

**UNITED
NATIONS**

E



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL
CEFACT/1999/ED001
24th September 1999

ENGLISH ONLY

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

Centre for the Facilitation of Procedures and Practices
for Administration, Commerce and Transport (CEFACT)

UN/EDIFACT WORKING GROUP

**DATA MAINTENANCE REQUEST
PROCESSING PROCEDURES**

* * *

Submitted by the T1 Technical Assessment Sub Working Group

Contents

Foreword.....	ii
1. DMR SUBMISSION PROCEDURES	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Scope.....	2
1.3 Change Request Procedures	2
1.3.1 Submission Procedures	2
1.4 Code Request Procedures.....	3
1.4.1 Category 1 & 3 Code Requests.....	3
1.5 Message in Development (MiD) Procedures	4
1.6 United Nations Standard Message (UNSM) Procedures	5
2. LOCAL DMR PROCESSING PROCEDURES.....	8
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Scope.....	9
2.3 Procedure.....	9
2.3.1 Log the DMR.....	9
2.3.2 Local review of the DMR	9
2.3.3 Submit DMR internationally	10
2.3.4 Distribution of DMR Status	10
3. INTERNATIONAL DMR PROCESSING PROCEDURES.....	11
3.1 Introduction	12
3.2 Scope.....	12
3.3 Interim T1 Technical Assessment.....	12
3.3.1 DMR Review Schedule.....	12
3.3.2 DMR Review.....	12
3.3.3 Status Assignment and Resultant Action	13
3.3.4 Single DMR Processing	14
3.3.5 T1 Reporting	14
3.4 EWG T1 Technical Assessment.....	15
3.4.1 Introduction.....	15
3.4.2 DMR Processing Procedures	15
3.4.3 Single DMR Processing	17
3.4.4 Non Message Development Group raised DMRs	17
Annex A - DMR Forms.....	18
Annex B - 'Entry Point' Names and Contact Details.....	29
Annex C - List of Associated Technical Documents.....	31
Annex D - Explanation of Code List Categories	32

Foreword

The purpose of these procedures is to provide a standard set of procedures whereby requests for UN/EDIFACT new UN Standard Messages (UNSMs), change requests, and code requests can be progressed in a logical and co-ordinated manner through the UN/EDIFACT Working Group (EWG). These procedures have been written in order to streamline the Data Maintenance Request (DMR) cycle time between submission and approval to four months.

The significant differences between these and previous versions of the DMR procedures are:

- i. Previously there was a requirement for a New Message Request (NMR) to be submitted to an 'Entry Point' as the first step in the message development process. This provided an opportunity to declare a request for joint development. Since the NMR realistically provides no added value and only delays the message development cycle, these new procedures eliminate the NMR step. However, it is now incumbent upon all those organisations and Experts involved in the standards development process to disseminate information as widely as possible to ensure adequate co-ordination of development efforts.
- ii. Previous procedures also required that message developers prepare and submit individual DMR forms for each change to the directories. This was required for both normal DMRs and for UNSM submissions. In order to improve DMR processing, a single DMR will now be permitted to contain the entire content of all related directory changes, including a UNSM and its associated data maintenance.
- iii. Previous procedures required each code request to be a separate DMR. However, in line with the philosophy of reducing the number of DMRs and the time spent on administrative functions to process DMRs, all code additions/changes for a single data element, which are not part of a UNSM, may now be submitted on a single DMR.

Figure 1 below and the accompanying text provide an overview of the DMR flow.

Local procedures include:

- i. DMRs are sent to the 'Entry Point', where they are logged by the 'Entry Point' Secretariat;
- ii. The 'Entry Point' processes the DMRs according to local procedures;
- iii. 'Entry Points' screen all locally submitted DMRs for completeness and technical accuracy before forwarding a DMR on to the Central Secretariat.
- iv. DMRs must comply with the current version of the Technical Assessment Checklist (TAC). If not they will be rejected by the 'Entry Point'. The 'Entry Point' can also repair DMRs.

International procedures include:

- i. The Central Secretariat publishes a list of DMRs to be reviewed at the Interim T1 meeting as well as the current status of each DMR.
- ii. Interim T1 meetings conduct initial reviews, approve, and process DMRs for publication in the next publication cycle. The DMRs are reviewed along with any comments from the 'Entry Point' review. There are also reviews on postponed, deferred, or pending DMRs. A DMR may be 'deferred' until the next EWG T1 meeting. Interim meetings can also reject DMRs.
- iii. The Central Secretariat publishes a list of DMRs to be reviewed at the EWG T1 meeting as well as the current status of each DMR.
- iv. EWG T1 meetings resolve any open DMRs and obtain Development Group Chair approval to include the DMRs in the next directory production cycle. Initial DMR reviews will only be permitted as the last order of business. DMRs not reviewed will be postponed and scheduled for review at the next interim meeting. Note that postponed DMRs may only remain in that status until the next EWG meeting. If the postponed DMR is not reviewed and approved for publication within that time frame, then it will be assigned a status of 'rejected'.
- v. The results of the DMR reviews will be available on the UN web site.
- vi. The directory production process takes the DMRs agreed at the EWG meeting and uses them to produce a new version of the UN/EDIFACT Directory. The Directory Audit Team (DAT) then checks that all DMRs have been processed correctly and reports its findings to the EWG.

1. DMR SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

1.1 Introduction

These DMR submission procedures detail how message developers progress requests within the message development process to effect changes against directories.

1.2 Scope

The scope of this DMR submission procedure is to define the full range of Change Request, Message in Development (MiD) and UNSM procedures.

1.3 Change Request Procedures

The purpose of these procedures is to provide a method whereby requests for changes, deletions, and/or additions to published UN/CEFACT documents or directories for status UNSM covering:

- codes
- data elements
- composite data elements
- segments
- messages

can be progressed in a logical and co-ordinated manner.

1.3.1 Submission Procedures

The following submission procedures apply:

- i. DMRs may be originated by individuals, organizations, associations, consortiums etc.
- ii. The requester selects the applicable DMR form for submission from those identified in Annex A. The choice of form used by the requester is dependent upon the type of DMR. The forms range from a New Code Request to a request for a United Nations Standard Message (UNSM).
- iii. It is recommended that the latest published (or latest available to the submitter) UN/EDIFACT directory shall be used as the basis for raising the DMR.
- iv. The submitter forwards the DMR to an 'Entry Point' Secretariat, and it is processed according to the 'Entry Point' procedures. It is recommended that the request should first be reviewed by a regional or national standards body and/or group, as appropriate, but this is not a firm requirement.

1.4 Code Request Procedures

A code DMR can contain multiple code requests as long as they are all for the same data element.

1.4.1 Category 1 & 3 Code Requests

The following procedures apply to category 1 and 3 code requests [Note. Annex D describes the recognised code categories and is provided to assist the user in preparing DMRs]:

- i. DMRs can be accepted for category 1 & 3 codes if they are for data elements associated with the UN/EDIFACT syntax or with UN/ECE recommendations as stated in the Trade Data Element Directory (TDED). (Note. It is not a requirement that DMRs for such actions come to the EWG. They may be submitted directly to the responsible organisation. However, if such a DMR is received within the EWG, these procedures apply within the EWG.)
- ii. The DMR will then be assessed in the same way as all other code requests. No actual changes will be made to these DMRs, however, T1 comments will be passed along to the responsible organisation.
- iii. At the next T1 meeting, the DMR will be assessed against the Technical Assessment Checklist (TAC). After review and approval within T1, either with or without recommended modification(s), then:
 - a) If category 1 (codes related specifically to syntax data elements), the DMR will be passed to the Joint Syntax Working Group (JSWG); or
 - b) If category 3 (codes related specifically to UN/ECE recommendations), the DMR will be passed to the Codes Working Group (CDWG). All category 3 data elements are included in the Table 1.1.
- iv. The Central Secretariat will log all category 1 & 3 code requests that have been passed on to the relevant maintenance agencies. At each T1 meeting, a report on the status of each of these DMRs will be given. The UN/ECE web site will also contain these statuses.
- v. The Central Secretariat will co-ordinate with the JSWG and CDWG to determine the results of their assessment of the DMRs. Within the context of the EWG, these DMRs will be considered to have one of the following status':
 - a) Approved: The DMR will be applied to the next published directory. The tag assigned will also be notified.

- b) Rejected: The DMR was rejected and the specific reasons for rejection will be stated.
- c) Modified: The DMR was applied in an amended form. The returned amended form will be obtained for information and tracking purposes. Note: Agreements with the JSWG and CDWG have been reached whereby modifications will be made with the agreement of the DMR submitter and/or the T1 Chair and/or Vice Chair. If modifications are required then they will be done following consultation with the user to ensure that their business need is met.

Table 1.1
Data Elements Subject to Category 3 Codes
UN/EDIFACT Recommendations and Their Equivalent in TDED

Recommendation	Data Element
3 – ISO Country Codes	3207 – Country, coded 3239 – Country of origin, coded 8453 – Nationality of means of transport, coded
5 – INCOTERMS	4053 – Terms of Delivery
9 – Currency	6345 – Currency, coded
16 – LOCODES	3225 – Place location identification 3223 – Related place location one identification 3233 – Related place location two identification
17 – PAYTERMS	4277 – Terms of Payment identification
19 – Modes of Transport	8067 – Mode of Transport, coded
20 – Units of measure	6411 – Measure unit qualifier 6417 – Measurement unit identification
21 – Types of packages	7065 – Types of packages identification
23 – Freight costs and charges	8023 – Freight charges identification
24 – Transport status	4405 – Status, coded *
28 – Type of means of transport +	8179 – Type of means of transport identification
29 – Type of cargo +	7085 – Nature of cargo, coded
30 – Harmonised system +	7361 – Customs code identification

* Note that this data element also has many codes within the UN/EDIFACT code list.
+ Proposed Recommendation

1.5 Message in Development (MiD) Procedures

The following MiD procedures apply:

- i. Message developers shall first review current directories to determine if there is an existing message, which meets their required functionality.
- ii. If there is an existing message that primarily meets the required functionality but requires changes, the message developer shall follow the normal process for submitting DMRs for changes to existing messages.
- iii. If no suitable existing message is found, then the message developer shall notify the appropriate EWG message development group of an intent to develop a new message. It is the responsibility of the message development group to work with the developer as appropriate and vice versa. The message developer, if requiring assistance, should approach the 'Entry Point' Secretariat or assessment team, the appropriate EWG message development group or the UN/ECE Secretariat to obtain the necessary support.
- iv. The message developer should ensure that business requirements are documented and business models are developed in accordance with the recommendations of the Techniques and Methodologies Working Group (TMWG) and EWG decisions related to the implementation of all modelling requirements. The message developer will prepare the MiD submission based on the resultant documentation and Message Design Rules (MDRs). This documentation shall be prepared in accordance with the UN/CEFACT Rules for Presentation of Standardised Message and Directories Documentation (R.1023), and the developer shall use the Message and Code Handbook (MACH) for guidance in determining what information should be included in the boilerplate.
- v. The message developer shall submit the required documentation to an 'Entry Point' (see Annex A).
- vi. MiD submissions shall be technically assessed according to the local and international DMR review procedures (see sections 2 & 3). Any comments from the local and international assessment are part of the DMR history and shall be addressed by the developer in preparing the UNSM submission.
- vii. Approved MiD's accompanied by their associated DMR history will be posted on the UN/ECE Web site only after being technically assessed and approved by the appropriate message development group chair, or designated representative. If there is no message development group this can be done by the Chair of T1.

1.6 United Nations Standard Message (UNSM) Procedures

The following UNSM procedures apply:

- i. Once a MiD is approved, a message developer can prepare a DMR for a UNSM submission. Parties that are interested in contributing to the content of the UNSM are encouraged to join in the activities of the development groups. Developers shall address the necessary changes to functionality, evolving business requirements and comments made in the MiD technical assessment when developing the UNSM. Any comments that have not been applied shall have rationale provided to support the position.
- ii. The boilerplate shall be prepared in accordance with the current version of R.1023. Due to the single DMR concept, all directory entries (including new codes), or changes to existing structures shall be contained in the Directory Variations section and annotated with the appropriate change indicators to identify the nature of the change to the directory.
- iii. Data elements to be created shall be assigned a 4 digit tag based on the following:
 - a) The first digit of the data element tag shall be assigned based on the valid TDED (Trade Data Elements Directory) category :
 0. Reserved for use with service data elements only
 1. Documentation, references
 2. Dates, times, periods of time
 3. Parties, addresses, places, countries
 4. Clauses, conditions, terms, instructions
 5. Amounts, charges, percentages
 6. Measure identifiers, quantities (other than monetary)
 7. Goods and articles
 8. Transport modes and means, containers
 9. Other data elements
 - b) The second digit of the data element tag shall be a 7 to indicate that it is a temporary code.
 - c) The developer shall assign the third and fourth digits of the data element tag using any sequential number 0 - 9.
 - d) The fourth digit of the data element tag shall be an odd number if it is for a coded data element (a coded representation of a data element value) or an even number if it is for a clear data element (a free form description of a data element value). The odd number that follows an even numbered tag is reserved for the coded representation of the same data element.
 - e) The Central Secretariat shall assign the final tag used in directory production after EWG approval of the DMR.

- iv. Composite data elements to be created shall assign a tag in the format “Cnnn” for a batch composite data element and “Ennn” for interactive composite data elements. The “nnn” can be composed of any sequentially numbered values and must not duplicate any tag, which already exists within the UN/TDID. The Central Secretariat shall assign the final tag used in directory production after EWG approval of the DMR.
- v. Segments to be created shall assign a tag composed of any three alphabetic characters (A – Z) based upon the desires of the developer. The tag cannot duplicate any tag, which already exists within the UN/TDID. (The first character must not be a “U” as this is reserved for service segment use).
- vi. Messages to be created shall assign a tag composed of any six alphabetic characters (A – Z) based upon the desires of the developer. The tag cannot duplicate any tag, which already exists within the UN/TDID.
- vii. If more than one UNSM DMR is being submitted from the same message developer and the DMRs contain identical directory entries or identical changes to existing directories, then this shall be noted in the business need of the DMR. The proposed structured tags for new directory entries must be identical.
- viii. The DMR shall be submitted to an ‘Entry Point’ for technical assessment. The ‘Entry Point’ TAG shall follow Local Processing Procedures (see section 2) and the ‘Entry Point’ Secretariat shall submit the DMR to the Central Secretariat only if the entire message and its associated changes are approved.
- ix. T1 Technical Assessment shall review the UNSM DMR in accordance with International Processing Procedures.

2. LOCAL DMR PROCESSING PROCEDURES

2.1 Introduction

The local DMR processing procedure is part of the overall EWG procedure for the processing of DMRs.

2.2 Scope

Every DMR to be processed for inclusion in the UN/EDIFACT directory shall be subject to review by an 'Entry Point' before it is submitted for international processing.

The scope of this local DMR processing procedure is to define the requirements placed on the local process, and the management of this process as seen by the international community.

The procedure does not define the process of issuing a DMR, but assumes that a DMR has been raised. Likewise, the procedure also assumes a given organisational structure at the local entry points. Local procedures will apply.

2.3 Procedure

2.3.1 Log the DMR

Once received the secretariat of an 'Entry Point' shall:

- i. Verify the general validity of the DMR (i.e. that the form is correct as per Annex A).
- ii. Assign an 'Entry Point' log number to the DMR.
- iii. Notify the DMR submitter about the DMR log number assigned.
- iv. Distribute the DMR to the nominated review team(s).

2.3.2 Local review of the DMR

Each 'Entry Point' shall ensure that the DMR is subject to the following types of review:

- i. The business need stated on the DMR shall be assessed to ensure:
 - a) that the business need is not already catered for in the latest published UN/EDIFACT directory;
 - b) that the technical solution (i.e. the requested change to the UN/EDIFACT directory) adequately meets the stated business need.

- ii. The proposed technical solution (i.e. the requested change to the UN/EDIFACT directory) shall be assessed to ensure that it complies to the current technical rules and guidelines (see Annex C);
- iii. During the assessment of the DMR changes may be suggested by the designated 'Entry Point' review team(s) to ensure the DMR complies with technical rules and guidelines. These technical changes shall be incorporated before the document is forwarded on to the Central Secretariat.

Upon completion of the above reviews the DMR shall be assigned a status of approved, rejected or withdrawn by the submitter.

2.3.3 Submit DMR internationally

At the end of the local review the 'Entry Point' secretariat shall:

- i. Notify the DMR submitter about the results from the local review;
- ii. Submit 'Entry Point' approved DMRs, in English, to the Central Secretariat electronically in DMRDEF message format.

2.3.4 Distribution of DMR Status

After each T1 meeting the DMR submitter will be informed of the result of the review.

3. INTERNATIONAL DMR PROCESSING PROCEDURES

3.1 Introduction

The International DMR processing procedure is part of the overall EWG procedure for the processing of DMRs.

3.2 Scope

The scope of this International DMR processing procedure is to outline the procedures to be adopted at the Interim T1 and the EWG T1 Technical Assessment meetings.

3.3 Interim T1 Technical Assessment

3.3.1 DMR Review Schedule

The primary order of business for interim meetings is to conduct initial reviews at the international level, approve, and process DMRs for publication in the next publication cycle. T1 will conduct initial DMR reviews as well as reviews on postponed, deferred, or pending DMRs.

At the beginning of the meeting, a review schedule will be determined. This schedule will be based on the list of DMRs made available by the Central Secretariat. Message development group representatives should report any discrepancies in the list (mainly the allocation of DMRs to the message development group) at the beginning of the meeting. DMRs received by the Central Secretariat prior to the cut off date and DMRs 'postponed' from the EWG T1 meeting will be scheduled first. Only if time permits, will DMRs received by the Central Secretariat after the cut off date be reviewed. It should be noted that review of a DMR received after the cut off date must be approved by either the T1 Chair or Vice-chair.

Each message development group should ensure that the authorised representative(s) to discuss a DMR, other than message development group members of T1, attends at the appropriate time, i.e., during the scheduled appointment time for the message development group.

The schedule, when possible, should take into account message development group members who are not the message development group representative(s) but who wish to attend at least part of the meeting in order provide expertise on specific DMRs.

3.3.2 DMR Review

At the beginning of the review any originating 'Entry Point' comments pertaining to the DMR should be noted. Any electronic comments that have been received from T1 members who are not able to attend should also be noted. These electronic comments shall be considered in the assessment process, but the meeting will not be delayed or disrupted in order to receive, confirm, clarify, or otherwise determine the intent of the submitter with respect to the comments.

All members, including both technical experts and message development group representatives, are encouraged to comment and ask questions on each DMR as may be required. The message development group representatives shall have an opportunity to present any appropriate information during the meeting with a view to assisting T1 with the overall assessment of a DMR.

3.3.3 Status Assignment and Resultant Action

After review, T1 shall assign a status to the DMR. The allowable statuses and the action to be taken are:

- i. **Approved (A).** The T1 members present agree that the original DMR, excluding MiD DMRs, is valid without modification for inclusion in the next directory set. MiD DMRs can only be approved, but are not included in the directory. However, all T1 comments concerning suggested amendments to the DMR should be published with the MiD.
- ii. **Withdrawn (W).** The submitter, or the message development group authorised representative(s) responsible for the original DMR, decides that the DMR should not be applied to the next directory. The DMR is removed from any further processing or consideration. The T1 Secretariat should provide a list of withdrawn DMRs for each message development group and the authorised or designated representative should sign this list.
- iii. **Rejected (R).** For technical reasons, documented in the Technical Assessment Checklist (TAC), T1 disapproves of the DMR. The reason for rejection shall be detailed and, when possible, T1 shall provide an alternate solution. When T1 cannot provide an acceptable solution, the DMR may be assigned a code of D (Deferred), at the request of the development group chair or designated representative, pending resolution of the user requirement.
- iv. **'JT' (J)**¹. A status allocated to a new DMR identified by a number assigned by T1, for which the JT procedures have been followed and the message development group has agreed with the suggested amendments. 'JT' DMRs may be categorised as approved DMRs. Any associated 'Approval pending' DMRs shall be changed to 'Approved'.
- v. **Approval pending (G).** A temporary status allocated by T1 to a DMR if the only reason for the DMR being unresolved is that another DMR to which it relates is subject to amendments via the JT process. The UN log Number of the DMR on which this DMR is pending will be recorded against the DMR.
- vi. **Deferred (D).** A status allocated to an original DMR when the message development group representative cannot answer questions

¹ 'JT' stands for JTAG (Joint Technical Assessment Group), which is the former name of T1.

raised or cannot concur with any changes recommended by T1. This status will permit the message development group representative an opportunity to confer with the responsible message development group in order to resolve the DMR. The deferred DMR should be resolved at the following EWG T1 meeting.

This status may also be assigned to DMRs related to a DMR that is pending resolution or when a DMR impacts more than one message development group. In the latter situation, T1 will assign one message development group to co-ordinate all comments from other message development groups. The co-ordinating message development group is responsible for answering any comments and questions raised by other interested message development groups. The deferred DMR will then be reviewed under the lead co-ordinating message development group time slot at the next appropriate T1 meeting. The co-ordinating message development group is expected to have obtained consensus before returning the DMR to T1.

3.3.4 Single DMR Processing

The user of a single DMR permits multiple related DMRs to be included on a single DMR submission. In assessing the DMR, T1 may approve all, part or none of the DMR content. If a partial approval applies, the original DMR will be JT'd to include all accepted portions of the original DMR. This will permit the JT'd DMR to be applied to the directory providing the JT'd DMR meets all appropriate technical requirements as well as the requirements of the submitter. Any such DMR which does not meet the user and technical requirements may be postponed or deferred until the DMR can be satisfactorily processed.

3.3.5 T1 Reporting

The T1 Secretariat shall prepare a report that will contain the following on all DMRs that were reviewed or subject to review at the meeting:

- i. UN log number
- ii. 'Entry Point' log number
- iii. Final status (as of the end of this meeting)
- iv. Comments - these should include any changes made to a JT'd DMR and any changes that need to be addressed when a MiD DMR is submitted for UNSM status.

At the end of the Interim T1 meeting, the status of all processed DMRs are calculated, published, and sent (along with the content of the JT'd DMRs) to the Central Secretariat for inclusion in the next directory, after approved by the message development group Chair at the following EWG meeting.

3.4 EWG T1 Technical Assessment

3.4.1 Introduction

These procedures are to be followed for the review of DMRs during an EWG meeting of the T1 Technical Assessment Group. This meeting shall be held in conjunction with the EWG meetings.

The primary order of business for EWG T1 meetings is to resolve any open DMRs. Open DMRs are DMRs that were deferred from the Interim T1 meeting and those that were postponed from the previous EWG T1 meeting. At the EWG T1 meeting any DMRs that were approved or JT'd at the previous Interim T1 meeting can be reopened at the explicit request of the development group Chair, who must provide the T1 chair with a list of those DMRs by the first evening Steering Committee meeting.

DMRs that were rejected at the previous Interim T1 meeting may also be reopened at the explicit request of the development group Chair. However, the Chair should be able to provide a change to the DMR that repairs the technical reason for the original rejection.

Initial DMR reviews will only be permitted as the last order of T1 business and shall not exceed T1 regular scheduled time allotments. DMRs not reviewed will be postponed and scheduled for review at the next Interim T1 meeting. (Note that postponed DMRs may remain in that status only until the next EWG T1 meeting. If the DMR is not reviewed and approved for publication within that time frame, then it will be assigned a status of 'rejected').

When T1 is reviewing DMRs there are occasions when a question may arise that may result in not approving the DMR. The responsible development group should make every effort to be prepared to answer T1 questions. Development groups should send representatives that have the ability and authority to answer business and technical questions as well as have the authority to make necessary changes to the DMR. The development group representative is also responsible for correcting the amended DMR and returning it to T1 during the current EWG T1 meeting.

3.4.2 DMR Processing Procedures

The following DMR processing procedures apply:

- i. Prior to the EWG T1 meeting the Central Secretariat shall publish a list of DMRs to be reviewed and any T1 comments made during an Interim T1 meeting, along with any comments that have been collected. Specific time allocations will be made and published for each development group having business with T1.
- ii. Development groups shall prepare their points for discussion to T1. The development group shall send a responsible representative who can make, if necessary, any appropriate changes.

iii. One of the following statuses shall be assigned during an EWG T1 meeting:

- a) **Rejected (R).** For technical reasons, documented in the TAC, T1 disapproved of the original DMR. The reason for rejection shall be detailed and, as far as possible, T1 shall provide an alternative solution to avoid a future rejection. When T1 cannot provide an acceptable solution, the DMR may be assigned a code of “D” (Deferred), at the request of the development group chair or designated representative, pending resolution of the user requirement.
- b) **‘JT’ (J).** A status allocated to a new DMR identified by a number assigned by T1, for which the JT procedures have been followed and the message development group has agreed with the suggested amendments. ‘JT’ DMRs may be categorised as approved DMRs. Any associated ‘Approval pending’ DMRs shall be changed to ‘Approved’.

After the amendments are agreed, T1 shall copy the DMR and allocate a ‘JT’ number to it. The proposed amendment will be applied to this copy, so that the resultant DMR will reflect all of the agreed changes. The T1 Secretariat will provide a copy of the amended DMR to the message development group representative. The message development group representative will ensure that the amended DMRs are correct and will indicate such by signing the DMR. If the DMR involves structural changes to a message, the message development group representative will provide two electronic versions (in Microsoft Word format) of the resultant message. (Note: One version shall be in revision mode with the changes to the original DMR annotated. The second shall have all revisions applied, reflecting the final product that will appear in the Directory.) The DMRs should be returned to T1 during the current Interim T1 meeting but must be returned by the end of the next EWG T1 meeting. If not returned at the end of the next meeting, the original DMR will be rejected along with any associated ‘Approval pending’ DMRs.

Development groups may choose to include other DMRs in the list of those being repaired in order to retain consistency across other related DMRs.

- c) **Approval Pending (G).** A temporary status allocated by T1 to a DMR if the only reason for the DMR being unresolved is that another DMR to which it relates is subject to amendments via the JT process. The UN log number of the DMR on which this DMR is pending will be recorded against the DMR.

- d) **Postponed (P).** A status allocated to an original DMR when T1 was not able to assign a status and the DMR review is postponed until no later than the next EWG T1 meeting where it must be resolved. Reasons to postpone a DMR are a lack of time or no qualified authorised development group representative being available.

T1 will publish the time allotments for DMR review.

At the conclusion of an EWG T1 meeting, the status of all processed DMRs are tabulated, published, and sent (along with the content of the JT'd DMRs) to the Central Secretariat for inclusion in the next directory. The development group Chair must sign off and approve at the EWG meeting.

3.4.3 Single DMR Processing

The user of a single DMR permits multiple related DMRs to be included on a single DMR submission. In assessing the DMR, T1 may approve all, part or none of the DMR content. If a partial approval applies, the original DMR will be JT'd to include all accepted portions of the original DMR. This will permit the JT'd DMR to be applied to the directory providing the JT'd DMR meets all appropriate technical requirements as well as the requirements of the submitter. Any such DMR which does not meet the user and technical requirements may be postponed or deferred until the DMR can be satisfactorily processed.

3.4.4 Non Message Development Group Raised DMRs

Occasionally, there is a need for a recognised EWG group (e.g., DAT, etc.) other than a development group to raise and submit a DMR. Such a DMR could have a direct impact on existing or anticipated implementation or could undergo dispute resolution by T1 Technical Assessment and would not have the benefit of a co-ordinated development group position. Thus, except in 'urgent' situations, the submitting group should first present the DMR to the appropriate development group(s) for review and comment. If the development group(s) confirms the business need of the DMR, it should follow normal 'Entry Point' submission procedures. The affected development group or the 'primary' development group, if more than one is affected, shall be noted on the DMR form.

An 'urgent' situation is defined as a condition that directly affects the timely and accurate semi-annual publication of the directory. In the case of an 'urgent' situation, the DMR shall be presented during an EWG to the affected development group(s) and then sent to T1 Technical Assessment for their review, reconciliation, and approval at the same EWG meeting.

Normative Annex A

DMR Forms

Introduction

The primary mechanism desired for the submission of all data maintenance, as well as any exchanges related to information regarding data maintenance, is via the DMRDEF and DMSTAT messages, as appropriate. The following formats are provided to identify the necessary data required from the submitter, depending upon the nature of the data maintenance. All EP-unique formats have been eliminated in order to harmonise the content.

New Code Request / Code Change Request

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE :	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*) + country code:	
Phone (*) +country code:	

Code Name (*):	
Code TAG (*):	
Action (*):	
Code definition (*):	
Code Note:	
Based on data element (*):	
Based on composite:	
Based on segment:	
Based on message (*):	
Based on Directory:	
Target Directory:	
Code category (*):	

Business Need/justification (*):	
---	--

(*) Mandatory fields

Guidance on filling in DMR forms

Example:

New Code Request / Code Change

UN Log: (Assigned by UN)	'UN' log number assigned to the DMR. (e.g., UN-99-0011)
UN Date: (Assigned by UN)	Date the DMR was logged by the 'UN'. (e.g., 1999-01-03)
Requester: (Assigned by Requester)	EWG Development Group to which the Requester is a member. (e.g., D14)
EP Log: (Assigned by 'Entry Point')	'Entry Point' log number assigned to the DMR. (e.g., WE-01000)
EP Date: (Assigned by 'Entry Point')	Date the DMR was logged by the 'Entry Point'. (e.g., 1999-01-19)
User ref: (Assigned by Requester)	Reference allocated by the Requester at the time of DMR completion. (e.g., EEG1. Code Request)
User date: (Assigned by Requester)	Date allocated by the Requester at the time of DMR completion. (e.g., 1999-03-22)
Originator: (Assigned by Requester)	Name of requesting party
Company: (Assigned by Requester)	Company of requesting party
Address: (Assigned by Requester)	Address of requesting party
Email: (Assigned by Requester)	Email address of requesting party
Fax + Country code (Assigned by Requester)	Fax number (including country code) of requesting party
Phone + Country code (Assigned by Requester)	Phone number (including country code) of requesting party
Code Name: (Assigned by Requester)	In a Request for Change, this should contain the name as required. (e.g., Recommended maintenance quantity)
Code TAG: (Assigned by Requester)	The 3 digit tag assigned to the code. (e.g., ABC)
Action	Whether this is an Addition of a new code, Marking an existing code for deletion, or Changing an existing code. (e.g., Add)
Code definition: (Assigned by Requester)	Detailed description of the code name (e.g., Recommended quantity of an article which is required to meet an agreed level of maintenance.)
Based on data element: (Assigned by Requester)	The data element in which the code is to be used. (e.g., 3035 Party qualifier)

Based on composite: (Assigned by Requester)	The composite in which the code is to be used. (e.g., C819 Address usage)
Based on segment: (Assigned by Requester)	The segment in which the code is to be used. (e.g., NAD Name and Address)
Based on message: (Assigned by Requester)	The message in which the code is to be used. (e.g., INFENT Enterprise accounting information message)
Based on Directory: (Assigned by Requester)	The release of the UN/EDIFACT directory used as the reference for producing the DMR. (e.g., D99A)
Target Directory: (Assigned by Requester)	The UN/EDIFACT directory for which the DMR is to applied. (e.g., Batch or Interactive)
Code Category: (Assigned by Requester)	Indicate the category into which these code(s) fit. 1 – Codes related to service data elements 2 – Codes in the public domain, maintained by UN/EDIFACT 3 – International code lists endorsed by UN/ECE 4 – Other code lists maintained by officially recognised organisations
Business Need/justification (Assigned by Requester)	The reason why the requester has asked for the code.

New Data Element Request / Data Element Change Request

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*) +country code:	
Phone (*) +country code:	

Data element Name :	
Data Element TAG:	
Action (*):	
Data element definition:	
Data Element Note:	
Based on composite:	
Based on segment:	
Based on message (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	

Business Need/justification (*):	
---	--

Structure (*):	
-----------------------	--

New Composite Data Element Request / Composite Change Request

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*) +country code:	
Phone (*) +country code:	

Composite TAG (*):	
Composite Name (*):	
Action (*):	
Composite Definition (*) (*):	
Composite Note:	
Based on Segment (*):	
Based on Message (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	

Business Need/Justification (*):	
---	--

Structure (*):

Position	Data Element Tag	Data Element Name	M/C

New Segment Request / Segment Change

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*)	
+country code:	
Phone (*)	
+country code:	

Segment TAG (*):	
Segment Name (*):	
Action (*):	
Segment Definition (*):	
Segment Note (*):	
Based on Message (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	

Business Need/Justification (*):	
---	--

Structure (*):

Position	Data Element Tag	Data Element Name	M/C	Occurrences

Request for a MID
(Message in development)

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*)	
+country code:	
Phone (*)	
+country code:	

Name of Message (*):	
Message TAG (e.g., INVOIC) (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	
Business Need / Justification (*):	

ATTACHED DOCUMENTATION

Request for a UNSM
(United Nations Standard Message)

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*)	
+country code:	
Phone (*)	
+country code:	

Name of Message (*):	
Message TAG (e.g., INVOIC) (*):	
Message function (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	
UN log of the MID (*):	
Business Need / Justification (*):	

ATTACHED DOCUMENTATION

Message Structure Change Request

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*)	
+country code:	
Phone (*)	
+country code:	

Message Name (*):	
Message TAG (e.g. INVOIC) (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	

Business Need/justification (*):	
---	--

Proposed change (*):	
-----------------------------	--

Message Deletion Request

UN LOG:	
UN DATE :	
Requester (*):	
EP LOG :	
EP DATE	
User ref (*):	
User date:	

Originator (*):	
Company (*):	
Address:	
Email (*):	
Fax (*)	
+country code:	
Phone (*)	
+country code:	

Message Name (*):	
Message TAG (e.g. INVOIC) (*):	
Based on Directory (*):	
Target Directory (*):	

Reason for deletion (*):	
---------------------------------	--

Informative Annex B

'Entry Point' Names and Contact Details

United Nations/Economic Commission for Europe
Trade Facilitation Section/EDIFACT Development Group
8 – 14 Avenue de la Paix
1211 Geneva 10
Switzerland
Ph: +41 22 907 2457; Fax: +41 22 917 0037
Edifact@unece.org
<<http://www.unece.org/cefact>>.

AZ Entry Point
John Pemberton
Diskray Pty Ltd
PO Box 28
KEIRAVILLE NSW 2500
AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 242293003; Fax: +61 242291635
acmcsec@w150.aone.net.au
<<http://www.tradegate.org.au/>>.

X12/DISA Entry Point
Data Interchange Standards Association (DISA)
333 John Carlyle Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314
>tel. USA 703-518-4168, fax USA 703-548-5738
Gaile L. Spadin gspadin@disa.org
Daniela Bilbro dbilbro@disa.org
<<http://www.disa.org>>

**Asia Pacific Council for Facilitation of Procedures and Practices for
Administration, Commerce and Transport (AFACT) - ASIA Entry Point**
Contact: Rie Sakamoto
JASPRO
Daichidaimon Building
2-10-1 Shibadaimon
Minatoku, Tokyo 105-0012
jastpro@red.an.egg.or.jp
<<http://www.afact.org>>

European Board for EDIFACT Standardization (EBES) Entry Point

Contact: Alain Dechamps

EBES c/o CEN-ISSS

Rue de Stassart, 36

1050 Brussels

Belgium

alain.dechamps@cenorm.be

Tel + 32 2 550 08 67, Fax +32 2 550 09 66

<<http://www.cenorm.be/ebes>>

Informative Annex C

List of Associated Technical Documents

1. UN/EDIFACT Message Design Rules for EDI (TRADE/WP.4/R.840/Rev 5)
2. UN/EDIFACT Rules for Presentation of Standardised Message and Directories Documentation (TRADE/WP.4/R.1023/Rev 4)
3. Technical Assessment Checklist (TAC) (Latest Version)
4. Message and Code Handbook (MACH)
5. Implementation Guides for DMRDEF and DMSTAT (Latest Versions)

Normative Annex D

Explanation of Code List Categories

The following definitions apply to the four categories of codes applicable to UN/EDIFACT messages and are provided to assist the user community in determining the correct information for inclusion in DMR preparation:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Description</u>
Class 1	Service data element code sets applicable to data element numbers 0001 – 0999 which are maintained by JSWG.
Class 2	User data element code sets which are maintained by UN/EDIFACT.
Class 3	User data element codes included in the international code lists issued as ISO International Standards and UN/ECE Recommendations which are endorsed by UN/EDIFACT. (Note. All UN/ECE Code Recommendations are maintained by the Codes Working Group (CDWG)).
Class 4	Proprietary code sets (e.g., industry or sector code sets) maintained by parties other than UN/EDIFACT, ISO or UN/ECE.