# Impact Analysis Report / RFC-Proposal

**Section 1: Meta-data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFC ID** | **RFC\_NCTS\_0120** (RTC-59118) |
| **Related Incident ID** | IM474892 |
| **RFC Initiator / Organization** | NA-LU |
| **CI** | NCTS-P5 (DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 Main Document) |
| **Type of Change** | **Standard** **Emergency** |
| **Nature of Change** | Justification for Evolutive   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **RFC Source** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Legal & Policy Change**  **Organisational Changes** | **Business Change**  **IT Change** | |
| **Review by Business User recommended?** | **Yes No** |

***Change Summary***

|  |
| --- |
| **DDNTA Main Document 5.14.1-v1.00: Handling AXR request (IE164) when security = 0 or 1 in the transit declaration** |
| When the ‘Security indicator’ is not EXS in the transit declaration data (i.e. other than ‘2’ or ‘3)’, the Office of Departure needs to reply to an incoming IE164 with a **negative IE165**. A **new code** is added in the **CL224** to be used as an appropriate ‘Request rejection reason code’ in the IE165 (change in **CS/RD2** CONF & PROD).  Additionally, the DDNTA Main Document will be updated to provide a clarification for this case. |

**Section 2: Problem statement**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In the structure of the IE165, we have the data element “Request rejection reason code”:      The values of the CL224 are:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 1 | MRN unknown | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 2 | Declaration invalidated | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 3 | No diversion: binding itinerary and no incident notified | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 5 | Movement arrived at Office of Destination | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 10 | Customs Office does not have the role 'EXIT' |   Indeed, in case of diversion, with no binding itinerary on the declaration, it is possible for the Office of Departure to receive an AXR request message (CD164C) for a movement without EXS data. In this case, it is recommended that the Office of Departure shall reply back with a negative CD165C message. As a result, it is proposed to introduce a new code under CL224 for this specific case.  Additionally, it is proposed that the DDNTA Main Document is updated to insert a clarification that the IE164 is replied back with a **negative IE165** when ‘Security’ = ‘0’ or ‘1’. |

**Section 3: Description of proposed solution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **In CS/RD2, the CL224 will be enhanced with a new value as follows:**  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 1 | MRN unknown | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 2 | Declaration invalidated | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 3 | No diversion: binding itinerary and no incident notified | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 5 | Movement arrived at Office of Destination | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | 10 | Customs Office does not have the role 'EXIT' | | CL224 | AxrRejectionReason | ~~20~~ 11 | No EXS data included in the transit declaration |   The following update will be performed into the **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00** **(Main Document)** (changes are depicted in red colour):  **The paragraph “*III.II.3.2.4 Diversion at Office of Exit for Transit*” will be updated as follows:**  Diversion at the Office of Exit for Transit takes place when the consignment arrives at a non-declared Office of Exit for Transit (referred to as actual Office of Exit for Transit).  The Office of Departure will always need to accept or reject the diversion from a declared Office of Exit for Transit. The actual Office of Exit for Transit will try to locate the movement information, and if unknown, it will request it from the Office of Departure. If a rejection reason code is communicated back, this means that the diversion is not accepted by the Office of Departure.  If the movement information is communicated without a rejection reason code, the actual Office of Exit for Transit performs risk analysis and based on this, it decides whether the movement can leave the security area.  The information related to the incidents that occurred during the journey of the movement are sent to the Risk Analysis Systems for risk evaluation. Actually, this incident information are contained in the ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record Response’ (C\_AXR\_RSP) IE165 message.  In the event that an ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record Request’ C\_AXR\_REQ (IE164) message is received and the data element ‘Security’ in the transit declaration is not equal to ‘2’ or ‘3’ (i.e. no EXS data are present in the declaration data), the Office of Departure will reply back with a negative ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record Response’ (C\_AXR\_RSP) IE165 message by using rejection reason code ’~~20~~ 11’.  **A new note in “*III.II.3.2.4 Diversion at Office of Exit for Transit*” and in “III.II.7 Export Followed by Transit (EFT)” will be added as follows:**  *NOTE: In case of Export followed by Transit, if the export declaration includes EXS data, but the transit declaration does not include the EXS data (i.e. Transit Operation.Security = ‘0’ or ‘1’), then the ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record’ C\_AXR\_SND (IE160) message shall not be sent by the Office of Departure. In case an ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record Request’ C\_AXR\_REQ (IE164) message is received by the Office of Departure, it will be responded with a negative ‘Anticipated Exit for Transit Record Response’ (C\_AXR\_RSP) IE165 message by using rejection reason code ’~~20~~ 11- No EXS data included in the transit declaration’. The carrier will be invited to lodge an EXS at the Office of Exit for Transit, even if the EXS was lodged as part of the Export declaration(s). Nevertheless, if the Office of Exit for Transit is located in the country of the Office of Departure, there is no need for separate EXS (the information HOUSE CONSIGNMENT.Security indicator from export declaration = ‘2-EXS’ shall be re-used, if it's the case for all the House Consignments), taking into account that all the EXS data is available in the Office of Exit (actual) that is located in the country of Office of Exit for Transit.*  **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**  **No impact on External Domain.**  This RFC-Proposal is considered as a ***minor* improvement** of the DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Main Document). **The logic is the provision of a negative IE165 in case no EXS data exists in the transit declaration (i.e. Security is not equal to ‘2’ or ‘3)’**.  The **Functional Specifications (FSS/BPM)-v5.30 also needs to be updated**, to reflect precisely the above explanation.  While this RFC-Proposal requires adaptation of the NTAs operating in NCTS-P5 or under NCTS-P5 Conformance Testing), it is considered that the change proposed has very minor impact on business continuity and **a limited impact** on the Common Domain. Consequently, it can be deployed in a **flexible way**.  **Proposed** date of applicability in Operations (T-Ops): At the latest by 1.12.20**23**,ideally when starting NCTS-P5 operations (**flexible**)  **Proposed** date of applicability in CT (T-CT): July 2022  **Expected** date of approval by ECCG (T-CAB): January 2022  **Impact on transition P4-P5**: None  **Consequence of not approving the RFC-Proposal**: In case of reception of an IE164 for a transit declaration that does not have EXS data, then the Office of Departure will have to send a negative IE165 with an rejection reason code that is not very precise.  **Risk of not implementing the change**: Very low.  Impacted IEs:   * None   Impacted CI Artefacts:   * **Functional Specifications (FSS/BPM)-v5.30: Yes;** * **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Main Document): Yes;** * **NCTS\_CTP-5.7.0-v1.00: Yes;** * **NCTS\_TRP-5.7.5-v1.00: Yes;** * UCC IA/DA Annex B: No; * DDCOM-20.3.0-v1.00: No; * DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix Q2\_R\_C, PDFs): No; * CSE-v51.6.0: No; * DMP Package-5.6.0 SfA-v1.00: No (incl. update of file Rules and Conditions\_v0.43): No; * CTS-5.6.1-v1.00: No; * ACS - v5.5.0 & ACS-Annex-NCTS: 5.5.0: No; * ieCA 1.0.1.0: No; * CRP-5.5.0-v1.00: No; * CS/MIS2\_DATA: No; * CS/RD2\_DATA: No; * AES-P1 and NCTS-P5 Long-Lived “Legacy” (L3) Movements Study v1.40: No. |

**Impact on CI artefacts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00, Main Document** | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **As described in Section 3 - Proposed Solution** | |
| **Functional Specifications – v5.30 (FSS/BPM)** | **Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High**  **Short description**   |  | | --- | | **The textual descriptions described in the Section 3 will be also transposed to the text of the *FSS-UCC NCTS Section I-BUSINESS PROCESS THREADS FOR CORE BUSINESS* and of the BPM.** | |
| **NCTS\_CTP-5.7.0-v1.00** | **Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High**  **Short description**   |  | | --- | | **An existing CTP scenario will be adapted, to test the case of negative IE165, using the code ‘20’ of CL224** | |
| **NCTS\_TRP-5.7.5-v1.00** | **Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High**  **Short description**   |  | | --- | | **Update of test data, and possibly change in an existing business scenario (post TP).** | |

**Estimated impact on National Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **Low impact** (update of the NTA for the new value of the CL224)**.** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document History** | | | |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | ***Comment*** |
| v0.10 | Draft by CUSTDEV3 | 14/12/2021 |  |
| v0.11 | SfR to NPMs | 14/12/2021 |  |
| v1.00 | SfA to NPMs | 25/02/2022 | *Updates in blue based on APO* |
| v1.10 | SfA-NPM + IMP | 10/04/2022 | *With implementation details in purple, taking into account the RFC\_NCTS\_0182\_CSRD2 that defines the code ‘11’ and not ‘20’.* |