

dentsu TRACKING

Dentsu Aegis Network

EU SECONDARY REPOSITORY SPECIFICATIONS CHANGES FROM VERSION 1.4.4 TO 1.4.5

This document details the changes in the List of Specifications and Data Dictionary from version 1.4.4 to version 1.4.5 for the EU Secondary and Router.

Summary of changes

Date	Version	Done by	Comment
07.07.2022	1.0	Dentsu Aegis Network	
26.08.2022	1.1	Dentsu Aegis Network	Add the TotalupUI clarification Update the
08.09.2022	1.2	Dentsu Aegis Network	Publication

Publication

Date	Version	Submitted to
08.09.2022	1.2	Published

Confidentiality Statement

The information contained in these documents is confidential, privileged and only for the information of the intended recipient and may not be used, published or redistributed without the prior written consent of Dentsu Aegis Network.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	PURPOSE	4
1.2	TYPE OF UPDATES	4
1.3	SUMMARY OF CHANGES	4
2	LIST OF SPECIFICATIONS 1.4.5 UPDATES	5
2.1	[TECHNICAL] OPTIONAL EXTENSION TO THE DEACTIVATION EVENT (2.3)	5
3	DATA DICTIONARY 1.4.5 UPDATES	6
3.1	[TECHNICAL] TOTALUPI ONLY AVAILABLE FOR UI AFTER JULY 2020	6
3.2	[TECHNICAL] EVENT TIME VALIDATION	6
3.3	[COSMETIC] RCL EOID VALIDATION	7
3.4	[FUNCTIONAL] OPTIONAL EXTENSION TO THE DEACTIVATION EVENT (2.3)	7
3.5	[FUNCTIONAL] RELAXATION OF THE LOCATION VALIDATION ON AGGREGATION AND DISAGGREGATION PERFORMED OUTSIDE THE EU	8
3.6	[TECHNICAL] (4.1) INVOICE SELLER TECHNICAL VALIDATION	9
3.7	[TECHNICAL] (4.3) PAYMENT RECIPIENT TECHNICAL VALIDATION	9
3.8	[FUNCTIONAL] DISAGGREGATION ACKNOWLEDGMENT CONFIRMATION	10
3.8.1	<i>Legal ground</i>	10
3.8.2	<i>EUD – (3.6) Disaggregation of aggregated level UIs</i>	10
3.8.3	<i>Request</i>	11
3.8.4	<i>Response</i>	11
3.9	[COSMETIC] RCL – (5.0) RECALLS OF REQUESTS, OPERATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL MESSAGES	12

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This document describes the changes proposed to the Data Dictionary version 1.4.4 and the List of Specifications version 1.4.5.

1.2 Type of updates

In order to provide a better understanding of the proposed updates, each change is categorized as following.

- **Cosmetic:** the change corrects typo or wording elements without changing the feature purpose
- **Technical:** The change completes the current feature or correct minor omissions.
- **Functional:** the change adds or modifies the initial feature.

1.3 Summary of changes

Description	Type	Secondary repository	Router	Primary repository	ID Issuer	Economic Operator
TotalupUI only available for UI after July 2020	Technical		X			X
Event Time Validation	Technical	X	X	X	X	X
Optional extension to the deactivation event (2.3)	Functional	X	X	X		X
Relaxation of the location validation on aggregation and disaggregation performed outside the EU.	Functional	X	X	X		X
(4.1) Invoice Seller Technical Validation	Technical	X	X	X		X
(4.3) Payment Recipient Technical Validation	Technical	X	X	X		X
Disaggregation Acknowledgment Confirmation	Functional		X			X
RCL – (5.0) Recalls of requests, operational and transactional messages	Cosmetic	X	X	X		X

2 List Of Specifications 1.4.5 Updates

2.1 [Technical] Optional extension to the deactivation event (2.3).

PRIMARY

EO

Section: "4.2.3.1.1 Unit level unique identifier format"

Description of the change:

The deactivation of UI can be reported after the UI is issued and before its application with the deactivation reason unused (Deact_Reason1 = 5). The deactivation event support therefore different formats of the unit level identifier.

3 Data Dictionary 1.4.5 Updates

3.1 [Technical] TotalupUI only available for UI after July 2020.

EO

Section: “3.2.4.1 Information Type”

Description of the change: Complete the description with the limitation. Please note, however, that there is a certain limitation of the feature which is that if any of the underlying tobacco packs in the hierarchy represented by the aUIs sent in the message to check was produced before 1st of July 2020, the checksum returns “-1”.

Information_Type	Description
TotalupUI	<p>Total number of upUI present in the event.</p> <p>This optional field is supported on the following requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA – (3.2) Application of aggregated level UIs on aggregated packaging EDP – (3.3) Dispatch of tobacco products from a facility ERP – (3.4) Arrival of tobacco products at a facility ETL – (3.5) Trans-loading event EVR – (3.7) Report the delivery carried out with a vending van to retail outlet <p>Please note, however, that there is a certain limitation of the feature which is that if any of the underlying tobacco packs in the hierarchy represented by the aUIs sent in the message to check was produced before 1st of July 2020, the checksum returns “-1”.</p>

3.2 [Technical] Event Time Validation.

ALL

Section: “3.3.2 Timestamp”

Description of the change: Event Time Technical Validation

To prevent Economic Operator to report inaccurate Event Time information. An additional technical validation is introduced on the

- prevents dates to be reported prior to May 2019
- prevents dates in the future for more than 72 hours (the Router and the Primary repository).

Note the Event Time and Message Time Long are GMT timestamps.

Control	Description	Scope
VAL_TIME_2019	Prevent Event Time and message time long to be reported before May 2019	All messages
VAL_TIME_72	Prevent Event Time and Message Time long to be reported more than 72h in the future (compared with current time)	All messages

The related Error code have been added to support the technical validations

400	<p>TIME_2019</p> <p>Related Control: VAL_TIME_2019</p>	Error Descr: The field 'Event Time' or 'Message Time Long' is earlier than May 2019. No reported is allowed before that date.
-----	--	---

400	TIME_72	Error Descr: The field 'Event Time' or 'Message Time long' is reported in the future.
	Related Control: VAL_TIME_72	

3.3 [Cosmetic] RCL EOID validation.

PRIMARY

EO

Section: "3.3.4 Validation Scope"

Description of the change: align the Validation scope matrix to extend the RCL to the existence to the EOID.

3.3.4 Validation Scope

	IRU (2.1)	IRA (2.2)	IDA (2.3)	EUA (3.1)	EPA (3.2)	EDP (3.3)	ERP (3.4)	ETL (3.5)	EUD (3.6)	EVR (3.7)	EIV (4.1)	EPO (4.2)	EPR (4.3)	RCL (5)
Technical validation														
VAL_SEC_HASH	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_SEC_TOKEN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_MSG_JSON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_MSG_XML														
VAL_MSG_TYPE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_FIE_MAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_FIE_FORMAT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_FIE_REF	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_MSG_DUPLICATE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_MSG_CODE_DUPLICATE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VAL_UI_MULT_MSG	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Business rule validation														
UI creation														
VAL_UI_EXIST_APP			X	X										
VAL_UI_DUPLICATE_APP				X										
VAL_UI_EXIST_UPUI					X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
VAL_UI_EXIST_AUI					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
VAL_UI_EXIST_UPUI_SEQ			X		X	X	X	X		X				
VAL_UI_EXIST_AUI_SEQ			X		X	X	X	X	X	X				
VAL_UI_EXPIRY				X	X									
Entity Validation														
VAL_ENT_EXIST_EOID	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

3.4 [Functional] Optional extension to the deactivation event (2.3).

PRIMARY

EO

Section: "IDA – (2.3) Request for deactivation of UIs"

Description of the change: Extending of the deactivation event 2.3 to allow the deactivation of the UI not only based on the upUI(s) but as well on the upUI(L) and upUI(L) without timestamp. The receiving system (Primary repository, Router and Secondary repository) implements the existence validation on the different UI: upUI(s), upUI(L) and upUI(L) without timestamp.

Legal basis: The message 2.3 is clearly structured to permit the deactivation of UIs at any moment of their lifecycle, including when UIs are unused, i.e. not applied. In this sense, the addition of different “representations” of the same UI will be a purely technical extension. To recall, Annex II enables you “to extend the message content for strictly technical purposes to secure smooth functioning of the tobacco products traceability system”.

request for the deactivation of UIs – request					
Field	Description	Data Type	Cardinality	Priority	Values
Deact_upUI	List of unit packet level UIs to be deactivated	upUI(s) or upUI(L) or upUI(L) without timestamp	M	M, if Deact_Type = 1	

Automatic deactivation

The deactivation event (IDA 2.3) should be accepted (https status 200) for UI that have been expired (automatically deactivated)

3.5 [Functional] Relaxation of the location validation on aggregation and disaggregation performed outside the EU.

PRIMARY

EO

Section: “3.6.2.4.1 Import”

Description of the change: The process of aggregation and repacking in the case of the import scenario requires the ability to perform the Aggregation 3.2 and Disaggregation events 3.6 outside the EU on different location. Since no product movement can be reported outside the EU and prior to the arrival of the good in the EU, it has been identified that the location validation should be relaxed.

EPA 3.2 Aggregation event

Message Received	IRA 2.2	EUA 3.1 Import		EPA 3.2 parent UI Import			ERP 3.4 (Return)		EUD 3.6
				parent UI	parent UI	EPA 3.2 Child			
EPA 3.2 parent UI	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
EPA 3.2 child UI (upUI)	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
EPA 3.2 child UI (aUI)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

No
Yes
Yes (with Location Validation)

EUD 3.6 Disaggregation event

Message Received									
EUD 3.6		EPA 3.2 parent UI	EPA 3.2 parent UI Import	EPA 3.2 Child Import	EPA 3.2 Child Import	ERP 3.4	ERP 3.4 (Return)	EUD 3.6	EUD 3.6 (aUI implicitly disaggregated) - reuse of aUI
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

No
Yes
Yes (with Location Validation)

3.6 [Technical] (4.1) Invoice Seller technical Validation.

PRIMARY

EO

Section: "3.8.1.1"

Description of the change: Add the validation for the Invoice (4.1) event the EOID field should be equal to the seller EOID (EOID = Invoice_Seller).

EIV (4.1)	
Technical validation	
VAL_EOID_SELLER	Invoice_Seller , EOID field must be equal to the seller EOID (EOID = Invoice_Seller)

3.7 [Technical] (4.3) Payment Recipient technical Validation.

PRIMARY

EO

Section: "3.8.3.1"

Description of the change: Additional technical validation for the Payment event (4.3) on the recipient identity of the payment (EOID = Payment_Recipient)

EPR (4.3)	
Technical validation	
VAL_EOID_PAYMENT_RECIPIENT	Payment_Recipient, Technical validation recipient identity of the payment (EOID = Payment_Recipient)

3.8 [Functional] Disaggregation Acknowledgment Confirmation

PRIMARY

EO

Section: “3.6.6 EUD – (3.6) Disaggregation of aggregated level UIs”

Description of the change: The following optional functionality, provides technical information to the economic operator on the reporting of the disaggregation event (3.6)

3.8.1 Legal ground

The justification of scope is derived from careful reading of Article 36(3) of Implementing Regulation 2018/574, i.e. the same Article that provides for generation of checksum values. The idea behind the Article is that there must be a mechanism allowing for validating transmission, also in terms of its integrity. The message integrity is a broad term, but definitely encompasses both completeness and correctness. These two characteristics of data transmission fall under the sending party’s responsibility (Articles 36(3) and 32(7) should be read jointly).

For most of messages, a basic checksum appears to be sufficient to prove both completeness and correctness of data transmission. The sending party is usually aware of the results of its message, so after receiving the positive acknowledgement with the correct checksum value (recall code), the sending party can simply assume that the concerned UIs have taken a new correct state in line with the just-transmitted message. For example, a dispatch message changes the state of a UI from in stock to in transit. Both state/location and UI are known to the operator. The situation is clearly different for disaggregation messages. The sending party cannot be sure if the positive acknowledgment truly means that the correct outcome has been achieved as regards the “subordinate/child” UIs, which have become the top level UIs. In fact, under the system’s current configuration, the correctness of the resulting “subordinate/child” is only confirmed in the validation of a next logistic operation.

The list of the resulting “subordinate/child” UIs should only provide for the necessary assurance as to the disaggregation message in question. Therefore, it should not include any further subordinate levels of UIs, because such a feedback would go beyond what is necessary for concluding on the integrity of transmission.

Finally, it is important to underline that the proposed feedback would not be provided in response to a query, but as a part of the validation/acknowledgement mechanism. This also explains why there is no contradiction between the proposed extension to the disaggregation acknowledgement and the line taken with respect to the industry’s attempts to receive a possibility of querying the system.

3.8.2 EUD – (3.6) Disaggregation of aggregated level UIs

3.8.2.1 Description

Event showing that an aggregation no longer exists.

3.8.2.2 Description of the fields

aUI disaggregation event					
Field	Description	Data Type	Cardinality	Priority	Values

BasicInfo_Req	Block of basic information elements	Component << Basic Information Request >>	S	M	Message_Type = EUD
EO_ID	Economic operator's identifier	EOID	S	M	
F_ID	Facility's identifier	FID	S	M	
Event_Time	Time of event occurrence	Time(s)	S	M	
Message_Time_long	Message sending Time	Time(L)	S	M	
aUI	Aggregated level UI subject to disaggregation	aUI	S	M	
disaUI_comment	Comments by the reporting entity	Text(5000)	S	O	
Information	Indicates the request of additional optional information (only available on the Router interface)	Boolean	S	O	0 – No 1- Yes

3.8.3 Request

The "Information" field should be set to 1
This feature is only available on the Router.

3.8.4 Response

In the response messages the Information block contains the Data_List field that holds the list of "subordinate/child" UIs

3.8.4.1 Response Information block

Basic information block concerning the response - schema					
Field	Description	Data Type	Cardinality	Priority	Values
Information_Type	The identifier of the type of information	Text(5000)	S	M	
Data	Indicates the failure of the message reception	Text(5000)	S	M	0 – No 1- Yes
Data_List	Array of strings	Text(string limit = 5000)	M	O	

```
{
  ...
  "Information": [
    {
      "Info_Type": "ChildUIList",
      "Data": null,
      "Data_List": ["UI1", "UI2"]
    }
  ],
  ...
}
```

3.8.4.2 Information_Type

Information_Type	Description
ChildUIList	<p>List of children</p> <p>This optional field is supported on the following requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EUD – (3.6)

3.9 [Cosmetic] RCL – (5.0) Recalls of requests, operational and transactional messages.

PRIMARY

EO

Section: “3.10.1.6 Error response sample”

Description: The description of the error code refers to a potential IRU or IRA recall. This is incorrect as Recall doesn’t apply on the IRU nor IRA but only The reference to IRU and IRA should be removed.

400	RECALL_AFTER_ONE_WORKING_DAY	For requests of unit level or aggregated level Uis (ISU, IRU , ISA, IRA), recalls can be performed up to one working day after the original message.
-----	------------------------------	---