30 June 2008 AUDIT REPORT Page : 1/5

# The AUDIT REPORT

OF THE

# **D08A Directories**

 $30^{th}$  of May 2008 to  $30^{th}$  of June 2008

### **Team members:**

Chair: M. D. Conroy

A. Dechamps

M. Dill

UN/Secretariat : T. Kangur

# **Table of Contents**

1.	INTRODUCTION.	3
2.	GENERAL REMARK	3
3.	USE OF USER REQUESTED CODE VALUES	3
4.	DMRS INSTALLED IN THE D08A DIRECTORY RELEASE.	3
5.	STATISTICS ON INSTALLED DMRS	4
<i>c</i>	DECADITIU ATION OF AUDIT TEAM DECOMMENDATIONS	5

### 1. Introduction.

We are pleased to announce that the D08A directory has been produced in compliance with existing procedures and we consider it satisfactory for implementation.

### 2. General remark

The DMR lists provided caused two levels of confusion. In the first case the approved file name and the JTd file name were the same which resulted in one file overwriting the other. This meant that during the audit several DMRs were thought to be missing. In the second case some withdrawn dmrs were included in the list of approved DMRs. This meant that that during the audit the DMRs in question were thought to be missing in the new directory.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** Ensure that the approved and JTd file names are not the same and not to insert withdrawn DMRs in the list of DMRs provided.

## 3. Use of user requested code values

The practice of leading users to believe that the code values they request will be used is not recommended. There are two reasons for this.

- 1. It enables users to introduce significant codes which is over the long term dangerous and can lead to the misinterpretation of code values.
- 2. Using code values from an external code list can introduce problems with already assigned codes, or with code values from a competing external code list

While the ICG is not against occasionally using non significant code values provided by the user community, it is against making this a general practice.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** Inform that user community that code values that they request will not be systematically applied. This rule should in particular apply to significant code values.

# 4. DMRs installed in the D08A directory release.

See attached file: AUDIT-REPORT-D08A-Part-2-of-2.xls that contains the complete list of the DMRs installed and the error processing carried out against them.

# 5. Statistics on installed DMRs

	System generated	User generated	Total	Errors	DMRs referred to code group	DMRs referred to JSWG
Number of data element DMRs		0	0			
Number of composite DMRs		0	0			
Number of Segment DMRs		0	0			
Number of code DMRs		32	32	0		
Number of message DMRs		1	1	0		
Number of UNSMs		0	0			
TOTAL	0	33	33	0	0	0
	0,00%	100,00%	100,00%	0,00%		

<b>TOTAL DMRs PROCESSE</b>	33	
Duplicate DMRs		
Postponed DMRs		0
TOTAL DMRS IMPLEMEN	33	

ATG is to be commended as this is the first time that no errors were found during the audit.

# 6. Recapitulation of Audit team recommendations

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** Ensure that the approved and JTd file names are not the same and not to insert withdrawn DMRs in the list of DMRs provided.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** Inform that user community that code values that they request will not be systematically applied. This rule should in particular apply to significant code values.