

AUDIT
REPORT

OF THE

Merged D10A CCL Directories

August 2010 to January 2011

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. OVERVIEW	3
3. HISTORY OF FILES RECEIVED.	5
3.1 CCL FROM TBG17	5
3.2 RSM DOCUMENTS RECEIVED:	5
3.2.1 From TBG1	5
3.2.2 From TBG12	7
3.2.3 From TBG18:.....	8
4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT	10
4.1 D.09B / D.10A DIFFERENCES.....	10
5. RSM REVIEW:.....	15
5.1 RSMs NON CONFORM.....	15

1. Introduction

The ICG is pleased to announce that the D.10A is now complete and that CCL library can be released for publication.

No audit was performed on the Reference-BIE and Reference-qDT libraries.

2. Overview

The initial review of the CCL library began with the reception of the CCL file on 2010-06-30 however work did not effectively begin until 2010-08-29 due to vacation. Unfortunately at that time attempts to open the provided file were ineffective as it appeared to be corrupted. A new version was sent on 2010-08-30, which was the file used for the initial audit.

The D.01A directory began during the Forum meeting in August 2010 and an initial audit report was provided on TBG17 on 2010-08-31. The ICG provided TBG17 with a review of this report on 2010-09-02 indicating the anomalies found and the motivations behind them.

TBG17 after reviewing the problems identified and the time necessary to correct them, decided to merge the D.10B production into the D.10A production and to provide only a single D.10 CCL for 2010. The first release of this merged file was received on 2010-11-06.

The complete history of the files received during the audit process can be found under section 2, "History of files received".

The main issue with this release concerned the TBG1 RSMs. TBG1 decided, without consultation, to change the content of the RSM documentation. This meant that it was not possible to clearly identify the message structures of the TBG1 electronic documents making their audit not possible.

After discussion with TBG1 it was agreed to add the XMI (UML version) of the TBG1 messages into the RSMs. This addition enabled the complete structures to be validated.

Consequently the ICG would like to stress that the TBG1 message structures were validated with the UML XMI content and not with the partial diagrams provided in the message RSMs. Anyone wishing to see the complete structure should use the XMI content. The ICG found this acceptable since it provides a way forward towards the use of UML which is a UN/CEFACT objective.

The ICG also identified a problem concerning ABIE harmonisation as during the audit it identified the following ABIEs as being strictly identical except for the addition of a qualifier positioning the ABIE in a specific document. With a generic qualifier the document would be equally valid. Examples of such ABIEs are:

- The Class CIOH_ Exchanged_ Document and the class CIOCH_ Exchanged_ Document;
- The Class AAA_ Journal_ Person and the class, AAA_Wrap_ Person, (the addition of an optional Martial Status to these would make them identical to the class AAA_ Chart Of Accounts_ Person). The class AAA_ Report_ Person could also be investigated for harmonisation.

In certain cases the conceptual models are being developed making use of ACCs. This is not the purpose of an ACC nor is it the intent of a conceptual model. A conceptual model is supposed to express the business requirements for an electronic document in "business terms". In a considerable number of cases the business terms are being lost through the use of generalised core components that have no particular business meaning thus losing the single most important justification for the move from a UN/EDIFACT environment to the UMM environment. This practise should be stopped as quickly as possible and the conceptual models should be revised to clearly reflect the business requirements in business oriented language and not in a totally neutral language.

In some instances the canonical model does not show the attributes expected in the canonical model thus making it impossible to verify that the required attributes for the electronic document are indeed present in the CCL. The audit can therefore only verify that the required relationships between classes are present and consistent.

The use of abstract classes is becoming more and more prevalent and their semantic significance is difficult to apprehend. Rules should be defined in order to determine when and why an abstract class should be used.

There is a considerable number of infinite loops, one even looping the entire message itself. Mechanisms should be devised to explain the motivations for such loops and to indicate how they are intended to be restricted.

3. History of files received.

3.1 CCL from TBG17

File CCL10A-29JUN10.zipfile 17h40 – Verification work on this file did not effectively begin until 2010-08-29 due to vacation. However, attempts to open it were ineffective as it appeared to be corrupted.

A new version was sent on 2010-08-30 under the filename CCL10A 29JUN10.zip which was the file used for the initial audit.

A merged version, CCL10A 05NOV10.zip, was sent on 2010-11-06 00h15 which included the D10B updates. This version cancelled and replaced all other work.

A revised version, CCL10A 02DEC10.xls, was sent on 2010-12-02 containing corrections.

Another revised version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls was sent on 2010-12-15 with further corrections.

A fourth revised version CCL10A 21DEC10.xls was sent on 2010-12-22 with further corrections.

A fifth revised version CCL10A 04JAN11.xls was sent on 2011-01-04 with corrections from the previous pass

The final revised version CCL10A 11JAN11.xls was sent on 2011-01-11 with corrections to the previous pass.

This audit report only addresses this last document.

3.2 RSM documents received:

3.2.1 From TBG1

- **The reception of the first list of RSMs was confirmed on 2010-11-11.**

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross_Industry_Catalogue_2+02+00.doc

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Invoice_2+05+00+draft.docx

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Order_2.02+CCL10A.docx

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Quotation_1.01+CCL10A.docx

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process_2+03+draft.docx

Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process_1+03+draft.docx

Specification+TBG1+RSM+Report+++Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice_1+02+-+10A.docx

- **A second revision of all these documents was received on 2010-12-04 containing all the revised documents but the same errors were apparent.**

- **A third revision of the documents was received on 2010-12-20**

Catalogue

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/44564735/Specification+TBG1_RSM_Cross_Industry_Catalogue_2+04+00.doc

Invoice

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965007/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Invoice+2+08+00+draft.docx>

Remittance Advice

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965169/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Report+-+Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice+1+04+-+10A.docx>

Order

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/4948735/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Order+2.04+CCL10A.docx>

Scheduling

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965210/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process+1+05+draft.docx>

Delivery

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965229/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process+2+05+draft.docx>

Quotation

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/7536676/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Quotation+1.03+CCL10A.docx>

- ***A forth revision of the documents was received on 2011-01-04***

CII

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965007/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Invoice+2+09+00+draft.docx>

CIC

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/44564735/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Catalogue+2+05+00.zip>

CIO

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/4948735/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Order+2.05+CCL10A.docx>

CIQ

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/7536676/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Quotation+1.04+CCL10A.docx>

CID

<http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965229/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process+2+06+draft.docx>

CIR

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965169/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Report+-+Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice_1+05+-+10A.docx

CIS

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965210/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process_1+06+draft.docx

- **A fifth revision of the documents was received on 2011-01-26**

Catalogue

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/44564735/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross_Industry_Catalogue_2+06.docx

Invoice

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965007/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Invoice_2+10+00+draft.docx

Remittance Advice

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965169/Specification+TB+G1+RSM+Report+-+Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice_1+06+-+10A.docx

Order

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/4948735/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Order_2.06+CCL10A.docx

Scheduling

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965210/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process_1+07+draft.docx

Delivery

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/5965229/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process_2+07+draft.docx

Quotation

http://www1.unece.org/cefact/platform/download/attachments/7536676/Specification+TB+G1_RSM_Cross_Industry+Quotation_1.05+CCL10A.docx

3.2.2 From TBG12

- **Accounting Message**

The first version of the Accounting message (TBG12-18_RSM_Accounting_Message_v1.33.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

Followed by the following versions TBG12-18_RSM_Accounting_Message_v1.4.doc, TBG12-18_RSM_Accounting_Message_v1.4a.doc, TBG12-18_RSM_Accounting_Message_v1.4b.doc

A fifth version of Accounting Message (TBG12-18_RSM_Accounting_Message_v1.5.doc) was received on 2010-12-15.

- **Financial Reporting**

The first version of the Financial Reporting Message (TBG12-18_RSM_Financial_Reporting_v1.72.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

A second version of Financial Reporting (TBG12-18_RSM_Financial_Reporting_v1.9.doc) was received on 2010-12-15.

A third version of Financial Reporting (TBG12-18_RSM_Financial_Reporting_v1.10.doc) was received on 2010-12-28.

- **Accounting entry**

The first version of the Accounting Entry Message (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Entry_v3.3.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

A second version of Accounting Entry (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Entry_v3.4.doc) was received on 2010-12-15.

A third version of Accounting Entry (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Entry_v3.51.doc) was received on 2011-01-05.

- **Accounting Journal**

The first version of the Accounting Journal Message (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Journal_v1.4.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

A second version of Accounting Journal (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Journal_v1.5.doc) was received on 2010-12-10.

A Third version of Accounting Journal (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Journal_v1.6.doc) was received on 2010-12-15.

- **Accounting Ledger**

The first version of the Accounting Ledger Message (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Ledger_v1_34.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

A second version of Accounting Ledger (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Ledger_v1_35.doc) was received on 2010-12-10.

A third version of Accounting Ledger (TBG12_RSM_Accounting_Ledger_v1_5.doc) was received on 2010-12-10.

- **Chart of Accounts**

The first version of the Chart of Accounts message (TBG12_RSM_Chart_of_Accounts_1.34.doc) was received on 2010-11-05.

A second version of Chart of Accounts (TBG12_RSM_Chart_of_Accounts_1.35.doc) was received on 2010-12-15.

A third version of Chart of Accounts (TBG12_RSM_Chart_of_Accounts_1.36.doc) was received on 2010-12-28.

3.2.3 From TBG18:

- **Proxy Document**

A first version of the Proxy document (TBG18_RSM_Electronic_Data_Exchange_Proxy_v1.3-1.doc) was received on 2010-11-08.

A second version of the Proxy document (TBG 18_RSM_Electronic_Data_Exchange_Proxy_v1.3-2.doc) was received on 2010-11-30.

A third version of the Proxy Document (TBG 18_RSM_Electronic_Data_Exchange_Proxy_v1.3-3.doc) was received on 2010-12-07.

A fourth version of the Proxy Document (TBG 18_RSM_Electronic_Data_Exchange_Proxy_v1.3-4.doc) was received on 2011-01-04.

- **Cattle Document**

A first version of the Cattle document (20101101 TBG 18_RSM_CRIE V1.2.doc) was received on 2010-11-08.

A second version of the Cattle document (20101201 fvdTBG 18_RSM_CRIE V1.3.doc) was received on 2010-12-02.

A third version of the Cattle document (20101201 fvdTBG 18_RSM_CRIE V1.3.2.doc) was received on 2010-12-03

A fourth version of the Cattle document (20101207 fvdTBG 18_RSM_CRIE V1.3.2.doc) was received on 2010-12-08

4. Detailed Assessment

4.1 D.09B / D.10A Differences

D.09B UID	D.09B Name	Audit Comments
PASS 1		
UN01000042	Basic_ Work Item. Subordinate. Basic_ Work Item	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. Since it is a deprecated item, changes should normally not take place TBG17: We agree that DEPs shouldn't normally be changed, but in this case we think it was necessary. The publication comment directed use of an ASBIE which didn't exist, so we changed the pub comment. Couldn't change the DEP to CHG, because it is still a DEP.
UN01006877	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Seller Order_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006878	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Buyer Order_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006879	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Promotional Deal_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006880	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Contract_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006881	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Additional_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006911	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Settlement. Payable_ Specified. CI_ Trade_ Accounting Account	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01006912	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Settlement. Purchase_ Specified. CI_ Trade_ Accounting Account	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: This was fixed in 09B.1.
UN01000037	Basic_ Work Item. Reference File. Binary Object	This has been changed even though its been deprecated TBG17: This is not deprecated, and we can't find any changes.
UN01000066	Production_ Software. Version. Identifier	This has been changed and there is no change indicator. TBG17: Agree, put CHG in Column A.
UN01007485	Trade_ Product Warranty. Description. Text	This has disappeared from the CCL TBG17: Not in 09B.1
UN00000865	Quantity Analysis. Status. Code	This is a deprecated item that has been changed TBG17: We agree that DEPs shouldn't normally be changed. In this case we corrected a typo (had in stead rather than instead). We put CHG in Column A.
UN01007599	Party_ Contact. Additional_ Identification. Identifier	New BBIE no ADD indicator TBG17: Agree. We put ADD in Column A.

UN00004860		<p>Changed and no change indicator</p> <p>TBG17: We found no differences, and had asked what difference you found. Since we don't want to see this one a third time, we put CHG in column A.</p> <p>For information: an extra space at the end of the description has been suppressed</p>
UN00004969		<p>Changed and no change indicator</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in column A.</p>
Pass 2		
UN01002519	Note. Details	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B).</p>
UN01006877	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Seller Order_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	<p>This has been changed and there is no change indicator.</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in Column A</p>
UN01006878	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Buyer Order_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	<p>This has been changed and there is no change indicator.</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in Column A</p>
UN01006879	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Promotional Deal_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	<p>This has been changed and there is no change indicator.</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in Column A</p>
UN01006880	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Contract_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	<p>This has been changed and there is no change indicator.</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in Column A</p>
UN01006881	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement. Additional_ Referenced. CI_ Referenced_ Document	<p>This has been changed and there is no change indicator.</p> <p>TBG17: We put CHG in Column A</p>
UN01006911	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Settlement. Payable_ Specified. CI_ Trade_ Accounting Account	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We think this needed a change indicator; so we put CHG in Column A.</p>
UN01006912	CIDDL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Settlement. Purchase_ Specified. CI_ Trade_ Accounting Account	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We think this needed a change indicator; so we put CHG in Column A.</p>
UN01002520	Note. Subject. Text	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.</p>
UN01002521	Note. Content. Code	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.</p>
UN01002522	Note. Content. Text	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition</p> <p>TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.</p>
UN01002523	Note. Subject. Code	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already</p>

		exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.
UN01002524	Note. Identification. Identifier	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.
UN01002525	Note. Name. Text	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.
UN01002526	Note. Creation. Date Time	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition.
UN00000383	Party. Role. Code	change indicator but no change identified
UN00000384	Party. Language. Code	change indicator but no change identified
Pass 3		
UN01002519	Note. Details	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the ABIE in question in line 3698 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22 TBG17: Change indicator removed.
UN01002520	Note. Subject. Text	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3699 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22 TBG17: Change indicator removed.
UN01002521	Note. Content. Code	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the

		<p>UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3700 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22</p> <p>TBG17: Change indicator removed.</p>
UN01002522	Note. Content. Text	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3701 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22</p> <p>TBG17: Change indicator removed.</p>
UN01002523	Note. Subject. Code	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3702 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22</p> <p>TBG17: Change indicator removed.</p>
UN01002524	Note. Identification. Identifier	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3703 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22</p> <p>TBG17: Change indicator removed.</p>
UN01002525	Note. Name. Text	<p>Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3704 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls.</p>

		Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22 TBG17: Change indicator removed.
UN01002526	Note. Creation. Date Time	Incorrect change indicator: Already exists in D.09B and is not an addition TBG17: We don't find this in the Message BIEs from 09B.1. (Or 09B). So it is an addition. The D.09B-1 file named CCL09B.1_18MAY10_Full.xls that I have just reloaded from the UN/CEFACT website contains the BBIE in question in line 3705 of the Message BIE folder. Unchanged in version CCL10A 14DEC10.xls. Corrected CCL version provided 2010-12-22 TBG17: Change indicator removed.
UN01000379	Procuring_ Project. Total_ Budget. Amount	Changed, no change indicator TBG17: No visible change. Please indicate precisely what has changed.
UN02000010	Payment Means_ Code. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000011	Payment Method_ Code. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000069	Dangerous Goods Packaging Level_ Code. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000070	Dangerous Goods Regulation_ Code. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000095	Weight_ Measure. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000083	Payment Terms Type_ Code. Type	Added no change indicator TBG17: ADD indicator added.
UN02000003	Identifier. Content	Changed, no change indicator TBG17: CHG indicator added.
UN02000030	Code. Content	Changed, no change indicator TBG17: CHG indicator added.
UN02000051	Code. Content	Changed, no change indicator TBG17: CHG indicator added.
UN01008912	AAA Entry_ Capital Asset Amortization. Specified. AAA_ Period	This should be to Delimited_ Period as defined in RSM. In addition it is also identified as Delimited_ Period in column BV of the CCL. TBG17: The change has been made in the CCL.
UN01005479	CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context	This appears no longer to be used in any message and should be withdrawn TBG17: The CCL is correct. The new TBG1 RSMs are being corrected.
Pass 4		
UN01000379	Procuring_ Project. Total_ Budget. Amount	Changed, no change indicator TBG17: No visible change. Please indicate precisely what has changed. The word "supplier?s" was changed to "supplier's" in column G.
UN02000095	Weight_ Measure. Type	Incorrect change indicator, ADD instead of CHG

5. RSM Review:

The TBG1 RSM documentation is inconsistent and introduces the use of another RSM to describe scoped classes that it privileges for use in new message development. In order to reduce documentation in each business message it simply refers to the scoped classes. This signifies that the RSM for the BRS documentation is incomplete without the scoped documentation and that if the scoped document changes then all change without necessarily requiring such a change. The ICG does not believe that such a principle should be maintained and urges the groups to make use of UML which in essence resolves such documentation issues.

5.1 RSMs non conform

RSM	Audit Comments
PASS 1	
electronic bovine animal registration exchange	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technically there are 3 messages so there should be 3 canonical models 2. The roles defined in the model are not the same as the property terms of the ASBIEs so there is a problem there. 3. The ABIE Responsible_ Person does not exist in the CCL 4. The ABIE Cross Border Animal Movement Issue cannot be used
electronic Data Proxy Message	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ABIE Delimited_ Period does not exist 2. The multiplicity of at least 7 relations are wrong It could be that the CCL that is wrong (example Unstructured_ Address from Proxy_ Party has a multiplicity of 0..1 in the model and in the CCL it has 1..1). 3. No multiplicity for the Telex relation 4. The BBIEs of the Payment_ Financial Institution are incorrect in three cases.
Cross_Industry Invoice	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missing relationship between CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context and CI_ Document Context_ Parameter. 2. There are no dependent relations for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Trade_ Party b. CI_ Trade_ Product c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms e. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment f. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event g. CI_ Trade Allowance Charge h. CI_ Trade_ Tax i. CI_ Logistics_ Service Charge j. CI_ Trade_ Payment Terms k. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means l. CI_ Trade_ Price m. CI_ Supply Chain_ Packaging 3. Not all relations have the "composite" indication TBG1: fixed 4. Diagrams are partially incomplete and have to be related to another. This is basically a problem due to the way the classes are referenced. It

	<p>would be considerably easier if a class which went no further was indicated as a "leaf" and one which was detailed on another page was indicated with the section reference. One is not sure whether the incomplete diagram or the complete one is the correct one.</p> <p>TBG1: notes added – note contains "leaf" if it goes no further</p>
Cross_Industry_Catalogue	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Cross_Industry+Order	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Cross_Industry+Quotation	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice	The points indicated above being true for all the cross industry documents full checking was stopped.
Accounting_Message	No issues identified
Financial_Reporting	No issues identified Note: There is an infinite loop with AAA_Report TBG17: This is not a violation of CCTS, so no change is needed.
Accounting_Entry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relation exists in CCL but not in model: Posted_Accounting Entry Line and Fiscal Tax as well as Fiscal Tax and Booked Accounting Account TBG12 – changed RSM and canonical model according to relation existing in CCL Relation exists in model but not in CCL Posted_Accounting Line Monetary Value and Fiscal Tax TBG12 – removed the relation in RSM and canonical model Relation to AAA_Period exists in Model but not in CCL for Portioned_Monetary Allocation TBG12 – changed the relation in RSM and canonical model according to relation existing in CCL: Portioned_Monetary Allocation. Related. Delimited_Period (UN01003927)
Accounting_Journal	No issues identified
Accounting_Ledger	No issues identified
Chart_of_Accounts	<p>Missing element in AAA Chart of Accounts_ Person (Marital state). TBG17: Added BBIE.</p> <p>Note there are 2 infinite loops in this document. TBG17: This is not a violation of CCTS, so no change is needed.</p> <p>There is also an unusual infinite loop to the root class of the document TBG17: This is not a violation of CCTS, so no change is needed.</p>
Common Supply Chain Classes	This was positioned at the end of the RSM under the heading Additional information. It turns out that it apparently contained the missing parts of theCII and

	<p>others canonical model.</p> <p>The following problems were identified in this document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The identification of single classes such as CI_Trade_Accounting Account has absolutely no added value. It would be clearer to identify them in a note every time they are used as being a "leaf". TBG17: We see added value, for reusability and commonality. 2. The title headings are confusing. For example the title Accounting (CSC-ACC) – CI_Trade_Accounting Account. This IMO should be simply the name of the class. TBG1: These are references to the BRS and provide value. 3. The terms CSC-ACC are not defined. There are also titles that are incorrect such as 4.36. TBG1: These are references to the BRS and provide value. Please provide the rule or reference that shows these are incorrect. 4. The titles which have no content serve no purpose and in some cases are incorrect or confusing (see 4.14 and 4.26) TBG1: These are references to the BRS and provide value. Please provide the rule or reference that shows these are incorrect. 5. The following Classes do not appear to be required in the CII: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ci_Delivery_Adjustment b. CI_Delivery_Instructions c. CI_Financial_Adjustment d. CI_Supply Chain_Forecast Terms e. CI_Supply Chain_Inventory f. CI_Handling_Instructions g. CI_Referenced_Product h. Logistics_Shipping Marks i. CI_Supply Chain_Supply Plan j. CI_Transport_Dangerous Goods k. CI_Workflow Object TBG1: Agree. This is intentional. The changes made in the CII make it clear which common ABIEs are used. 6. The following classes exist in section 5 but not in the section 4 model: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_Logistics_Transport Equipment TBG1: Included in 4.5. Consignment (CSC-CNS) – CI_Supply Chain_Consignment b. CI_Logistics_Package TBG1: Removed from section 5. c. CI_Returnable asset_Instructions TBG1: see 4.28 CI_Supply Chain_Packaging d. Specified_Binary File TBG1: see 4.15
--	--

	<p>7. The following class structures are incomplete:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context Parameter TBG1: The diagram should have been for CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context. Corrected. b. Specified_ Binary File (4.15) TBG1: Added to Section 4 c. CI_ Legal Organization TBG1: Added the diagram. d. CI_ Tax_ Registration TBG1: Added the diagram. <p>5. It should be stressed that the canonical model is designed to reflect the complete requirements of the corresponding XML Schema or other syntax implementation. Nothing more and nothing less should be found within the model in question. IMO the "Common" part of schema is in reality not common but merely a list of disjoint classes that could be used somewhere. They certainly should not appear in the canonical model since they are not implementable in their entirety.</p> <p>TBG1 and TBG17: The model does not contain items that are not used, so no impact on the schema. No rules were violated, so no change made.</p> <p>6. Since this problem is common to all the TBG 1 RSMs I have carried out no further reviews other than to verify that this is the case. Consequently they will all have to be revised.</p> <p>TBG1 and TBG17: We disagree that this is a problem, but the RSMs are being changed to better identify which ABIEs from the common ABIEs are being used.</p>
<p>PASS 2</p>	
<p>electronic Data Proxy Message</p>	<p>There still remains an incompatibility between the CCL and the Model . The relation Proxy_Party and Client_Business_Account has a multiplicity of 0..* in the model and 0..1 in the CCL</p> <p>TBG18: Corrected the RSM.</p>
<p>electronic bovine animal registration exchange</p>	<p>The class Cross Border Animal Movement_ Issue details is still present in all models and no longer exists in the CCL.</p> <p>TBG18: Removed from RSM.</p> <p>The initial canonical model covering all messages serves no purpose and should be deleted.</p> <p>TBG18: RSM corrected.</p> <p>Cross Border Livestock Message: The relations between Livestock Animal and Specified classification (unified appearance applicable and national appearance applicable) do not have the same multiplicity as in the CCL.</p> <p>Electronic animal passport message: since this message is identical to the Cross Border Livestock Message the same problems exist.</p> <p>Animal Inspection Message: Same problem with the Livestock Animal class.</p> <p>TBG18: RSM corrected.</p>

PASS 3	
electronic Data Proxy Message	<p>The canonical model does not provide all the information specified in the Conceptual model and in some cases provides additional information to that specified in the conceptual model. In essence the two models are inconsistent.</p> <p>Unstructured_Address.Country Sub-Division Name has a multiplicity that doesn't correspond to the CCL.</p> <p>TBG18: RSM corrected.</p>
electronic bovine animal registration exchange	No other issues
Accounting_Message	No issues identified
Financial_Reporting	No issues identified
Accounting_Entry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relation to Delimited_Period in Portioned_Monetary Allocation has no multiplicity. <p>TBG12 – Changes multiplicity 1 to 1..1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delimited_Period does not have the same number of attributes in the CCL as in the canonical model. <p>TBG12 – Removes the following attributes from the canonical model (Inclusive, Description, Complete, Function)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relation AAA Entry_Capital Asset Amortization. Specified. AAA_Period should be to Delimited_Period <p>TBG12 – Changes the association to Delimited_Period</p>
Accounting_Journal	No issues identified
Accounting_Ledger	No issues identified
Chart_of_Accounts	No issues identified
Cross_Industry Invoice	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_Document Context_Parameter b. CI_Trade_Party c. CI_Referenced_Document d. CI_Trade_Delivery Terms e. CI_Supply Chain_Consignment f. CI_Supply Chain_Event g. CI_Trade_Currency Exchange h. CI_Trade_Allowance Charge i. CI_Trade_Tax j. CI_Trade Settlement_Payment Means k. CI_Trade Payment Terms l. CI_Trade_Product m. CI_Trade_Price n. CI_Supply Chain_Packaging o. CI_Logistics_Service Charge

	<p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>2. It is inconsistent to find classes on a page that interrelate but which have no relationships between them. Examples: CI_ Trade_ Party and CI_ Referenced_ Document in 6.2.4, 6.2.5, 6.2.6 etc, CI_ Specified_ Period and CI_ Referenced_ Document in 6.2.6, CI_ Trade_ Allowance Charge and CI_ Trade Tax in 6.2.6 etc.</p> <p>TBG1: added a note clarifying that all relationships between CI (common classes) are shown only in the common RSM. This is to avoid maintenance/versioning issues. Therefore you could include this in the text of point 1 above.</p> <p>3. CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context has disappeared from the model but is still referenced in the documentation</p> <p>TBG1: This was an error in the RSM, it should have been CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context</p> <p>4. 6.2.14 the relationship Grouped_ Work Item. Actual. Work Item_ Complex Description is missing.</p> <p>TBG1: Valuation Breakdown Statement and Grouped and Basic Work Item have been reworked to be more consistent and now includes the missing elements.</p>
Cross_Industry_Catalogue	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms e. CI_ Trade_ Tax f. CI_ Trade Payment Terms g. CI_ Supply Chain_ Packaging h. CI_ Logistics_ Location i. CI_ Trade_ Country j. CI_ Transport_ Dangerous Goods k. CI_ Handling_ Instructions l. CI_ Product_ Characteristic m. CI_ Product_ Classification n. CI_ Trade_ Product Instance o. Specified_ Binary File <p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>2. Section 6.2.1.3 should be suppressed as it is</p>

	<p>completely described in section 6.2.1 and is only confusing.</p> <p>TBG1: Removed diagram 6.2.1.3</p> <p>3. 6.2.1.5 the ABIE Trade Product_ Supply Chain_ Packaging. Is missing the relations to CI_ Returnable Asset_ Instructions and CI_ Packaging_ Marking</p> <p>TBG1: updated diagram 6.2.1.5</p>
Cross_Industry+Order	<p>2. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Tax e. CI_ Trade Payment Terms a. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment b. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event c. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means d. CI_ Trade_ Currency Exchange e. CI_ Trade_ Allowance Charge f. CI_ Trade_ Product g. CI_ Trade_ Price a. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan <p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>3. The relationships should e expressed as composite relations.</p> <p>TBG1: fixed</p> <p>4. The relations within CI_ Document Context_ Parameter in 6.2.1 do not exist in the CCL</p> <p>TBG1: This was an error in the RSM, it should have been CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context</p> <p>5. The class CIOH_ Exchanged_ Document is identical to the class CIOCH_ Exchanged_ Document. One should be removed.</p> <p>TBG1: A future version of this RSM will add qualified datatypes which will differentiate between these. Therefore they remain unchanged in this version.</p>
Cross_Industry+Quotation	<p>2. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document</p>

	<p>in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms e. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event f. CI_ Trade_ Currency Exchange g. CI_ Trade_ Allowance Charge h. CI_ Trade_ Tax i. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means j. CI_ Trade Payment Terms k. CI_ Trade_ Product l. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan <p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>3. The ABIE Specified_ Binary File is missing the relation to Specified_ Period in 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3 and 6.2.4</p> <p>TBG1: added a note clarifying that all relationships between CI (common classes) are shown only in the common RSM. This is to avoid maintenance/versioning issues. Therefore you could include this in the text of point 1 above.</p> <p>4. Remove the detail of CIQL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Delivery from 6.2.7 since it is provided in 6.2.6 alternatively add the relationship to CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan</p> <p>TBG1: Diagram in 6.2.6. removed. Diagram in 6.2.7. updated</p>
Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process	<p>6. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Supply Chain_ Packaging e. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms h. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment i. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event j. CI_ Trade_ Product k. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan l. CI_ Handling_ Instructions

	<p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The section 6.2.2 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document. TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_ Document Line_ Document diagrams 2. The section 6.2.3 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document. In addition it partially repeats other views incompletely. TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_ Document Line_ Document diagrams 3. The section 6.2.7 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document. TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_ Document Line_ Document diagrams 4. The section 6.2.11 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document. TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_ Document Line_ Document diagrams
<p>Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CISH_ Supply Chain_ Trade Delivery incomplete in section 6.2.1. and not described elsewhere TBG1: fixed 6.2.1 – simplified with notes pointing to detailed diagrams 2. CIS_ Supply Chain_ Trade Agreement incomplete in section 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere TBG1: fixed 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 3. CIS_ Document Line_ Document in section 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere TBG1: fixed as above

	<p>4. CISDFL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Delivery in section 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere</p> <p>TBG1: fixed as above</p> <p>The number of missing items in the model prevents further analysis of this document.</p> <p>TBG1: missing diagrams added – similar pattern used as in Delivery process</p>
Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Trade_ Party b. CI_ Referenced_ Document c. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means d. CI_ Trade_ Currency Exchange <p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>5. The structure in section 5.2.1 cannot be developed into a valid schema since one half of the classes are unrelated to the MA class.</p> <p>TBG1: changed section 5 to 6 to be consistent with other RSMs. Updated 5.2.1 by simplifying and adding notes</p> <p>6. The section 5.2.2 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>7. The section5.2.3 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>8. The section5.2.4 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>9. The section5.2.5 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create</p>

	<p>documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>10. The section5.2.6 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>11. The section5.2.7 is incorrect (it is the same as 5.2.4) and is unnecessary since CTR Supply chain trade settlement is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>12. The section5.2.8 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>13. The section5.2.9 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p>
PASS 4	
electronic Data Proxy Message	No further issues identified
Accounting_ Entry	No further issues identified
Cross_Industry Invoice	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms e. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. CI_Supply Chain_Event g. CI_Trade_Currency Exchange h. CI_Trade_Allowance Charge i. CI_Trade_Tax j. CI_Trade Settlement_Payment Means k. CI_Trade Payment Terms l. CI_Trade_Product m. CI_Trade_Price n. CI_Supply Chain_Packaging o. CI_Logistics_Service Charge <p>Without all these classes the invoice model is incomplete.</p> <p>2. The XMI rendering of this document is not compliant with the standard practise of representing a model and cannot be used to generate a schema.</p>
Cross_Industry_Catalogue	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_Document Context_Parameter b. CI_Trade_Party c. CI_Referenced_Document d. CI_Trade_Delivery Terms e. CI_Trade_Tax f. CI_Trade Payment Terms g. CI_Supply Chain_Packaging h. CI_Logistics_Location i. CI_Trade_Country j. CI_Transport_Dangerous Goods k. CI_Handling_Instructions l. CI_Product_Characteristic m. CI_Product_Classification n. CI_Trade_Product Instance o. Specified_Binary File <p>Without all these classes the Catalogue model is incomplete.</p> <p>2. The XMI rendering of this document is not compliant with the standard practise of representing a model and cannot be used to generate a schema.</p> <p>3. 6.2.1.5 the ABIE Trade Product_Supply Chain_Packaging. Is missing the relations to CI_Returnable Asset_Instructions and CI_Packaging_Marking</p> <p>TBG1: updated diagram 6.2.1.5</p>

Cross_Industry+Order	<p>7. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Tax e. CI_ Trade Payment Terms a. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment b. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event c. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means d. CI_ Trade_ Currency Exchange e. CI_ Trade_ Allowance Charge f. CI_ Trade_ Product g. CI_ Trade_ Price a. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan <p>Without all these classes the Order models are incomplete.</p> <p>4. The XMI rendering of these documents is not compliant with the standard practise of representing a model and cannot be used to generate a schema.</p> <p>8. The relationships should e expressed as composite relations.</p> <p>TBG1: fixed</p> <p>9. The relations within CI_ Document Context_ Parameter in 6.2.1 do not exist in the CCL</p> <p>TBG1: This was an error in the RSM, it should have been CI_ Exchanged Document_ Context</p> <p>10. The class CIOH_ Exchanged_ Document is identical to the class CIOCH_ Exchanged_ Document. One should be removed.</p> <p>TBG1: A future version of this RSM will add qualified datatypes which will differentiate between these. Therefore they remain unchanged in this version.</p> <p>The CCL should not contain identical classes with the only difference being a non conformant qualifier identifying a message. The Class in question could be used in all documents without the qualifier and without any other change. It has nothing to do with qualified datatypes.</p>
Cross_Industry+Quotation	<p>1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It</p>

	<p>contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms e. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event f. CI_ Trade_ Currency Exchange g. CI_ Trade_ Allowance Charge h. CI_ Trade_ Tax i. CI_ Trade Settlement_ Payment Means j. CI_ Trade Payment Terms k. CI_ Trade_ Product l. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan <p>Without all these classes the Quotation models are incomplete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The XMI rendering of these documents are not compliant with the standard practise of representing a model and cannot be used to generate a schema. 2. Remove the detail of CIQL_ Supply Chain_ Trade Delivery from 6.2.7 since it is provided in 6.2.6 alternatively add the relationship to CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan <p>TBG1: Diagram in 6.2.6. removed. Diagram in 6.2.7. updated</p>
<p>Cross+Industry+Delivery+Process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_ Document Context_ Parameter b. CI_ Trade_ Party c. CI_ Referenced_ Document d. CI_ Supply Chain_ Packaging e. CI_ Trade_ Delivery Terms h. CI_ Supply Chain_ Consignment i. CI_ Supply Chain_ Event j. CI_ Trade_ Product k. CI_ Supply Chain_ Supply Plan l. CI_ Handling_ Instructions <p>Without all these classes the Delivery models are</p>

	<p>incomplete.</p> <p>3. The XMI rendering of these documents are not compliant with the standard practise of representing a model and cannot be used to generate a schema.</p> <p>14. The section 6.2.2 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_Document Line_Document diagrams</p> <p>15. The section 6.2.3 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document. In addition it partially repeats other views incompletely.</p> <p>TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_Document Line_Document diagrams</p> <p>16. The section 6.2.7 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_Document Line_Document diagrams</p> <p>17. The section 6.2.11 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 6.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: Changed/simplified Despatch Advice diagram – 6.2.1. Added CIDDL Logistics Package and CIDDL_Document Line_Document diagrams</p>
<p>Cross+Industry+Scheduling+Process</p>	<p>5. CISH_Supply Chain_Trade Delivery incomplete in section 6.2.1. and not described elsewhere</p> <p>TBG1: fixed 6.2.1 – simplified with notes pointing to detailed diagrams</p> <p>6. CIS_Supply Chain_Trade Agreement incomplete in section 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere</p> <p>TBG1: fixed 6.2.1 and 6.2.2</p> <p>7. CIS_Document Line_Document in section 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere</p> <p>TBG1: fixed as above</p> <p>8. CISDFL_Supply Chain_Trade Delivery in section 6.2.2 and not described elsewhere</p>

	<p>TBG1: fixed as above</p> <p>The number of missing items in the model prevents further analysis of this document.</p> <p>TBG1: missing diagrams added – similar pattern used as in Delivery process</p>
<p>Cross+Industry+Remittance+Advice</p>	<p>2. This document makes reference to another RSM that is based on another BRS and which is not intended for message implementation. It contains parts of the model and TBG1 has guaranteed that the document is correct. All relationships between these classes are only to be found in the aforementioned document. The ICG consequently has not audited the document in question and has assumed that it is correct. The following classes should be identified in the document in question with the correct multiplicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CI_Trade_Party b. CI_Referenced_Document c. CI_TradeSettlement_PaymentMeans d. CI_Trade_CurrencyExchange <p>Without all these classes the Remittance models are incomplete.</p> <p>18. The structure in section 5.2.1 cannot be developed into a valid schema since one half of the classes are unrelated to the MA class.</p> <p>TBG1: changed section 5 to 6 to be consistent with other RSMs. Updated 5.2.1 by simplifying and adding notes</p> <p>19. The section 5.2.2 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>20. The section 5.2.3 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>21. The section 5.2.4 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>22. The section 5.2.5 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p>

	<p>23. The section5.2.6 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>24. The section5.2.7 is incorrect (it is the same as 5.2.4) and is unnecessary since CITR Supply chain trade settlement is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>25. The section5.2.8 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p> <p>26. The section5.2.9 is unnecessary since it is completely contained in section 5.2.1 and only leads to confusion and could create documentation problems in future revisions of the document.</p> <p>TBG1: required now – due to simplified section 6.2.1</p>
PASS 5	
<p>Due to the difficulties with the validation of the TBG1 RSM documents because of a change in the presentation of the canonical model that does not respect current practises, the ICG validated the TBG1 document structures by making use of XMI file that is provided at the end of the document. The ICG cannot vouch for the diagrams in section 6.</p>	

END