".{1,999}" />
  </xs:restriction>
</xs:simpleType>
```

- Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs):

The change applicable to types.xsd of Appendix H is also applicable to Appendix I.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)
- TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)

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 MSAs may lose information about translated descriptions (e.g. CN codes translated description) which are currently truncated due to the format defined for the corresponding ‘Description’. Therefore, this implementation will allow them to include

	detailed information in the aforementioned description field and eliminate the risk of business information loss
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level. More specifically, it incorporates the necessary updates in order to increase the data length of the 'DescriptionType' simple type in the types.xsd file so that translated descriptions are not truncated. According to the proposed changes, the types.xsd will be updated and the corresponding simple type 'DescriptionType' which is updated is used in ie734.xsd and ie733.xsd files. If Central SEED uses the updated .xsds when communicating with MSAs that have not yet deployed this RFC in production, the receiving MSAs will reject the IE734 messages received. To avoid such rejections, Central SEED should use the updated ie734.xsd only when communicating with the MSAs in the new phase (i.e. P3.4). When communicating with the Phase 3.3 MSAs, Central SEED should use the existing ie734.xsd. It is considered that the aforementioned proposal will enable Central SEED to support both phases (the old and the new one) without entailing any business continuity risk. However, as soon as the new Phase, i.e. EMCS Phase 3.3 is in production, all MSAs as well as Central SEED should be aligned with the new ie734.xsd. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE734 message is not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	This RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** without any business continuity risks. It is also proposed that Central SEED is enabled to support both phases (the old and the new one)
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-~~xxx~~148 • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A

Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04/2018[16]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

[16] DDNEA-P3-261 RFC was first discussed in CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

DDNEA-P3-262 – Add missing values in the 'Primary Criterion Type Code' code list

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-262
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specifications
Incidents	IM254675
Known Error	~~N/A~~KE18369
Date at which the Change was proposed	05/03/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** During the review of the Excise BPMs, a discrepancy between Rule008 in FESS and the corresponding code list 'TC06 – Primary Criterion Type Code' in DDNEA Appendix B was identified. More specifically, in FESS Appendix D, Rule008 includes two additional values which are values '4=(reserved)' and '7=(reserved)' which are not included in the corresponding technical code list TC06 in DDNEA Appendix B. The current RFC proposes the necessary updates to align the code list 'TC06 – Primary Criterion Type Code' with the details described in Rule008 in FESS. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix B: CODELISTS The following new values will be added in the 'TC06 – PRIMARY CRITERION TYPE CODE' code list.

Code	Description	Remarks
1	ARC	
2	Brand name of product	
3	Categories of goods of the movement	
4	***(reserved)***	
5	(reserved)	

6	(reserved)	
7	***(reserved)***	
8	City of consignee	
9	City of consignor	
10	City of guarantor	
…	…	…

- Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)

The following new entries will be added in tcl.xsd file:

```
<xs:enumeration value="4">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:enumeration>
<xs:enumeration value="7">
  <xs:annotation>
    <xs:documentation>(reserved)</xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
</xs:enumeration>
```

- Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs):

The changes applicable to tcl.xsd of Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None)
- TRP for EMCS Phase (Low)

CDEAs:

- Central SEED v1 application (Low)
- CTA (None)
- CS/MISE (None)

NEAs:

- Impact on NEAs (Low)

Effect of not implementing the Change

If the proposed change is not implemented, then the identified misalignment between Rule008 in FESS Appendix D and ‘TC06 – Primary Criterion Type Code’ in DDNEA Appendix B, regarding the code list values ‘4=(reserved)’ and ‘7=(reserved)’, shall be retained

Risk assessment

This RFC concerns a change in the tcl.xsd in order to include two additional values ‘4=(reserved)’ and ‘7=(reserved)’ of TC06 which is used in IE701 messages.

It is considered that the aforementioned change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period since the newly added codes are actually ‘(reserved)’ and shall not be used in Production. However, even in cases of erroneous use of the aforementioned

	codes, it is expected that no business continuity risks will be encountered. More specifically: • If the sender is aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned changes while the receiver is not, the respective IE701 messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver, since they may include the newly added codes. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application removes any of the newly added 'reserved' codes from the IE701 messages sent. It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any business continuity risk. • In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned changes when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the sender will not be able to use the newly added codes based on the fact the updated tcl.xsd will not have been deployed. Therefore, there will be message rejections from the receiver since the newly added code list values will not be included in the sent IE701 messages. *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE701 messages are not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-146- • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~076

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-263 – Update XML tag for the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> data item

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-263
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM243529
Known Error	~~N/A~~KE18368
Date at which the Change was proposed	22/12/2017
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC is generated on the back of DDNEA-P3-214 RFC and proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the changes related to the data item <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage>. More specifically, the DDNEA-P3-214 RFC proposed the required updates in relation to the data item <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage>, but it was observed that the corresponding XML tags were not updated correctly leading to confusion in relation to the use of the aforementioned data item. Thus, the current RFC proposes the necessary updates in the XML tag of the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> data item. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix E: XML Mapping: ○ The XML tag of the data item 'MESSAGE - (BODY) E-AD.Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage' will be updated from 'AlcoholicStrength' to '***AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage***' • Appendix H: Directory with XML Schemas (XSDs): In the ie815.xsd and ie801.xsd files, the following update should be performed: **<u>From</u>**:

	<xs:element name="AlcoholicStrength" type="emcs:AlcoholicStrengthType" minOccurs="0" /> **<u>To</u>**: <xs:element name="***AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage***" type="emcs:AlcoholicStrengthType" minOccurs="0" />

Impact assessment	Specification Documents:
	• DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
	• CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)
	• TRP for EMCS Phase (Low)
	
	CDEAs:
	• Central SEED v1 application (None)
	• CTA (None)
	• CS/MISE (None)
	
	NEAs:
	• Impact on NEAs (Low)
	
	FAD (Low):
	• The FAD for the e-AD submission shall be updated as follows:
	  ○ Main form and Continuation page
	  From 17.g Alcoholic Strength to **17.g Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage**

Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the XML tags for the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> data item will not be aligned with the DDNEA specifications as updated by DDNEA-P3-214
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes at the syntactic level. More specifically, it concerns the update of the XML tags in relation to the <Alcoholic Strength by Volume in Percentage> 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. xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates while the receiver is not, the respective messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver in case that they include the updated XML tag <AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage>. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application replaces any occurrence of the <AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage> XML tag with the <AlcoholicStrength> XML tag in the IE801 and IE815 messages sent • In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new. xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, the messages sent will not be validated successfully by the receiver.

	More specifically, the transmitted messages will not include the updated <AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage> XML tag which will lead to the encounter of a syntactic violation. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the receiving application replaces any occurrence of the <AlcoholicStrength> XML tag with the <AlcoholicStrengthByVolumeInPercentage> XML tag in the IE801 and IE815 messages received *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE801 and IE815 messages are also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~295 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~074, DDNEA-P3-214

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

DDNEA-P3-264 – Consultation of registration information by economic operators/Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-264
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with specification
Incidents	IM176185
Known Error	KE16216
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/11/2016
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3.4 with the FESS concerning the consultation of registration information by economic operators. More specifically, the consultation of registration information by economic operators (via SEED-on-EUROPA) is described in FESS Section III via the Use case UC1.30 under Sub-Section *"4.4 Consultation of registration information by economic operators (UC1.30)"*, but it is not described in the current version of DDNEA (v1.92). This process is also described in the Legislation (see Articles 6(2), (3) and (4) of Implementing Regulation No 612/2013). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the Section *"V CENTRAL SERVICES"* in DDNEA will be amended to include a separate Sub-Section named ***"V.III SEED-on-EUROPA"*** as described in **"Annex 5: DDNEA-P3-264 – Consultation of registration information by economic operators"**.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs:

	• Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the FESS, since there will still be no reference to the Use Case *UC1.30* describing the consultation of registration information by economic operators
Risk assessment	This change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period, since it concerns a documentation update. The current system behaviour is in accordance with the change that this RFC proposes.
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018[17]

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

[17] DDNEA-P3-264 RFC was first discussed in EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Review results	

DDNEA-P3-265 – Adding a new Rule in IE701 regarding the values of the "RA_PRIMARY Value" data item

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-265
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM165746
Known Error	KE15690
Date at which the Change was proposed	10/10/2016
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA with the updates for FESS as described in FESS-230 RFC. As described in FESS-230 RFC, a new Rule which will apply to <RA PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item in IE701 will be created. The rule will specify the values that should be used in the aforementioned data item when the <RA_PRIMARY CRITERION TYPE CODE> is set as '46' (Type of transport). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], a new rule should be created and applied to the <RA PRIMARY VALUE> data item in IE701. More specifically, • In DDNEA Appendix D, a new Rule shall be added as follows: **R249** If the value of < Primary Criterion Type Code> Data Item is "46= Type of Transport", then an existing <Transport Mode Code> in the list of BC67 -TRANSPORT MODES shall be used • In DDNEA Appendix D, the IE701 message shall be updated as follows: *From:* **IE701 - COMMON REQUEST (C_REQ_SUB)**

------RA PRIMARY CRITERION
Primary Criterion Type Code R n..2 TC06

---------RA PRIMARY VALUE
Value R an..255

To:

IE701 - COMMON REQUEST (C_REQ_SUB)

------RA PRIMARY CRITERION
Primary Criterion Type Code R n..2 TC06

---------RA PRIMARY VALUE
Value R an..255 R249

- In DDNEA Appendix B, in the "Code list Mapping" section the following combination will be added:

FESS Rules	DDNEA Codelists
R249	BC106
R250	**BC67**

- In DDNEA Appendix K a new row, including the following description, shall be added in the table "Rules and Conditions mapping to IE paths":

R249	IE701.MESSAGE - E-AD LIST REQUEST. RA PRIMARY CRITERION. RA PRIMARY VALUE. Value

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (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 DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-230 RFC

Risk assessment	This RFC concerns a change at the semantic level. More specifically, it concerns the addition of R249 on the <RA_PRIMARY VALUE> Data Item. The specific RFC can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since: • Alike any other semantic validation, this rule will be validated only at the sending side of the IE701 message (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side over CD). Hence, the violation of this rule by the sender will not trigger any semantic rejection (IE906) by the receiver *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, do not affect the External Domain, since the IE701 messages are not exchanged over the ED.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-230 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-296~~xxx~~ • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~075

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-230
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

DDNEA-P3-266 – Allowing zero values in specific numerical data items

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-266
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM227793, IM235998
Known Error	KE17142, KE17437
Date at which the Change was proposed	25/09/2017
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** Based on the implementation of DDNEA-P3-211 – "Leading zeroes not allowed for numerical values" for EMCS Phase 3.3., the necessary updates were performed in order to propagate in the .xsds the validation that the leading zeroes shall not be used for numerical values. Therefore, the types.xsd included in Appendix H of DDNEA v1.92 was updated so that leading zeroes are not allowed for the numerical Data Items. However, during EMCS P3.3 CT, it was identified that for some of these numeric data items for which the leading zeros have been prohibited due to the implementation of the aforementioned RFC, zero values shall be allowed. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the pattern of the following simple types should be updated accordingly so that leading zeroes are not allowed but zero values are allowed for the respective numerical Data Items: • ErrorColumnNumber • ErrorLineNumber More specifically, the following updates shall be performed: • Appendix H: types.xsd file ○ The pattern of the aforementioned simple types will be updated as described below: ErrorColumnNumber (IE917): **Existing pattern**: <xs:pattern value="[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,8}" /> **Updated pattern**: <xs:pattern value="[0]|[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,8}" />

	ErrorLineNumber (IE917): **Existing pattern** <xs:pattern value="[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,8}" /> **Updated pattern** <xs:pattern value="[0]|[1-9]{1}[0-9]{0,8}" /> • Appendix I: Directory with Web Service Interface Definitions (WSDLs): ○ The changes applicable to types.xsd of Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (~~None~~Low) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Medium)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then the update in the simple types definition that would allow zero values on specific numerical data items will be missing, leading to messages that will be rejected due to the existing validation that does not allow zeroes in numerical values
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes in types.xsd in order to perform the necessary updates to allow zero values on specific numerical data items. If the sender is aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates while the receiver is not, the respective messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver. As a temporary workaround, it is proposed either the affected MSA to update locally the types.xsd with the new values or the sender MSA in which the zero value occurs to transform via its parser application the value zero to one. In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new .xsds with respect to the aforementioned updates when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC, the messages sent will be validated successfully by the receiver, since the values zero will be also allowed. *The changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect the External Domain, since the IE917 message is exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** - • **Children RFCs:** SEED-145- • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~072

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-267 – Update the description of rule 'Rule248'

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-267
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specifications
Incidents	IM256140
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	14/03/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-239 RFC. More specifically, a discrepancy was identified between the Common Specifications and the corresponding Legislation (684/2009 Annex II) in relation to the description of 'Rule248' which applies in the <Maximum Journey Time> data item in IE709. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE The following update should be performed in the description of 'Rule248' highlighted in bold/italic): *From:*

Rule248	The format of <Maximum Journey Time> is expressed in hours or in days, with the format P99, where: - "P" is a letter in ("H" = Hours or "D" = Day) - "99" is a two digits number If P is "H" then the number is less or equal to 24 if P is "D" then the number is less or equal to the possible values of <Maximum Journey Time> per <Transport Mode Code> as described in the following table: ---------- ---------- Transport ModeCode Maximum Journey Time 0 - Other D45 1 - Sea Transport D45

	2 - Rail transport D35 3 - Road transport D35 4 - Air transport D20 5 - Postal consignment D30 7 - Fixed transport installations D15 8 - Inland waterway transport D35 Note 1: The value “Other” refers to multimode transport (where there is unload and reload of cargo) and covers the cases of Groupage, Export, Split and Change of destination. Note 2: In case of export, the journey time is the estimated duration of the journey up to the exit of the EU customs territory.

To:

Rule248	The format of <Maximum Journey Time> is expressed in hours or in days, with the format P99, where: - "P" is a letter in ("H" = Hours or "D" = Day) - "99" is a two digits number If P is "H" then the number is less or equal to 24 if P is "D" then the number is less or equal to the possible values of <Maximum Journey Time> per <Transport Mode Code> as described in the following table: ---------- ---------- Transport ModeCode Maximum Journey Time 0 - Other D45 1 - Sea Transport D45 2 - Rail transport D35 3 - Road transport D35 4 - Air transport D20 5 - Postal consignment D30 7 - Fixed transport installations D15 8 - Inland waterway transport D35 Note 1: The value “Other” refers to multimode transport (where there is unload and reload of cargo) and covers the cases of ***Group Consigments***, Export, Split and Change of destination. Note 2: In case of export, the journey time is the estimated duration of the journey up to the exit of the ***customs territory of the Union***.

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None)

	• CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with Common Specifications in relation to the description of 'Rule248' as this is defined in FESS Appendix D
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update in relation to the supporting notes added in the description of 'Rule248'
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-239 • **Children RFCs:** - • **Other RFCs:** -

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	

Review results	

DDNEA-P3-268 – Adding clarifications in the Common Specifications about the use of UTC for 'Date' fields

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-268
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM165369
Known Error	KE17067
Date at which the Change was proposed	17/08/2017
Requester	ITSM3 TES

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** It was identified that further clarifications are needed in the Common Specifications in relation to the specification for 'Date' fields in accordance with UTC (Coordinated Universal Time). More specifically, it should be clarified in the Common Specifications that UTC apart from datetime and time fields should also be used for the date fields, as the use of UTC may also affect the date and cause exceptional rejections (e.g.: 1am on 16 June in Greece is 11pm on 15 June in the UK). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following changes shall be performed. • In the main document of DDNEA, the section VIII.I.2.1.1.2 Date/Time Fields shall be updated as follows: **<u>From</u>**: The specification of Date and/or Time fields used in TMS (Section VII and Appendix D) is as per W3C XML Schema specification [S15] except that: • for all times in DateTime and Time fields time zone must be omitted with the local time always implied as being the Coordinated Universal Time (UTC, sometimes called "Greenwich Mean Time"); • all years in DateTime and Date fields are in the Common Era (i.e. AD), hence the negative sign is not permitted.

	Although the reader should refer to the W3C XML Schema specification [S15], the following table (Table 35) indicates the format for each type and their corresponding regular expression. **<u>To:</u>** The specification of Date and/or Time fields used in TMS (Section VII and Appendix D) is as per W3C XML Schema specification [S15] except that: • ***for all times in DateTime, Date and Time fields time zone must be omitted with the local time always implied as being the Coordinated Universal Time (UTC, sometimes called "Greenwich Mean Time");*** • all years in DateTime and Date fields are in the Common Era (i.e. AD), hence the negative sign is not permitted. Note: In the External Domain, it is proposed that the MSAs use their local time, but they should ensure that they perform the required conversions for the values of the DateTime, Date and Time fields between the Common Domain and the External Domain. It shall be highlighted though that this conversion is not always feasible for the Date fields. Although the reader should refer to the W3C XML Schema specification [S15], the following table (Table 35) indicates the format for each type and their corresponding regular expression.
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (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 it may cause ambiguities in the handling of date fields. As defined in common specifications, the UTC time zone shall be used for the messages exchanged over the Common Domain. In the External Domain, it is proposed that the MSAs use their local time, but they should ensure that they perform the required conversions for the values of the DateTime, Date and Time fields between the Common Domain and the External Domain. It shall be highlighted though that this conversion is not always feasible for the Date fields.
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business risks since it concerns a documentation update
Deployment approach	This RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	There is no reference to other RFCs

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	N/A
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB#175 on 20/03/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone Mj

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-269 – Structured information on attachments

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-269
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specification
Incidents	IM259111
Known Error	KE17960
Date at which the Change was proposed	15/01/2018
Requester	DG TAXUD

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3.4 with the updates for FESS by FESS-240 RFC. The FESS RFC concerns the addition of a standard way of referring to electronic attachments and/or accompanying paper documents. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA: • Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE The following new data items will be added in the structure of the IE815 message: **---DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE** ***Document Type C an..4 BC106 C006*** ***Document Reference C an..35 C202*** Document Description C an..350 C006 Document Description_LNG C a2 BC12 C002 Reference of Document C an..350 C006 Reference of Document_LNG C a2 BC12 C002 The following new data items will be added in the structure of the IE801 message: **---DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE** ***Document Type C an..4 BC106 C006*** ***Document Reference C an..35 C202*** Document Description C an..350 C006 Document Description_LNG C a2 BC12 C002 Reference of Document C an..350 C006

Reference of Document_LNG C a2 BC12 C002

Additionally, the new data item <Document Type> will replace the <Supporting Document Type> data item under the <Type of Document> data group in the IE734 message, so that the corresponding values described in FESS-240 (i.e. having 'an..4' format) are allowed to be included in the IE734 message.

- Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE

In the 'Conditions' section, the description of condition 'C006' will be updated as described below:

C006 At least one, among these ***three*** fields:

- <Document Type>

- <Document Description>

- <Reference of Document>

Additionally, in the 'Conditions' section, a new condition 'C202' will be added with the following description:

C202 IF <Document Type> is used

THEN <Document Reference> is 'R'

ELSE <Document Reference> does not apply

- Appendix G: DATA ITEMS

The following new data items will be added (following the alphabetical ordering of the table):

Data item	**Format**
Document Type	an..4
Document Reference	an..35

- Appendix K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING

The following new entries will be added in the list of conditions' mappings.

C006	IE801.MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Type
C006	IE815.MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Type
C202	IE801.MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Reference
C202	IE815.MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Reference

- Appendix E: XML MAPPING

The following new XML-tags will be created:

Data-group or Data-item	Data Type	XML-Tag
MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Type	an..4	DocumentType
MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Reference	an..35	DocumentReference

- Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES

The following two new message elements will be added in the Correlation tables as described below:

A new Message Element that is: <MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Type> will be inserted with:

- The data type set to ‘an..4’ and
- the codelist set to ‘106’
- the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE815 and IE801 messages

A new Message Element that is: <MESSAGE - DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE.Document Refence> will be inserted with:

- The data type set to ‘an..35’ and
- ~~the codelist set to ‘106’~~
- the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE815 and IE801 messages

- Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)

The following insertions will be performed in IE815.xml and IE801.xml documents”

```
<xs:complexType name="DocumentCertificateType">
   <xs:annotation>
     <xs:documentation>
       <doc:description value="DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE" />
     </xs:documentation>
   </xs:annotation>
   <xs:sequence>
<xs:element name="DocumentType" type="ie:DocumentTypeType"
minOccurs="0" />
<xs:element name="DocumentReference"
type="ie:DocumentReferenceType" minOccurs="0" />
  <xs:element name="DocumentDescription"
type="ie:LSDDocumentDescriptionType" minOccurs="0" />
  <xs:element name="ReferenceOfDocument"
type="ie:LSDReferenceOfDocumentType" minOccurs="0" />
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
```

The following simple types will be inserted in the types.xsd:

```
==========================================================
        Document Type
==========================================================
 <xs:simpleType name="DocumentTypeType">
  <xs:annotation>
   <xs:documentation>
    <doc:description value="Document Type" />
   </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
   <xs:maxLength value="4" />
   <xs:pattern value=".{1,4}" />
  </xs:restriction>
 </xs:simpleType>

==========================================================
        Document Reference
==========================================================
 <xs:simpleType name="DocumentReferenceType">
  <xs:annotation>
   <xs:documentation>
    <doc:description value="Document Reference" />
   </xs:documentation>
  </xs:annotation>
  <xs:restriction base="xs:token">
   <xs:maxLength value="35" />
   <xs:pattern value=".{1,35}" />
  </xs:restriction>
 </xs:simpleType>
```

- Appendix I: DIRECTORY WITH WEB SERVICE INTERFACE DEFINITIONS (WSDLS)

The changes applicable to the types.xsd file in Appendix H are also applicable to Appendix I.

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium) • TRP for EMCS Phase (Medium) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (~~None~~Medium) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Medium) FAD (Low):

	• The FAD for the e-AD submission shall be updated as follows: ○ Main form and Continuation page ▪ DOCUMENT Certificate **18.a** Document Type ○ The following Explanatory Note will be added accordingly: ▪ **18.a** Document Type **Provide the Document Type of the attached certificate** ○ No field shall be added for "Document Reference" since the existing "18.c Reference of Document" can be used ○ The numbering of the rest fields should be amended
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-240 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns changes both at the syntactic and the semantic level. **<u>Changes at the syntactic level</u>** Concerning the changes at the syntactic level, this RFC describes the insertion of the "Document Type" and "Document Reference" Data Items, in the <DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE> Data Group of the IE815 and IE801 messages. If not all MSAs deploy this RFC in production at the same time, when the sender is aligned with the new ie815.xsd or ie.801.xsd with respect to the aforementioned changes while the receiver is not, the respective messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver, if: • the "Document Type" and "Document Certificate" Data Items (which are Required) will be included under the optional <DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE> Data Group. It shall be noted that a transformation solution is not suggested in this case (to be applied by the sender), since if the sender is advised (prior sending the IE815/IE801 messages to a receiver that has not deployed the current RFC, to remove the "Document Type" and "Document Certificate" Data Items from the <DOCUMENT CERTIFICATE> Data Group, it will be like the sender is advised not to deploy the present RFC. Hence, unless the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before Mk, are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs so that it behaves as today when communicating with Phase 3.3 MSAs whereas it behaves in alignment with this RFC when communicating with Phase 3.4 MSAs (only), a simultaneous deployment by all MSAs is proposed to be followed for the rollout of the specific RFC, so that the aforementioned syntactic violations do not occur. **<u>Changes at the semantic level</u>** Concerning the changes at semantic level, namely the applicability of a new condition, i.e. C202, on the "Document Reference" Data Item of the IE815 and IE801 messages as well as the updated description of condition C006; they can be deployed in production in a Migration Period, since alike any other semantic validations, they are validated only at the sending side of the IE801 message (in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not

	performing semantic validations at the receiving side over the CD). Hence, if the sender is aligned with these updates while the receiver is not, no semantic rejection (IE906 message) shall be triggered by the receiver. However, considering that the aforementioned changes at semantic level can become applicable only if the relevant changes at syntactic level are performed (e.g. C202 can be validated only if the <DOCUMENT REFERENCE> Data Item is added in the IE815.xsd and IE801.xsd), the migration rollout approaches shall be examined with a focus on the changes at syntactic level, as described above. *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE815 and IE801 messages are also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-240 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~300, SEED-150 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~079

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-240
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is provisionally authorised for approval by the CAB, since it is subject to prior approval of FESS-240**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #176 on 13/04//2017

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-270 – Extending the Manual Closure functionality/ Rev1

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-270
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specification
Incidents	IM166904
Known Error	N/A
Date at which the Change was proposed	15/01/2018
Requester	DG TAXUD

Change Assessment

Change priority	Medium

Change Description	**Problem Statement:**
	
	The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align the DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3.4 with the updates for FESS by RFC FESS-241.
	
	In more details, the MSA of Dispatch application may set the state of the e-AD to “e-AD Manually Closed” and sends the status of the movement along with the sequence number of the last business message sent to the MSA of Destination.
	
	As a result, an excise movement can be manually closed, but this is currently achieved by using a multi-domain technical message. This process violates the nature of these technical messages and is not currently underpinned by the appropriate functionality.
	
	As an improvement in EMCS, the functionality of manual closure could be expanded, allowing movements to be closed manually with the use of the appropriate messages and ensuring the required information is communicated to the involved parties.
	
	Proposed Solution
	
	As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA:
	
	• DDNEA Main Document:
	  ○ Section ‘*III.VI.3 Manual Closing of the Movement*’ of the main document will be moved under ‘sub section IV.I. Follow-up scenarios’ and will be updated as described in **‘Annex 6-1: Manual Closing of the Movement (UC3.06)’**
	
	  ○ All state transition diagrams related to the ‘e-AD Manually Closed’ state will be updated as described in **‘Annex 6-2: Update of Figures 110, 113-117’**

- APPENDIX D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE

Two new messages will be created in order to handle the 'Manual Closure' functionality as described below:

IE880 – MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST (C_MNC_SUB)

MESSAGE	1x	R
---HEADER	1x	R
---SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	9x	O
---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE	999x	O

The data groups of the newly added IE880 message will include the following data items:

MESSAGE

Message sender	R	an..36	
Message recipient	R	an..36	
Date of preparation	R	date	
Time of preparation	R	time	
Message identifier	R	an..44	
Correlation Identifier	D	an..44	TR9121

---HEADER

Administrative Reference Code	R	an21	R030		
Sequence Number	R	n..2	R232		
Manual Closure Request Reason Code	R	n1	BC107		
Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement		D	an..999	C204	
Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement _LNG		D	a2	BC12	C002

---SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Supporting Document Description	D	an..999		C186
Supporting Document Description_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Reference of Supporting Document	D	an..999		C142
Reference of Supporting Document_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Image of Document	D	Base64Binary		C142
Supporting Document Type	D	n..2	BC106	C142

---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE

Body Record Unique Reference	R	n..3		BR024 R058 R232
Indicator of Shortage or Excess	O	a1	TC47	
Observed Shortage or Excess	D	n..15,3		C067 R232
Excise Product Code	R	an4		BC36
Refused Quantity	D	n..15,3		BR025 C095 R232

Complementary Information	O	an..350		
Complementary Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

IE881 – MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE (C_MNC_RES)

MESSAGE	1x	R
---HEADER	1x	R
---SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	9x	O
---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE	999x	O

The data groups of the newly added IE881 message will include the following data items:

MESSAGE

Message sender	R	an..36	
Message recipient	R	an..36	
Date of preparation	R	date	
Time of preparation	R	time	
Message identifier	R	an..44	
Correlation Identifier	D	an..44	TR9121

---HEADER

Administrative Reference Code	R	an21		R030
Sequence Number	R	n..2		
Date of Arrival of Excise Products	O	date		BR023
Global Conclusion of Receipt	O	n..2	TC16	
Complementary Information	O	an..350		
Complementary Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Manual Closure Request Reason Code	R	n1	BC107	
Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement	D	an..999		C204
Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement _LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Manual Closure Request Accepted	R	n1	TC27	
Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code	D	n1	BC108	C205
Manual Closure Rejection Complement	D	an..999		C206
Manual Closure Rejection Complement_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002

---SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Supporting Document Description	D	an..999		C186
Supporting Document Description_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Reference of Supporting Document	D	an..999		C142
Reference of Supporting Document_LNG	D	a2	BC12	C002
Image of Document	D	Base64Binary		C142
Supporting Document Type	D	n..2	BC106	C142

---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE

Body Record Unique Reference	O	n..3		BR024 R058 R232
Indicator of Shortage or Excess	O	a1	TC47	

Observed Shortage or Excess	D	n..15,3	C067 R232
Excise Product Code	O	an4	BC36
Refused Quantity	D	n..15,3	BR025 C095 R232
Complementary Information	O	an..350	
Complementary Information_LNG	D	a2	BC12 C002

Additionally, the structure of the IE734 message will be updated to include the <MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST REASON> and <MANUAL CLOSURE REJECTION REASON> data groups following the standard structure of the IE734 message.

- APPENDIX D: CONDITIONS

The following new conditions will be added as described below:

C204 IF <Manual Closure Request Reason Code> is "Other"
THEN < Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement> is 'R'
ELSE < Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement> is 'O'

C206 IF <Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code> is "Other"
THEN <Manual Closure Rejection Complement> is 'R'
ELSE < Manual Closure Rejection Complement > is 'O'

C205 IF <Manual Closure Request Accepted> is "0"
THEN < Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code > is 'R'
ELSE < Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code > is not applicable

- APPENDIX D: RULES

The existing rule 'TR9121' will be updated as described below:

TR9121 The field is Required for:
- response messages (IE821, IE905, ***IE881*** and IE934);
- refusal messages (IE702, IE704, IE714, IE906, and IE917); and
- the resubmitted lost/delayed messages as a result of status synchronisation request (IE801, IE803, IE807, IE810, IE813, IE818, IE819, IE829, IE839, IE881, IE905).

It does not apply for requests and one-way messages.

~~(*) An IE905 message can be a response message or a one way message (manual closure). In the former case, the field is Required. In the latter case, the field does not apply. However, the field is Required when an IE905 for manual closure is resubmitted as a result of status synchronisation request~~.

- APPENDIX B: CODELISTS

In the 'TC64-Requested Message Type' codelist, the existing 'STATUS RESPONSE' entry (highlighted) will be deleted and new entries related to the

Manual Closure (i.e. the Manual Closure Response message) will be added as shown below:

Code	Description	Remarks
IE801	E-AD	
IE803	NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD	
IE807	INTERRUPTION OF MOVEMENT	
IE810	CANCELLATION OF AN E-AD	
IE813	CHANGE OF DESTINATION	
IE818	ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT	
IE819	ALERT OR REJECTION OF AN E-AD	
IE829	NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT	
IE839	REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT	
~~***IE905***~~	~~***STATUS RESPONSE***~~	~~***The IE905 should be included only when the e-AD is manually closed.***~~
IE880	***MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST***	
IE881	***MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE***	
None	NONE	

In the 'TC60-Technical Message Type' codelist, the existing 'STATUS RESPONSE' entry (highlighted) will be deleted and new entries related to the Manual Closure (i.e. the Manual Closure Response message) will be added as shown below:

Code	Description	Remarks
IE717	CONTROL REPORT	
IE801	E-AD	
IE802	REMINDER MESSAGE FOR EXCISE MOVEMENT	
IE803	NOTIFICATION OF DIVERTED E-AD	
IE807	INTERRUPTION OF MOVEMENT	
IE810	CANCELLATION OF EAD	
IE813	CHANGE OF DESTINATION	
IE818	ACCEPTED OR (PARTIALLY) REFUSED REPORT OF RECEIPT/EXPORT	
IE819	ALERT OR REJECTION OF AN E-AD	
IE829	NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTED EXPORT	

IE837	EXPLANATION ON DELAY FOR DELIVERY	
IE839	REJECTION OF E-AD FOR EXPORT	
IE840	EVENT REPORT	
IE871	EXPLANATION ON REASON FOR SHORTAGE	
IE880	MANUAL CLOSURE REQUEST	
IE881	MANUAL CLOSURE RESPONSE	
~~IE905~~	~~STATUS RESPONSE~~	~~The IE905 should be included only when reporting manual closure of a movement (i.e., when X07: e-AD Manually Closed).~~

In section 'List of Available Business Codelists', two new entries will be added as shown below:

Number	Title	Format
BC107	Manual Closure Request Reasons	n1
BC108	Manual Closure Rejection Reason Codes	n1

In section 'Codelist Mapping', two new entries will be added as shown below:

FESS Rules	DDNEA Codelists
Rule252	BC107
Rule253	BC108

- APPENDIX E: XML MAPPING

The following new XML-tags will be created:

Data-group or Data-item	Data Type	XML-Tag
MESSAGE – HEADER.Manual Closure Request Reason Code	n1	ManualClosureRequestReasonCode
MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement	an..350	ManualClosureRequestReasonCodeComplement
MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement_LNG	a2	ManualClosureRequestReasonCodeComplementLng
MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Accepted	n1	ManualClosureRequestAccepted
MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code	n1	ManualClosureRejectionReasonCode

MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Complement	an.350	ManualClosureRejectionComplement
MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Complement_LNG	a2	ManualClosureRejectionComplementLng
MESSAGE – (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE		ManualClosure
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference	n..3	BodyRecordUniqueReference
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Indicator of Shortage or Excess	a1	IndicatorOfShortageOrExcess
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Observed Shortage or Excess	n..15,3	ObservedShortage
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.ExciseProductCode	an4	ExciseProductCode
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused Quantity	n..15,3	RefusedQuantity
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Complementary Information	an..350	ComplementaryInformation
MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Complementary Information	a2	ComplementaryInformationLng
MESSAGE – HEADER. Global Conclusion of Receipt	n..2	GlobalConclusionOfReceipt
MESSAGE – HEADER. Date of Arrival of Excise Products	date	DateOfArrivalOfExciseProducts

- Appendix F: DATA GROUPS AND TRANSACTION HIERARCHY

The following new data group will be added in the ‘Data Groups’ table entry:

Data Group	Identifier
---(BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE	MNC

- Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES

The following entries will be added in the Correlation tables as described below:

- Two new columns will be created for IE880 and IE881 messages
- The following list of existing message elements will be updated by setting the optionality to ‘R’ for the IE880 and IE881 messages
  - MESSAGE
  - MESSAGE.Message sender

- MESSAGE.Message recipient
- MESSAGE.Date of preparation
- MESSAGE.Time of preparation
- MESSAGE.Message Identifier
- MESSAGE – HEADER
- MESSAGE – HEADER. Administrative Reference Code
- MESSAGE – HEADER. Sequence Number

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Global Conclusion of Receipt’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n..2’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Date of Arrival of Excise Products’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘date’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Reason Code’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n1’
  - the codelist set to ‘107’
  - the optionality set to ‘Required’ (i.e. ‘R’) for the IE880 and the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘an..~~350~~’999’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE880 and the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement_LNG’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘a2’
  - the codelist set to ‘12’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE880 and the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Request Accepted’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n1’
  - the codelist set to ‘27’
  - the optionality set to ‘Required’ (i.e. ‘R’) for the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n1’
  - the codelist set to ‘108’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Complement’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘an..~~350~~999’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE881 message

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE – HEADER. Manual Closure Rejection Complement_LNG’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘a2’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE881 message

- The following list of existing message elements will be updated by setting the optionality to ‘D’ for the IE880 and IE881 messages
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description_LNG
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document_LNG
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Image of Document
  - MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type

- The existing message element ‘MESSAGE.Correlation Identifier’ will be updated by setting the optionality to ‘D’ for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY’ will be inserted with:
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Body Record Unique Reference’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n..3’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY. Indicator of Shortage or Excess’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘a1’
  - the codelist set to ‘47’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Observed Shortage or Excess’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n..15,3’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY. Excise Product Code’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘an4’
  - the codelist set to ‘36’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Refused Quantity’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘n..15,3’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Complementary Information’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘an..350’
  - the optionality set to ‘Optional’ (i.e. ‘O’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- A new message element that is ‘MESSAGE - (MANUAL CLOSURE) BODY.Complementary Information_LNG’ will be inserted with:
  - the data type set to ‘a2’
  - the codelist set to ‘12’
  - the optionality set to ‘Dependent’ (i.e. ‘D’) for the IE880 and IE881 messages

- APPENDIX A2: MESSAGES PER BUSINESS DOMAIN

Two new entries will be added in the ‘Follow-Up and Collaboration’ table as described in the attached **‘Annex 6-3: In-Scope Messages Exchanged from/to NDEA’**.

- APPENDIX A1: FULL MESSAGE SCOPE

The changes described for ‘Appendix A2’ are also applicable to ‘Appendix A1’.

- APPENDIX K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING

The following entries will be added in the ‘Rules and Conditions mapping to IE paths’ table following the table’s existing sorting of rows:

C/R	IE path
TR9121	IE880.MESSAGE. Correlation Identifier
TR9121	IE881.MESSAGE. Correlation Identifier
R030	IE880.MESSAGE - HEADER.Administrative Reference Code
R030	IE881.MESSAGE - HEADER.Administrative Reference Code

R232	IE880.MESSAGE - HEADER.Sequence Number
R232	IE881.MESSAGE - HEADER.Sequence Number
C186	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description
C186	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description
C002	IE880.MESSAGE - HEADER.Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement LNG
C002	IE881.MESSAGE - HEADER.Manual Closure Rejection Complement LNG
C204	IE880.MESSAGE - HEADER.Manual Closure Request Reason Code Complement
C205	IE881.MESSAGE - HEADER.Manual Closure Rejection Reason Code
C206	IE881.MESSAGE - HEADER.Manual Closure Rejection Complement
C002	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description_LNG
C002	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Description_LNG
C142	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document
C142	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document
C002	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document_LNG
C002	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Reference of Supporting Document_LNG
C142	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type
C142	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Supporting Document Type
C142	IE880.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Image of Document
C142	IE881.MESSAGE - SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.Image of Document
R058	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference
R058	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference
R232	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference
R232	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Body Record Unique Reference

R232	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Observed Shortage or Excess
R232	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Observed Shortage or Excess
C067	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Observed Shortage or Excess
C067	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Observed Shortage or Excess
C095	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused Quantity
C095	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused Quantity
R232	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused Quantity
R232	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Refused Quantity
C002	IE880.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Complementary Information_LNG
C002	IE881.MESSAGE - (BODY) MANUAL CLOSURE.Complementary Information_LNG

- APPENDIX H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)

The corresponding .xsd files will generated (from CSE) based on the message structure defined in the [Proposed Solution] section.

Impact assessment

Specification Documents:

- DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Medium)
- CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (High)
- TRP for EMCS Phase (High)

CDEAs:

- Central SEED v1 application (~~None~~Low)
- CTA (None)
- CS/MISE (High)

NEAs:

- Impact on NEAs (Medium)

Effect of not implementing the Change

If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-241 RFC

Risk assessment

This RFC concerns changes both at the semantic and syntactic level. More specifically, new messages (IE880 and IE881) are introduced to support the Manual Closure functionality, along with the corresponding rules and conditions. Moreover, the corresponding state transition diagrams are also impacted, since the transition to the ‘e-AD Manually Closed’ state will occur through the submission of the newly introduced IE881 message. Hence:

	• If the MSAs that opt to deploy this RFC in production before M_k are capable of differentiating the behaviour of their NEAs, so that they behave as today when communicating with P3.3 MSAs whereas they behave in alignment with this RFC when communicating with P3.4 MSAs (only), this RFC can be deployed in a Migration Period without business continuity risks. This is considered an operational guideline, in order to avoid rejections until this RFC is implemented by all MSAs and it is applicable to the use of the newly introduced messages as well as the corresponding state transitions to the 'e-AD Manually Closed' state • Otherwise, a Simultaneous Deployment at M_k would be more appropriate than a Migration Period deployment for the rollout of the specific RFC due to the entailed business continuity risks (i.e. in order to avoid rejections of the newly added messages (i.e. from MSAs that will not have deployed this RFC in production) and any possible de-synchronisation between the MSA of Dispatch and the MSA of Destination in relation to the 'e-AD Manually Closed' state) *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE881 message is also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-241 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~302, CSMISE-~~xxx~~162, SEED-149 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~081

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-241
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is provisionally authorised for approval by the CAB, since it is subject to prior approval of FESS-241**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04//2018[18]

[18] DDNEA-P3-270 RFC was first discussed in EMCS CAB#176 on 13/04/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-271 – Update the optionality of (CONSIGNEE) TRADER data group in IE821 message

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-271
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Incompliance with Specification
Incidents	IM260359
Known Error	KE17969
Date at which the Change was proposed	13/04/2018
Requester	MSA-DE

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-243 RFC. More specifically, it was identified that the optionality of the data group <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> in IE821 needs to be updated so that IE821 messages can be send as a response to a query for an e-AD with unknown destination or submitted for local clearance. Moreover, the same changes shall be applied to the IE819 message for consistency reasons. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: TECHNICAL MESSAGE STRUCTURE The structure of the IE821 message will be updated as follows: ***<u>From</u>***: MESSAGE 1x R ---HEADER 1x R ---E-AD LIST ITEM 99x O ------EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD 1x R ------(CONSIGNOR) TRADER 1x R ------(PLACE OF DISPATCH) TRADER 1x D C012

------(DISPATCH) IMPORT OFFICE	1x	D	C012
------(CONSIGNEE) TRADER	1x	R	
------(DELIVERY PLACE) TRADER	1x	D	C013
------(DELIVERY PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE	1x	D	C013
------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY	9x	R	
------(FIRST TRANSPORTER) TRADER	1x	O	
------(TRANSPORT ARRANGER) TRADER	1x	D	C102

To:

MESSAGE	1x	R	
---HEADER	1x	R	
---E-AD LIST ITEM	99x	O	
------EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD	1x	R	
------(CONSIGNOR) TRADER	1x	R	
------(PLACE OF DISPATCH) TRADER	1x	D	C012
------(DISPATCH) IMPORT OFFICE	1x	D	C012
------(CONSIGNEE) TRADER	***1x***	***D***	***C116***
------(DELIVERY PLACE) TRADER	1x	D	C013
------(DELIVERY PLACE) CUSTOMS OFFICE	1x	D	C013
------EXCISE PRODUCTS CATEGORY	9x	R	
------(FIRST TRANSPORTER) TRADER	1x	O	
------(TRANSPORT ARRANGER) TRADER	1x	D	C102

The structure of the IE819 message will be updated as follows:

From:

MESSAGE	1x	R
---HEADER	1x	R
---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER	1x	R

---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD	1x	R	
---(DESTINATION) OFFICE	1x	R	
---ALERT OR REJECTION	1x	R	
---ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD REASON	9x	D	C032

To:

MESSAGE	1x	R	
---HEADER	1x	R	
---(CONSIGNEE) TRADER	**1x**	**D**	**C116**
---EXCISE MOVEMENT E-AD	1x	R	
---(DESTINATION) OFFICE	1x	R	
---ALERT OR REJECTION	1x	R	
---ALERT OR REJECTION OF E-AD REASON	9x	D	C032

- Appendix C: EMCS CORRELATION TABLES

The existing Message Element that is: <MESSAGE - E-AD LIST ITEM - (CONSIGNEE) TRADER> will be updated with~~:~~ the optionality set to 'Dependent' (i.e. 'D') for the IE821 message.

The existing Message Element that is: <MESSAGE - (CONSIGNEE) TRADER> will be updated with the optionality set to 'Dependent' (i.e. 'D') for the IE819 message.~~the optionality set to 'Dependent' (i.e. 'D') for the IE819 message~~

- Appendix K: RULES AND CONDITIONS MAPPING

The following entries for condition 'C116' will be added as follows:

C/R	IE path
C116	IE821.MESSAGE - E-AD LIST ITEM - (CONSIGNEE) TRADER
C116	IE819.MESSAGE - (CONSIGNEE) TRADER

- Appendix H: DIRECTORY WITH XML SCHEMAS (XSDS)

The ie821.xsd file will be updated as shown below (bold/italics):

```
<xs:complexType name="EadListItemType">
  <xs:annotation>
```

```
      <xs:documentation>
        <doc:description value="E-AD LIST ITEM" />
      </xs:documentation>
    </xs:annotation>
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="DateOfDispatch" type="emcs:DateType" />
      <xs:element name="ExciseMovementEad"
type="ie:ExciseMovementEadType" />
      <xs:element name="ConsignorTrader" type="ie:ConsignorTraderType"
/>
      <xs:element name="PlaceOfDispatchTrader"
type="ie:PlaceOfDispatchTraderType" minOccurs="0" />
      <xs:element name="DispatchImportOffice"
type="ie:DispatchImportOfficeType" minOccurs="0" />
      <xs:element name="ConsigneeTrader"
type="ie:ConsigneeTraderType" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xs:element name="DeliveryPlaceTrader"
type="ie:DeliveryPlaceTraderType" minOccurs="0" />
      <xs:element name="DeliveryPlaceCustomsOffice"
type="ie:DeliveryPlaceCustomsOfficeType" minOccurs="0" />
      <xs:element name="ExciseProductsCategory"
type="ie:ExciseProductsCategoryType" maxOccurs="9" />
      <xs:element name="FirstTransporterTrader"
type="ie:FirstTransporterTraderType" minOccurs="0" />
      <xs:element name="TransportArrangerTrader"
type="ie:TransportArrangerTraderType" minOccurs="0" />
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
```

The ie819.xsd file will be updated as shown below (bold/italics):

```
<xs:complexType name="AlertOrRejectionOfEADType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="Attributes" type="ie:AttributesType" />
      <xs:element name="ConsigneeTrader"
type="ie:ConsigneeTraderType" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xs:element name="ExciseMovementEad"
type="ie:ExciseMovementEadType" />
      <xs:element name="DestinationOffice" type="ie:DestinationOfficeType"
/>
      <xs:element name="AlertOrRejection" type="ie:AlertOrRejectionType"
/>
      <xs:element name="AlertOrRejectionOfEadReason"
type="ie:AlertOrRejectionOfEadReasonType" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="9" />
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
```

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • DDNEA for EMCS Phase 3 (Low)

	• CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (Low) • TRP for EMCS Phase (Low) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (Low)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will be in misalignment with the changes proposed for FESS by FESS-243 RFC
Risk assessment	This RFC concerns a change in the ie821.xsd in order to update the optionality of the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group to be dependent on 'C116' It is considered that the aforementioned change has no impact on business continuity and can therefore be deployed in a Migration Period no business continuity risks will be encountered. More specifically: • If the sender is aligned with the new ie821.xsd or ie819.xsd with respect to the aforementioned changes while the receiver is not, in case the sent IE821 or IE819 messages don't include the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group based on 'C116', then such messages will not be validated successfully by the receiver, since the receiver would expect the previously defined as required <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group. To avoid such rejections, as a transformation solution, it is proposed that the sending application adds the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group with dummy values (e.g. 'unknown'). It is considered that the proposed bypass solution does not entail any business continuity risk. • In the same way, if the sender is not aligned with the new ie821.xsd or ie819.xsd with respect to the aforementioned changes when communicating with MSAs that have already deployed this RFC in production, any sent messages will be validated successfully by the receiver since they will include the <(CONSIGNEE) TRADER> data group and the receiver is not expected to perform any semantic checks in alignment with the general EMCS principle of not performing semantic validations at the receiving side. *It should be noted that the changes introduced by the specific RFC, affect also the External Domain, since the IE819 message is also exchanged over the ED. Though the implementation of this part of the RFC shall be examined at national level by the MSAs.*
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-243 • **Children RFCs:** CTP-P3-~~xxx~~298 • **Other RFCs:** TRP-P3-~~xxx~~077

Indicative changes to legislation

Draft recital for information	Please refer to FESS-243
Location of change in Legislation	N/A

Approval Process

CAB recommendation	• **Category of the Change: Review** • **Approval process:** ○ **The Change is authorised for approval by the CAB**
ECWP position	N/A
Authorisation date and process	EMCS CAB #177 on 26/04/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-273 – Update of Rule245 in order to be aligned with TC105

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-273
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM223691
Known Error	KE17831
Date at which the Change was proposed	01/09/2017
Requester	MSA-FR

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-219 RFC. More specifically, the codelist mapping included in Appendix B of DDNEA will need to be updated to indicate the 'Rule245' of FESS is mapped to 'TC105'. **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix B: Codelist Mapping The following record should be inserted in the codelist mapping section (highlighted in bold/italic):

FESS Rules	DDNEA Codelists
R231	TC10
R242	BC106
R245	***TC105***
R249	BC106

Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None)

	NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with FESS in relation to the mapping of Rule245 with TC105.
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update in relation to the mapping of Rule245 with TC105
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-219 • **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	Written procedure via e-mail on 03/08/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

DDNEA-P3-274 – Update of Rule026

RFC Information

RFC number	DDNEA-P3-274
RFC status	~~Accepted~~Implemented
Reason for Change	Specification Defect
Incidents	IM249175
Known Error	KE17833
Date at which the Change was proposed	31/01/2018
Requester	EMCS CPT

Change Assessment

Change priority	Low
Change Description	**Problem Statement:** The current RFC proposes the necessary updates in order to align DDNEA with the updates introduced in FESS by FESS-223 RFC. More specifically, the description of R026 in DDNEA Appendix D needs to be aligned with the corresponding description of Rule026 in FESS Appendix D (i.e. adding the clarification of "Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC" instead of "Article 22 of the Directive"). **Proposed Solution** As per the analysis provided in the [Problem Statement], the following updates shall be performed in DDNEA (highlighted in bold/italics): • Appendix D: Rules The description of 'R026' shall be updated as shown below (highlighted in bold/italic):

	R026 The possible values of <Operator Role Code> are: - 1 = Allowed to practise direct delivery - 2 = Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 of Directive 2008/118/EC The couplings <Operator Type / Operator Role Code> are as follows: A / B C D E ---------- Allowed to practise direct delivery X X ---------- Allowed to leave empty the destination fields according to Article 22 ***of Directive 2008/118/EC*** X X ---------- Where: A: OPERATOR TYPE B: OPERATOR ROLE C: AUTHORISED WAREHOUSE KEEPER D: REGISTERED CONSIGNEE E: REGISTERED CONSIGNOR
Impact assessment	Specification Documents: • CTP for EMCS Phase 3 (None) • TRP for EMCS Phase (None) CDEAs: • Central SEED v1 application (None) • CTA (None) • CS/MISE (None) NEAs: • Impact on NEAs (None)
Effect of not implementing the Change	If the proposed change is not implemented, then DDNEA will not be aligned with FESS in relation to the description of Rule026
Risk assessment	This RFC entails no business continuity risks, since it concerns a documentation update in relation to the description of R026
Deployment approach	The RFC can be deployed in a **Migration Period** with no business continuity risks
Reference to other RFCs	• **Parent RFCs:** FESS-223 • **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	Written procedure via e-mail on 03/08/2018

Release information

Release number	v2.00
Release date	11/2018
Deadline for alignment in Production	After Milestone M_j

Change Review

Review date	
Review results	

6 ANNEX – FESS RFCS

6.1 ANNEX 1: FESS-240 – STRUCTURED INFORMATION ON ATTACHMENTS

Annex 1_FESS-240.docx

6.2 ANNEX 2: FESS-241 – EXTENDING THE MANUAL CLOSURE FUNCTIONALITY

ANNEX 2-1: MANUAL CLOSURE OF A MOVEMENT (UC3.06)

Annex 1_FESS-241.docx

ANNEX 2-2: E-AD: MANUAL CLOSURE OF A MOVEMENT

Annex 2_FESS-241.docx

7 ANNEX – DDNEA RFCS

7.1 ANNEX 1: DDNEA-P3-228 – PROPAGATE TO THE .XSDS THE VALIDATION THAT THE VALUE OF SEVERAL DATA ITEMS MUST BE GREATER THAN ZERO

Annex-DDNEA-P3-228.doc

7.2 ANNEX 2: DDNEA-P3-244 – UPDATE REGARDING THE 'CORRELID' STRUCTURE IN CASES WHERE ARC AND SEQUENCE NUMBER ARE MISSING

Annex 1 DDNEA-P3-244.doc

7.3 ANNEX 3: DDNEA-P3-248 – UPDATES RELATED TO THE DISSEMINATION OF REGISTRATION DATA

Annex 1_DDNEA-P3-248.doc

7.4 ANNEX 4: DDNEA-P3-258 – CLARIFICATIONS ABOUT ARCHIVING OF REJECTED E-ADS/REV1

Annex 1_DDNEA-P3-258.doc

7.5 ANNEX 5: DDNEA-P3-264 – CONSULTATION OF REGISTRATION INFORMATION BY ECONOMIC OPERATORS

Annex 1_DDNEA-P3-264.do

7.6 ANNEX 6: DDNEA-P3-270 – MANUAL CLOSURE OF MOVEMENTS

ANNEX 6-1: MANUAL CLOSING OF THE MOVEMENT (UC3.06)

Annex 1_DDNEA-P3-270.do

ANNEX 6-2: UPDATE OF FIGURES 110, 113-117

Annex 2_DDNEA-P3-270.do

ANNEX 6-3: IN-SCOPE MESSAGES EXCHANGED FROM/TO NDEA

Annex 3_DDNEA-P3-270.do