# Impact Analysis Report / RFC-Proposal

**Section 1: Meta-data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFC ID** | **RFC\_NCTS\_0119**  (RTC-52687) |
| **Related Incident ID** | IM366235 |
| **RFC Initiator / Organization** | NA-FR |
| **CI** | NCTS-P5 (DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 Main Document) |
| **Type of Change** | **Standard** **Emergency** |
| **Nature of Change** | Justification for Evolutive   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **RFC Source** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Legal & Policy Change**  **Organisational Changes** | **Business Change**  **IT Change** | |
| **Review by Business User recommended?** | **Yes No** |

***Change Summary***

|  |
| --- |
| **DDNTA Main Document-5.14.1-v1.00 - Movement stopped at office of incident registration or office of transit that do not have the DES role in COL** |
| The DDNTA Main Document shall define the case where   * the transit movement arrives at the nearest Customs Office with role ‘***Incident Registration***’ to **register incident(s)** that occurred during the journey and the transit movement **needs to stop** at this Customs Office due to the significance of the incident(s), * … **but** this ***Customs Office of Incident Registration*** does not have the role '***Destination***' to handle destination formalities. |

**Section 2: Problem statement**

|  |
| --- |
| The Article 305(1) of UCC IA mentions: "*The carrier shall present without undue delay after the incident the goods together with the MRN of the transit declaration to the nearest customs authority of the Member State in whose territory the means of transport is located. (…)*".  In scenario **T-TRA-INC-M-001** (section **III.II.5.1**), there is a note saying: "*The nearest Customs Office for the registration of incident(s) must be located in the same Contracting Party as the place where the incident occurred*".  The main point is that the movement is stopped in the country due to the seriousness of the  Incident(s) and cannot continue its journey.  Therefore, **if the specific Office acting as Office of Incident Registration does not have the role of "DES", then another appropriate Office which has the role ‘DES’ within the same NA and with the nearest proximity with the Office of Incident Registration should handle the arrival process**.  In addition, we observe currently in operations that a certain number of **Customs Offices possess the role ‘TRA’ (Office of Transit) but not the role ‘DES’ (Office of Destination)**. It’s the case for some few offices located in CH, FR, GB, HR, MT and NL. The same problem could appear also in case of serious incident that requires to stop the movement there.  Therefore, these cases need to be handled as well by including a clarification in the DDNTA Main Document. |

**Section 3: Description of proposed solution**

|  |
| --- |
| The following update will be performed into the **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00** **(Main Document)** (changes are depicted in red colour):   1. **In paragraph “*III.II.5 Specific Scenarios for Incidents “En Route” (INC)*”, a new note will be inserted that mentions the following:**   *Notes:*   1. *The nearest Customs Office for the registration of incident(s) should be located in the same Contracting Party as the place where the incident occurred. The message ‘Incident Notification’ C\_INC\_NOT (IE180) should not be rejected, if it is sent by the Customs Office located on the other side of the border. This should remain exceptional cases.* 2. *In case the transit movement arrives at a Customs Office of Incident Registration that does not possess the destination role (‘DES’) and this Customs Office decides that the transit movement needs to stop due to the significance of the incident(s), then this Customs Office of Incident Registration sends the ‘Incident Notification’ C\_INC\_NOT (IE180) message to the Office of Departure, but the arrival procedure is handled by another nearby Customs Office (to the Office of Incident Registration) that possesses the destination role (‘DES’) and will act as Actual Office of Destination.*   **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**  **No impact on External Domain.**  This RFC-Proposal is considered as a **purely documentary improvement** of the DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Main Document) and assumed to have no implementation impact for the NAs.  **Proposed** date of applicability in Operations (T-Ops): N/A  **Proposed** date of applicability in CT (T-CT): N/A  **Expected** date of approval by ECCG (T-CAB): January 2022  **Impact on transition P4-P5**: None  **Consequence of not approving the RFC-Proposal**: Possible confusion for Business Analysts / National Helpdesk.  **Risk of not implementing the change**: None.  Impacted IEs:   * None   Impacted CI Artefacts:   * **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Main Document): Yes;** * **Functional Specifications (FSS/BPM)-v5.30:** **Yes**; * UCC IA/DA Annex B: No; * DDCOM-20.3.0-v1.00: No; * DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00 (Appendix Q2\_R\_C, PDFs): No; * CSE-v51.6.0: No; * DMP Package-5.6.0 SfA-v1.00: No (incl. update of file Rules and Conditions\_v0.43): No; * CTS-5.6.1-v1.00: No; * ACS - v5.5.0 & ACS-Annex-NCTS: 5.5.0: No; * NCTS\_CTP-5.7.0-v1.00: No; * NCTS\_TRP-5.7.5: No; * ieCA 1.0.1.0: No; * CRP-5.5.0-v1.00: No; * CS/MIS2\_DATA: No; * CS/RD2\_DATA: No; * AES-P1 and NCTS-P5 Long-Lived “Legacy” (L3) Movements Study v1.40: No. |

**Impact on CI artefacts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DDNTA-5.14.1-v1.00, Main Document** | Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **As described in Section 3 - Proposed Solution** | |
| **Functional Specifications (FSS/BPM)** | **Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High**  **Short description**   |  | | --- | | **The textual descriptions described in the Section 3 will be also transposed to the text of the *FSS-UCC NCTS Section I-BUSINESS PROCESS THREADS FOR CORE BUSINESS* and of the BPM.** | |

**Estimated impact on National Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cosmetic  Low  Medium  High  Very High  Short description   |  | | --- | | **Likely no impact** (maybe an update of the translated DDNTA Main Document?)**.** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Document History** | | | |
| **Version** | **Status** | **Date** | ***Comment*** |
| v0.10 | Draft by CUSTDEV | 14/12/2021 |  |
| v0.11 | SfR to NPMs | 14/12/2021 |  |
| v1.00 | SfA to NPMs | 25/02/2022 | *SfA to NPM* |