# Impact Analysis Report / RFC-Proposal

**Section 1: Meta-data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFC ID** | **RFC\_NCTS-P6\_0286** (JIRA: UCCNCTSP6-160) |
| **Related Incident ID** | **IM555962** |
| **RFC Initiator / Organization** | **NA-DE** |
| **CI** | **NCTS-P6 (DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00 – CSE-v60.4.4)** |
| **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***

|  |
| --- |
| **NCTS-P6 (DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00 – CSE-v60.4.4):** **Correction of the wording of Guideline G0139.** |
| In DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00, the Guideline **G0139** is included in **CC017D** (DEPARTURE CONTROL RESULTS), CD018D (DESTINATION CONTROL RESULTS) and **CC044D** (UNLOADING REMARKS) but the wording refers **ONLY** to customs officers and **NOT** to authorized consignees. The corrected wording will cover both. |

**Section 2: Problem statement**

|  |
| --- |
| In **DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.0.0** (based on CSE-v60.4.4) [*like in NCTS-P5*], the wording of G0139 is not 100% correct:  This guideline G0139 is not only applied in the IE017 & IE018 (the reference to the customs officer is correct) but **also in the IE044** (UNLOADING REMARKS). Hence, the wording of G0139 should be improved to NOT EXCLUDE the Authorized Consignee who may also identify the circumstance that two or more goods items are packed together. |

**Section 3: Description of proposed solution**

|  |
| --- |
| **DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.0.0 (incl. Appendix Q2)** and **CSE-v60.4.4**, shall be updated as follows (addition of **text highlighted in yellow** – removal of ~~text with strikethrough~~):  The updated wording of the guideline G0139 will be the following:  **G0139**  **Technical Description:**  N/A  **Functional Description:**  The ‘0’ (zero) value should only be used in cases where ~~the customs officer identifies~~ **it has been identified** that two or more goods items are packaged together but this was not declared correctly at first instance.  This G0139 remains applied in messages CC017**C**, CD018**C**, CC044**C** (after the change of suffix from ‘D’ to ‘C’ for those messages).  **IMPACT ASSESSMENT:**  This RFC-Proposal has no business continuity impact. It could be considered as a documentaryfix, with potential (limited) impact on the national documentation of the national processes.    **Proposed** date of applicability in Operations (**T-Ops**):   Before the country effectively starts its NCTS-P6 operations (at earliest 01.02.2025, at latest 01.09.2025)  **Proposed** date of applicability in CT (**T-CT**):                     Start of CT campaign (provisionally on 01.12.2024)  **Expected** date of approval by ECCG (**T-CAB**):                  Together with DDNTA-6.4.0  **Risk in case of non-implementation:**  None  **Impacted messages:**   * N/A   **Impacted Rules, Conditions & BRTs etc.:**   * G0139   **Impacted Ci Artefacts:**   * DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00 (Main Document): Νο. * Functional Specifications NCTS-P6 (FSS/BPM): 7.10.0: No. * **CSE-v60.4.4: Yes**. * **DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00 (Appendices D, P, Q2):** **Yes.** * NCTS-P6 DMP 6.3-v1.00 Package: No. * CTP-6.2.0-v1.00: No. * TRP-6.2.0-v1.01: No. * DDCOM-21-3.0-v1.00: No. * ieCA/TED 2.0.0.0: No. * ICS2-CR-CTS-1.1.0-v1.01: No. * ICS2-CR-CRP-1.1.0-v1.00: No. * CS/MIS2\_DATA: No. * CS/RD2\_DATA: No.   UCC IA/DA Annex B: No. |

**Impact on CI artefacts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CSE-v60.4.4** | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **Guideline G0139 will be updated as described in section 3.** | |
| **DDNTA-6.3.0-v1.00 (Appendices)** | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **Appendices P, Q2 and D will be updated as described in section 3.** | |

**Estimated impact on National Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| None Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | Opt-Out NAs and their traders: likely minimum impact.  Opt-In NAs and their traders: likely minimum impact.  Depending on the re-use of G0139. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
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