# Impact Analysis Report/ RFC-Proposal

**Section 1: Meta-data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFC ID** | **RFC\_NCTS\_0167**(RTC-57318) |
| **Related Incident ID** | IM451586 |
| **RFC Initiator / Organization** | Real Time Exercise |
| **CI** | **NCTS - P5 (DDNTA-** **5.14.1-v1.00)** |
| **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***

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk Analysis Result Code -- assessment of pattern and upgrade conversion --** |
| The current change occurred in an incident related to AES-P1 domain, but affects also NCTS-P5 domain.  In IM451586 is reported that a CD501C message was rejected by ieCA during the syntax validation of the upgraded output.  The reason for this is that the value "E" in data item: <RISK ANALYSIS IDENTIFICATION - RISK ANALYSIS - RISK ANALYSIS RESULT.Code> does not comply to the legacy assigned XSD pattern.  In NCTS-P5, the pattern that is assigned is the following: '.{1,4}[DEZ]|[!-~]{1,16}[DEZ]'.  The above pattern consists of two versions, one for transitional purposes: .{1,4}[DEZ]  and one new: [!-~]{1,16}[DEZ]  According to NCTS-P4 DDNXA v20.00 specifications, there is no strict pattern assigned on the legacy data item: <RISK ANALYSIS.Risk Analysis result code>, as a result, no syntax violation occurred on the input.  Additionally, the rule R821, assigned on <RISK ANALYSIS> data group mentions the following:  R821  Only those occurrences of the data group shall be included in the message for which the last digit of the attribute  “Risk Analysis result code” has one of the following values: D, E and Z.  From the above, and since the rule is mentioning the "last" digit of the attribute 'Risk Analysis result code', it is assummed that the <RISK ANALYSIS.Risk Analysis result code> should be a string of more than one character.  This assumption is in alignment with the assigned pattern on NCTS-P5 <RISK ANALYSIS IDENTIFICATION - RISK ANALYSIS - RISK ANALYSIS RESULT.Code> data item. |

**Section 2: Problem statement**

|  |
| --- |
| According to the NCTS-P4 DDNTA v20.00 specifications, there is no strict pattern assigned on the legacy data item: <RISK ANALYSIS.Risk Analysis result code>, as a result, no syntax violation occurred on the input. More specifically:  *<xs:element name="RisAnaResCodRKA1" type="simple:Alphanumeric\_Max5">  <xs:annotation>     <xs:documentation>             <doc:description value="Risk Analysis result code" />       </xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  </xs:element>*  However, on the NCTS-P5 phase, there is a strict pattern. More specifically, the following this is depicted on the NCTS-P5 DDNTA 5.14.0-v1.00 Appendix X (stypes.xsd file):  *<xs:simpleType name="RiskAnalysisResultCode"> ..     <xs:restriction base="AlphaNumType">       <xs:minLength value="1" />       <xs:maxLength value="17" />       <xs:pattern value=".{1,4}[DEZ]" />       <xs:pattern value="[!-~]{1,16}[DEZ]" />     </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>*  **Impacted IEs**: CD001C, CD003C, CD038C, CD050C, CD115C  **Impacted R/C/G/T/TRT/BRT:** N/A  **Impacted CIs**:   * **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix X): Yes;** * **DMP Package-5.6.0-v1.00 (incl. update of file Rules and Conditions\_v0.43): Yes;** * **TRP-5.7.5-v1.00: Yes;** * **CRP-5.5.0-v1.00: Yes;** * CSE-v51.6.0: **No;** * CTS-5.6.1-v1.00: **No;** * CTP-5.7.0-v1.00: **No;** * ACS: 5.4.0-v1.00 & ACS-Annex-AES/NCTS: 5.5.0-v1.00: **No;** * AES-P1 and NCTS-P5 Long-Lived “Legacy” (L3) Movements Study v1.40: **No;** * DDCOM **20.3.0-v1.00: No;** * ieCA **1.0.2.1: No** * CS/RD2: **No;** * CS/MIS2: **No** |

**Section 3: Description of proposed solution**

|  |
| --- |
| The next release of **DDNTA (Appendix X)** shall be corrected as follows (addition of **text highlighted in yellow**, removal of ~~text with strikethrough~~):  **File: stypes.xsd**  <xs:simpleType name="RiskAnalysisResultCode">  <xs:annotation>  <xs:documentation>RISK ANALYSIS.RISK ANALYSIS RESULT.Code (format: an..17)</xs:documentation>  </xs:annotation>  <xs:restriction base="AlphaNumType">  <xs:minLength value="1" />  <xs:maxLength value="17" />  ~~<xs:pattern value=".~~*~~{1,4}[DEZ]~~*~~" />~~  <xs:pattern value=".{0,4}[~~D~~E~~Z~~]" />  <!-- for upgrade purposes -->  <xs:pattern value="[!-~]{1,16}[~~D~~E~~Z~~]" />  <!-- for new phases -->  </xs:restriction>  </xs:simpleType>  The next release of **NCTS-P5 DMP** will also be updated as following:  **Resolution for upgrade,**  For the transitional period, a transitional pattern has been defined on the XSDs “.{0,4}[~~D~~E~~Z~~]” in order to allow values from NCTS-P4  **Resolution for downgrade,**  No issue for downgrade since C0715 makes the DI required when RISK ANALYSIS IDENTIFICATION.Code is 'R' or 'X', which are the values for downgrade risk. Furthermore, no formatting issue, since E1101 will be applied during TP to set the format to an..5 and a transitional pattern has been defined on the XSDs “.{0,4}[~~D~~E~~Z~~]” in order to allow values to NCTS-P4.  **IMPACT ASSESSMENT:**  This RFC-Proposal concerns changes at syntactic level in Common Domain messages.    It is considered that the change proposed via the current IAR has impact on business continuity and therefore shall be deployed in a **Big Bang** approach. More specifically:    **Changes at semantic level**   N/A    **Movement initiated under the previous DDNTA (5.14.1) release which continues its flow under the new DDNTA (5.15.0) release (open movement):** No issues are expected to occur in open movement case.    **Changes at syntactic level:** This IAR concerns changes at syntactic level, as it describes the update of the existing pattern for simple type “RiskAnalysisResultCode”, in order to accept elements which only contain ~~‘D’,~~ ‘E’ ~~or ‘Z’~~. That practically means that:   * If the sender is aligned with the proposed changes, and the recipient is not, then a syntactic rejection will occur, as the recipient excepts at least one character (to four) before ‘D’, ‘E’ or ‘Z’ on the risk analysis code. * If the sender is not aligned with the proposed changes and the recipient is, then no syntactic rejection shall be caused, since the recipient is expecting from zero to four characters before ~~‘D’,~~ ‘E’ ~~or ‘Z’.~~     **Risk of not implementing the change:** In case of not implementing this change, a syntactic rejection may occur, as the recipient excepts at least one character (to four) before ‘D’, ‘E’ or ‘Z’ on the risk analysis code.  **Proposed** date of applicability in Operations (**T-Ops**):   1.12.2022  **Proposed** date of applicability in CT (**T-CT**):                     July 2022  **Expected** date of approval by ECCG (**T-CAB**):                  January 2022  **Impact on transition: None**  **Risk of not implementing the change: Yes** |

**Impact on CI artefacts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| DDNTA 5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix X) | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | Update of Appendix x (stypes.xsd) as defined in section 3. | |
| DMP Package-5.6.0 | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | Update of NCTS-Data Mapping-v0.48.xls' file on R&C fields and update of ‘Rules and Conditions.xls’ file. | |
| TRP-5.7.5 | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | |  | |
| CRP-5.5.0-v1.00 | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | |  | |

**Estimated impact on National Project**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | It is considered that the change proposed via the current IAR has impact on business continuity and therefore shall be deployed in a Big Bang approach. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document History** | | |  |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | ***Comment*** |
| v0.10 | Draft by CUSTDEV | 22/11/2021 | *Draft by CUSTDEV* |
| V0.11 | Updates by CUSTDEV | 15/12/2021 | *Version Update* |
| v1.00 | Updates by CUSTDEV | 18/02/2022 | *Update xsd pattern to remove values D,Z based on the RFC\_NCTS\_0178\_CUSTDEV3-IAR-RTC60097* |
| v1.10 | SfA to NPMs | 24/02/2022 | *SfA with implementation details* |