



WG ICT - softwareleveranciers

REPORT

22-11-2018

CONVENOR	Bart Cieters (AAD&A) & Albert Palsterman (CRNSP)
REPORTER	Albert Palsterman (CRNSP)
PRESENT	Sjoerd Dufoer, MS Sonia Debois, AADA Laurent Moyersoer, NxtPort Guy Van den Driessche, MSC Lina Asly Wouter De Vlieger, AADA Jan Van Wesemael, Alfaport Martin Goblet, Ziegler Patrick Braat, Softpack Peggy Cole, Organi Jim Styleman, AEB Remko Ruiten, ABM Janik Monsieus, Descartes Johan Geerts, Intris
EXCUSED	

Info : The questions from CRSNP are in black normal format.

The replies from customs are in blue italic format.

The last questions and new topics of CRSNP are marked in yellow.

1. Adapt customs systems to UCC

Organization of ICT-workgroup for data analyses

UCC Compare Cuscar data definition with UCC annex B G3 and G4 definition

The comparison was made on 5/5/2017.

The comparison was made and distributed by email to Customs and all members on 7/5/2017.

The members found considerable differences in concept and data definition between both messages.

For further information please refer to the email.

The members would like to be informed on the next steps/planning taken by Customs.

If a BPM session would be advisable some members would like to participate.

Next week there is meeting with the national forum to discuss how we will proceed.

Update: First meeting European ProjectGroup on 11 and 12 September. 13 Member States .Goal is a BPM and Common Specifications for the members of this Project Group

Next meeting : 23 and 24 October 2017. If needed in the upcoming meetings members of the group WG ICT – Softwareleveranciers will be consulted.

During the meeting the BPM for AIR has been discussed. At the end of the meeting it was clear that an agreement wasn't possible yet. All the participants have taken the possible scenarios back home for further study. Our goal is to have an agreement during the next meeting (12 and 13 December 2017)

The working group is working further on L4 BPM Air. We expect to finalize level 4 at the end of next

meeting. Next meeting on 27 and 28 February 2018.

L4 hasn't been finalised, because the link with the new ICS2-system had to be clarified. Next meeting (18 and 19 April) 3 ICS-experts of the EU will be present and we hope to finalise the L4. Once the L4 has been finished, it can be send to the EU for validation.

Please report state of play

L4 was not fully finalized. Only the link with ICS2 was discussed. A new MIG will be discussed in the meetings planned on 19 and 20 June. After the meeting more information will be supplied. The next meeting is planned after the summer vacations on 4 and 5 September in Luxemburg.

As we understood the scheme's as indicated in the UCC Annex B will be followed by the Belgian authorities. Please inform the current state of play.

L4 happy flow has been finalised. A dedicated part has worked on the message specifications. After the meeting the EU has informed us that Annex B is under review. This review has an impact on the work of the project group. The EU will send some delegates to the next meeting of the project group for further clarification.

When will the information regarding the new Annex B will be available ?

No news yet about Annex B

During the last meeting the ICS experts of the Commission were present. We have received a working document of Annex B. In this we were able to proceed in our message structure.

During this meeting, the Commission has also clarified the structure of the ENS-messages. After this clarification the projectgroup has decided to re-use the data of ICS2. The format of the TSD-message will have the same structure of the ENS-messages.

This decision has already been discussed with the World Shipping Council and the Belgian Couriers. Both agreed with our approach.

Next meeting 11 and 12 december

2. Starteam number 23222

Customs will, together with IBM and ICT, investigate whether following statuses can be transmitted.

- Financiële afhandeling opgestart (contante betaling)
- Klaar voor controle
- Controle door MODA

Because the upgrades to CCFF and CCRM have taken place in the meantime, this issue remains on the agenda.

As mentioned during the last meeting, this will be integrated during the review of the import process

Here are the statutes we asked for

> STATUS AANGIFTE

<input type="checkbox"/> Financiële afhandeling OK	<input type="checkbox"/> Geannuleerd
<input type="checkbox"/> Gecontroleerd	<input type="checkbox"/> Goederen vrijgegeven
<input type="checkbox"/> Annulatie aangevraagd	<input type="checkbox"/> Op voorhand gereserveerd
<input type="checkbox"/> Afgeschreven	<input type="checkbox"/> Klaar voor controle
<input type="checkbox"/> Onregelmatigheden vastgesteld	<input type="checkbox"/> Annulatie aanvraag van NCTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Gevalideerd door NCTS	<input type="checkbox"/> Aanvraag tot TC verworpen
<input type="checkbox"/> Financiële afhandeling opgestart	<input type="checkbox"/> Fout tijdens financiële afhandeling
<input type="checkbox"/> Ongeldig	<input type="checkbox"/> AER
<input type="checkbox"/> Regularisatie aangevraagd	<input type="checkbox"/> Afschrijving verworpen door NCTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Wachten op antwoord van NCTS	<input type="checkbox"/> Wachten op bevestiging aanzuivering door NCTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Afgewezen na aankomst goederen	<input type="checkbox"/> Controle door MODA
<input type="checkbox"/> Niet actie	<input type="checkbox"/> Onder release verzoek
<input type="checkbox"/> Aangifte onder wijziging	<input type="checkbox"/> Wijziging afgewezen
<input type="checkbox"/> Goederen zijn niet om uit te gaan	<input type="checkbox"/> Onder Afsluiten
<input type="checkbox"/> ENS Geregistreerd	<input type="checkbox"/> Onder Behandeling
<input type="checkbox"/> Afgehandeld	<input type="checkbox"/> Wachten Akkoord Directie
<input type="checkbox"/> Regularisatie geweigerd	

> STATUT DE LA DÉCLARATION

<input type="checkbox"/> Traitement financier OK	<input type="checkbox"/> Annulée
<input type="checkbox"/> Vérifiée	<input type="checkbox"/> Marchandises libérées
<input type="checkbox"/> Annulation Demandée	<input type="checkbox"/> Réservée à l'avance
<input type="checkbox"/> Apurée	<input type="checkbox"/> A Vérifier
<input type="checkbox"/> Irrégularités détectées	<input type="checkbox"/> Annulation demandée par NCT
<input type="checkbox"/> Validée par NCTS	<input type="checkbox"/> Demande de CT rejetée
<input type="checkbox"/> Traitement financier en cours	<input type="checkbox"/> Erreur lors du traitement financier
<input type="checkbox"/> Invalide	<input type="checkbox"/> AER
<input type="checkbox"/> Régularisation demandée	<input type="checkbox"/> Apurement refusé par NCTS
<input type="checkbox"/> En attente d'une réponse de NCTS	<input type="checkbox"/> En attente de la confirmation d'apurement par NCTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Afgewezen na aankomst goederen	<input type="checkbox"/> Vérification par MODA
<input type="checkbox"/> Inactif	<input type="checkbox"/> Sous demande de liberation
<input type="checkbox"/> Déclaration sous amendement	<input type="checkbox"/> Amendement rejeté
<input type="checkbox"/> Biens seront interdits de sortir	<input type="checkbox"/> Onder Afsluiten
<input type="checkbox"/> ENS Enregistré	<input type="checkbox"/> À l'étude
<input type="checkbox"/> Complétée	<input type="checkbox"/> En attente d'accord de la direction
<input type="checkbox"/> Régularisation refusée	

The statuses were added to the request. They will be taken into account when the PLDA will be reworked. At the latest it must be ready before end 2020.

The Item remains on the agenda

3. Performance Customs applications

a. Limit of 999 tariff items in declaration

In XML it is only possible to send a few hundred items per declaration (200 to 300) without time-out. In EDIFACT it is however possible to send 999 items without time-out. According to CRSNP, it is not working in XML due to:

- The XML message is much larger than the EDIFACT message?
- The XML message is converted to an EDIFACT message before processing by Customs?

Limit of 999 tariff lines: this has improved, but 999 lines is still problematic. Important topic for the WG ICT.

Extra monitoring has been added by our ICT Department. More info has been transferred to IBM.

Monitoring has shown us that there is a performance problem with the AEO web service. This problem will be solved in AEO. A new version of AEO will be delivered and we expect to install this version in production in January 2018. After this installation, the monitoring of our applications will go on.

The AEO web service has been updated and no performance issues have been reported on this part of the application. Further monitoring is going on and on Monday new data for investigation has been provided.

For the performance of our most important applications, working groups have been put in place. For PLDA every Monday an extensive monitoring and analysis with Dynatrace has been scheduled. For EMCS the same monitoring and analysis will be executed. For the PLDA Double Answer-messages a ticket has been opened (Startteam 30012)

Please report state of play.

See b. hereafter

Ticket 30012 is part of the scope of PLDA17.15

As we understood from the report of the brainstorming meeting of 24/10 only the performance of the web-application is monitored Can also the B2G performance be monitored.?

We can confirm that also the B2G is monitored. We are also executing performance tests on Sim environment. This environment is almost an exact copy of our production environment. On Monday 19/11/18 a new run has been executed. We are analysing the Dynatrace reports and the DB logs. PLDA17.16 has been foreseen to upgrade the performance of PLDA based on the outcome of these performance tests.

Ticket 30012 (double answer messages) will be delivered in PLDA17.15.


b. General delay since some time

The general performance of PLDA on some points seems to be deteriorating
A .pdf outprint of a released document is received nearly immediately, whereas the XML message of the release (on which the printed document is based) is sent one hour later

Performance of NCTS is even worse.

Question : Can customs monitor the performance of their systems ?

If needed we can give some statistics.



Please report state of play.

Every Monday a full monitoring of the systems is carried out. Apparently it is not a server problem but the lack of performance would be due to a number of issues such as network and software issues (unoptimised DB queries, unoptimised links between systems etc.)

Please inform state of play as CRSNP do not see any progress.

4 main problems have been registered (Tickets 30329, 30330, 30331 and 30332). The first 3 tickets have been delivered with PLDA17.14.0. The last one will be delivered with PLDA17.14.1. We want to install PLDA17.14 as soon as possible in Production to verify the Dynatrace monitoring again.

Please give state of play and tickets delivered.

All tickets have been solved and the solution has been installed in Production.

c. Drop out of communication Monday 10/09

On the contrary Monday last the communication for some members dropped out. The result was that no declarations could be validated for a whole day. A lot of companies were impacted by the failure. As we understood some changes were made to the communication protocol. Such changes must be better coordinated and users must be informed weeks before the change, in order to take the appropriate measures.

During the maintenance weekend there was a migration of the Apache and DMZ-servers from Solaris to Linux. On Acceptance there weren't issues reported, but in Production there was a bug or configuration error. Due to this error some traders weren't able anymore to send messages to Customs. To avoid this kind of problems after a maintenance weekend if the software providers or companies could send some messages after the restart of the servers on Saturday or Sunday. Bart Cieters will send a mail to crnsn.iedereen if some companies are willing to volunteer as tester after a maintenance weekend.

Sometimes some of the software companies are contacted, but this seems not (yet) the standard procedure ? Can this be improved or standardized ?

How? RSS-feed? Web? Mail? Perhaps the contact with the companies can be discussed during the brainstorming meeting.

4. Clear-off failed ?

As we understood the data in the reply message after a cancellation request message has changed. Therefor it is not possible to cancel a message for when a regularization (new) message was created. Is this problem a known issue ? can we have the starteam number ?

This problem has been reported by several companies. Ticket 31086 has been created for this bug. This ticket is part of PLDA17.15.

5. Electronic Consolidation (Globalisatie)

For the moment the project has been set on hold because there is a huge difference in the received statistics from the software houses and from the Customs offices. Further investigation is needed. Statistics are clear, but the Project is still on hold. Some questions have to be answered but the project manager of PLDA didn't find the time yet.

On 21/11 a meeting of the WG globalisatie has been planned. We understand that the project is on hold because of budget limitations an a great impact on the customs hardware. (Much more data must be processed that today and the actual set-up is not capable to cope with it. Consequently the question is : Makes this meeting still sense ? Or is it cancelled ?

Since Monday 13 November 2017 the project has been resumed. Meeting of 21/11 has been postponed until 19/12.

The meetings have been resumed. First meeting was on 9/1/2018. The application is planned to go live

on 1/5/2019. First and next step in the process is the issuing of the specifications. As far as we understood the original idea of working remains.

Indeed the original idea remains

When will the specifications be available ?

We understand the GEFEG tool was used for the data model ?

What would be the added value for the CRSNP members when also using the GEFEG tool. In other words, what is available from BE customs that can be imported or transmitted to the GEFEG tools of the members ?

The specs will be available by the end of May.

For the specifications the GEFEG tool hasn't been used. For the other UCC-projects we will use this tool.

The specs are based on the EU data model.

Please note that before the "globalisatie" can be put in operation the customs system must be upgraded, as we expect at least 100 % increase in number of declarations to be processed.

This project has still to be started.

As I understand the CRSNP members will first study the specs and will come back with observations

Please report state of play.

When will the specifications be available ?

The specifications will be delivered in the upcoming weeks. They need to be evaluated internally first before their publication.

The publication is planned in the next weeks.

After the summer vacations we will plan a new consultation date. However please forward as soon as possible the remarks.

In such manner IBM will be able to take the remarks into account.

This topic will be discussed in detail on the meeting of 20/9. Please note the remarks as mentioned in the emails of the members. Specific as mentioned in the mail of 8/8 to CRSNP.iedereen.

In addition to the mail we want to add following topics :Consignee on heading in regulation 40. Do situations exist where one consolidated declaration with regulation 40 can consist of more than one consignee ? Investigation requested to Martin (Ziegler)

It has always been mentioned that Consignee would be on header level. In case of multiple consignees multiple declarations have to be made.

From a practical point of view we do not see the possibility to add DV1 fields to the consolidated declaration. Members are of opinion that declarants using consolidated declaration should always be exempted by default authorization from sending transactional DV1 data.

No DV1 data elements will be added

How to cope with small differences/rounding differences between the duties calculated by the declarant and those calculated by customs. What is the error margin ?

At this moment the declarants of consolidated declarations calculate the duties and taxes themselves. This means that they de facto all dispose of a Self Assessment authorization ?!

It was decided during one of the first meetings that the system will calculate the duties.


An updated XSD-schema is under review and will be published as soon as possible.

According to the last information of Chris de Clerck the globalisation specs are final.

Can we have the new specs and when will tests be possible ?

Specs have been shared. Meeting Globalisatie has been scheduled on 18/1/2019

6. Short term planning



7. Expired certificates

How can we, using a Get Status message, after the renewal of an expired certificate request the status of a particular declaration?

It may concern thousands of messages. Many declarations with an Exit Confirmation or "Regularisaties" are not confirmed through the normal IT channels and are retrieved using a Get Status message. How can this be solved ?

David Vandendriessche will attend the next meeting

We are looking forward to his solution proposal.

To solve this problem IBM needs to update the structure of the database. By mid 2018 it should be possible to solve this issue in prod.

This issue is treated in the sub committee "communicatie en authenticatie"
See topic further in this report.

IBM and our ICT Department are investigating how they can solve this issue by mid 2018.

Please report state of play.

This issue is planned to be resolved in release 17.13.

Since release 17.13 has not yet been installed please provide new planning

Release 17.13 has been installed in production, but for the solution further meetings are necessary with ICT Ops and the Helpdesk. The analysis of the screen has already been done. We hope to have the solution in PLDA17.15 or PLDA17.16.

When will the solution be available please, mid december ?

After further analysis with examples of Crossroad we found out that the certificates are not the problem. Due to the archiving of the processed messages we are losing the link with the callback address of the traders.

We'll solve this issue in 2 steps :

- *Postponement of the archiving of messages : We are investigating until how long the archiving of these messages can be postponed. We wan't to avoid that this postponement has an impact on the performance of PLDA.*
- *Modification of the DB : after this change we will always keep the link between the declaration, the certificate and the callback address. Our contractor will try to solve this problem in PLDA17.16*

(depending on the changes for upgrading the performance) or PLDA 17.17. If a reorg is needed the solution can only be installed in production during a weekend, probably a maintenance weekend.

8. NCTS :

a) NCTS Roll out (pdf)

It is still not clear what offices will be using the new NCTS application and when they will be activated.
Can this be clarified ?

*New offices will be rolled out shortly/finally i.e. BE408000 and BE432000. We hope still before the end of June. Others will follow once we notice no major issues (or the issues solved).
The idea is to have them changed by clusters of ESD/TAO. Starting up with "Gent"-offices.
The goal is to have by the end of 2017 all offices should be in NCTS-RW.*

Is there a planning for the next offices after the ones that have been announced?

BE408000 and BE432000 have been switched to NCTS-RW.

The roll-out for next offices depends about how big and troublesome the lessons learned are from this roll-out.

Except the fact that the next offices to be rolled out will be in Flanders, we did not come up with a newly fixed planning yet.

Please note however we already came to the conclusion no more than 2 offices will be migrated at a time.

In any case we do stress upon the fact

Traders must be aware they should have their email-address for receiving the TAD linked to their EORI (eori.be@minfin.fed.be)

Traders working in Simplified procedure, should ask regional KLAMA-services to check if their authorizations are correctly and fully registered in the DB of Authorizations. Once their authorizations are registered in this DB, they can ask ncts.helpdesk@minfin.fed.be to register their UNLO-Code also in the actual NCTS so they can start using the UNLO-code instead of the VP-code

The use of "camion...truck" as identity of means of transport, is yet not allowed, and in the new system checked by the system. So this is not something new...

Before we roll out a new office we do the exercise in TEST with PROD-data. For traders it means that if they ask for it, they can already test if their application is congruent to what is coming up.

In the attached file you'll find the planning of the migration. This planning can still change.

We are looking forward to the upgrades. However we would have preferred that only the involved offices would be out of service and not the whole Belgian NCTS application.

Is the plan still to upgrade all offices before 1/7/2018 ?

It's impossible to migrate the offices when a part of the system is up and running. We hope to finalize the migration by the end of May. An updated planning has been published on our website. A bug was discovered in the system for the write-off. Customs is working to solve this issue as soon as possible. Please also note that when sending discharge remarks the case seals must be ticked when the shipment is ok.

ANR is delayed till 24 May.

Please report state of play.

Today the Antwerp office is being converted. The conversions will end by July as planned. On the other hand the members of CRSNP estimate that 4 times a year a total unavailability of the customs system for one full day is very high. Customs is investigating to reactivate the double fail-over system in order to limit the unavailability.

issue should be resolved. The upgrade was not a success.

What are the lessons learned for the future ?.

1. Between the real development and the go-live there was too much time

2. *During development we should already take into account how the migration of all the offices can be done. An unavailability of the application of 1 day to migrate 1 or more offices is unacceptable*
3. *Avoid changing contractors when the application hasn't been installed in production.*

And although measures were taken to resolve the issues, not all of them were resolved. In the ports, Antwerp, Gent, where normal procedures are used it takes up to two hours between the sending of the NCTS declaration and the receipt of the release message. This makes either long waiting hours (and costs) for the logistic companies or drivers leave without documents. This a.s.a.p.

This will be discussed during Steerco Nationaal Forum.

The result is that in Antwerp it takes up to 3 hours before an NCTS message is released. The solution provided by the National Forum is that customs declarants would ask for a simplification. However in Belgium, customs declarants cannot get a simplification for more than their own location whereas in Rotterdam they can. in Rotterdam, nearly all customs declarants have simplifications and NCTS validation takes a few minutes, NCTS is a community legislation, the same for all the member states, why is this in Belgium different than in the Netherlands ?

The discussion whether simplification is possible or not, is a legal issue. We will check if the simplification procedure is possible in the application but it is up to legal department to decide whether it can be used or not.

b) Emergency procedure NCTS

There are a few issues which we want to bring to the table for general clarity :

- 1) It is not possible to print a red stamp on the document. Can this not be replaced by a text or stamp in normal color ? Printing in color is not common. The issue was already reported a few times.
- 2) There are no local offices anymore. It results in the fact that truck drivers sometimes have to drive large distances to the next nearest customs office. It makes the emergency procedure very impractical for many users. Is there no work around possible for general use ?

AADA will verify if the emergency procedures can't be changed. The emergency procedures will be adapted, a new circular will be published soon. The emergency procedure would work in such a way that there is no further need to go with the shipment to the nearest customs office for a stamp. The system would work in a similar way as the authorized shipper authorization.

Please report state of play.

No update available.

As we understand a circular letter was distributed but it did not resolve any of the issues in practice. Our members are still in favour of the emergency procedure as described above. It should work in a similar way as the authorized shipper authorization. In Holland in normal procedure the declaration (on an SAD with special mentions) is sent to the customs office by email. The customs officer puts a stamp on it and sends it back by mail. It is a very simple procedures and very effective.

The members also evaluated the NxtPort proposal.

There are several reasons why the members are not in favour of the proposal.

It is a complex procedure and the emergency procedure should be simple.

The responsibilities if a document is not cleared or not received or lost in communications are not clearly defined.

The synchronisation after the emergency procedure is extremely complex

What customer will pay for the programming of such a complex procedure ?

How will Customs synchronize with the EU DB.

Therefor the members consider the proposal not realistic.

Laurent Moyersoer presented the proposed solution of Nxtport. The members are of opinion that the solution could only work if Nxtport would also be able to update the EU.COM system, since in other cases there is no added value..

From the field we understand that every customs office has its own procedure. Who can be contacted in order to synchronize the way of working of the different customs offices ?

This will be discussed during Steerco Nationaal forum.

Emergency procedure NCTS please provide the new plan if any?

This has to be discussed in the Working Group Algemene Bepalingen of the national Forum. This point can be archived

9. Cuscar

Cuscar Transfer (overbengen)

Can customs supply us a example message with function code 8 ?

Has customs already tested the message ?

Is there no UNB segment missing ? During development our specialist was of opinion that the message cannot work without it since missing essential data

As we understood from the last meeting WG binnenbrengen of 29/9 there is no customs instruction / procedure yet how to use the "Transfer" function of specifying the responsibilities and way of use. When is it expected to be ready ?

As discussed during the CRSNP meeting of 14/11/2017, Cuscar RTO will be used by customs and software providers as a test case to publish technical as well as functional specifications for this change. Customs will publish asap the necessary info.

After the last exchange and supply of data from customs several software providers have been able to send a technical perfect message and received answers from Customs. The thing that is still missing is a part of the use case.

More on how the message should be used in practice.

Software providers do not understand how this message works in practice.

I.e. Who will be sending the message ? The departing or receiving TS operator ?

How will he identify himself ? Will he need to have an agent code or an Eori number or both ?

Is there already a reply or instruction how this should be used in practice ?

Ilse Eelen is finalizing this instruction. It will be for Maritime and Aviation.

Please report state of play.

The instruction should be valid for the total Belgian territory. The procedure is nearly finished. We need to wait for the outcome. The issue is treated in the WG "binnenbrengen".

Next meeting of the WG binnenbrengen is foreseen 27/9 10.00 h

Is there anything going to be changed in the existing messages ?

No changes planned.

10. Locations codes box 30

The file of 1 April 2018 was OK.

The file of 1 May 2018 was clearly corrupt again.

The procedure is under investigation. Let us wait and see the new delivery on 1 June.

We received the files of 1/6 and 1/8

The location codes from 1/9 were not received.

Can they be sent please.

Location codes have been sent.

Update November was not received.

I'm investigating if we can't use another way to deliver this info.

11. Meeting on communication and authentication

IT customs wants to move NCTS and PLDA to the same communication protocol
Following protocols are offered: Web services/FTP/AS2/IDcard or token.

A separate meeting will be organized by the CRSNP communication providers for the members that perform communication. Descartes will take the initiative and inform the result to customs.

A meeting with a smaller group of software providers has been scheduled. First meeting will take place on 23 November 2017.

The members have expressed their concern in a message to the customs authorities regarding the new way of communication. The topic has a general impact on all economic operators and should be treated on a national forum level. A preliminary meeting with a small delegation of communication providers is foreseen on 6/2 10.00 h in NG probably room A13

Meeting is foreseen on 8/2/2017. Meeting Room A08

The report on the meeting "communicatie en authenticatie" held on 8/2 sheds more light on the resolution of this issue.

We are looking forward to the next meeting on 19/4.

No further steps were taken. The issue is temporary suspended for more urgent matters. As soon as the IT provider will reactivate the project you will be informed.

Is there any further evolution ?

By the end of October 2019 the AIX Servers used by NCTS and Tarbel have to be sourced out. This is the priority number 1. Once this has been done new meetings will be organized.

**As we understood from the brainstorming meeting of 24/10 new meetings of this WG should be planned ?
When is the next meeting ?**

Next meeting isn't planned yet.

12. Change "Charge report" to use as "Arrival at Exit" (IE507)

- a) for the maritime terminals.**

1.5.1	Reference type	n1	1 = MAWB 2 = Permit (including RoRo) 3 = Containernumber 4 = VIN (RoRo)		<arrivalIdType>
1.5.2	Reference	an..40	(M)AWB Number (Air freight) or Permit (Sea freight) <u>containernumber or VIN number (Sea freight)</u>	R9 R10 R11	<arrivalId>
1.5.3	Package type	an2	ISO code for packages (UNECE Recommendation No. 21)	R12	<packageType>
1.5.4	Quantity	n..6	Quantity	R8 R13	<quantity>
1.5.5	Gross mass	n..11,3	Gross mass in KGM	R14	<weight>
1.5.6	Size and type	an..10	<u>Container size/type - ISO</u>	C1	<SizeType>
1.6	MRN			R4	<MRN>
1.6.1	Reference type	an3	ABT = MRN export (ECS) XTT = Transit decl. – Transit <u>XTR = Transit decl. – BE</u> XTX = Manual transit declaration XSE = Manual SAD XAG = AGD (Excise) XT5 = T5 XSP = Rail waybill number XMA = Non SAD documents AIO = Transshipment number EXS = Exit Summary Declaration <u>AHI = Transport contract reference number (carrier's agent release number)</u> <u>ANN = Transport Equipment Announcement Number</u> <u>BN = Booking reference number</u> <u>CN = Carrier's reference number</u> <u>UCN = Unique consignment reference number</u> NPX = Emergency procedure	R5	<mrnReferenceType>
1.6.2	Reference	an..35	Number of the declaration	R6	<mrnReference>

Foreseen in PLDA17.10, but not yet confirmed.

When will this message be available for testing ?

These changes have been already installed in Production and can be tested.

Please note that under ref 1.5.1 in the message above the code for VIN = 5 (not 4)

We understood that, If the message only refers to the container id's the system will have an issue, while the same container returns often and this means that data will not be handled correctly. Customs will investigate in order to provide a solution.

Please report state of play.

The activation in operation is postponed to 1/9.

The Antwerp Port Authorities have taken an initiative in order to automate the breakbulk flow in the port of Antwerp. They use the Cubics system which allows for split shipments of one MRN declaration. It keeps an (export) accounting of the material actually shipped. Dorothy Cardoen has made the analyses. The export accounting is based on the unique booking reference as already agreed in the proposal of 2006.

Rumors exist that the implementation of the export manifest would be postponed until there would be a final solution on breakbulk? In view of the fact that containerized cargo covers abt. 80 % of the export in the Antwerp port CRSNP advise not to wait until a final decision is made on breakbulk but start to implement the export manifest for containerized cargo as soon as the issues are resolved for containerized cargo, and later

go to the next steps.

As we understand the activation is postponed to 17/9 ?

It was indeed 17/9 except for 3 terminals. These 3 terminals have been activated on 24/9

This point can be removed.

b. The transfer message in Airfreight

Next step is the transfer message between the forwarder and the handling agent.

We understood from Customs that still one communication had to be set up between customs and the handling agent. Please provide state of play. When will this be ready for implementation ?

No planning available yet. There are 4 handling agencies. In order to start the implementation we need to know their EORI number and communication provider. From 3 agencies we have already the info. A reminder has been sent to the 4th agency.

The use of the message for maritime containers has been mandatory since September 2018.

As for Brucloud (Air) we understand that it is a limited success since users with a limited number of declarations do not want to pay for the service. In the latter case it has no added value. (taken from the report on the last meeting of the national forum).

13. New measures Tarbel 1/2/2019

8 new measure types (control measures) for TARIC 2019 February package.

New import measure types are: 761, 762, 763 and 764

New export measure types are: 765, 766, 767 and 768.

These new measure types are going to be used for TARIC integration of possible new upcoming Annexes regarding the restrictions against North

Korea, Iran and other countries affected by restrictive measures.

New Produced documents C101, C102, Y970

14. Regularisatie aangiften

Volgende bemerkingen werden ons ter beschikking gesteld via douane :

“Zoals gezegd mogen wij geen regularisaties meer toestaan zowel bij bestemming als bij vertrek nadat wij een vaststelling gedaan hebben. De aangiften blijven in de status “onregelmatigheden vastgesteld” Bij vertrek dienen jullie een nieuwe aangifte op te maken.

Dit volgens artikel 173 paragraaf 2 van het DWU;

“Artikel 173

Wijziging van een douaneaangifte

1. De aangever wordt, op zijn verzoek, toegestaan een of meer gegevens in de douaneaangifte te wijzigen nadat deze door de douane is aanvaard. De wijziging mag niet tot gevolg hebben dat de douaneaangifte betrekking heeft op andere goederen dan die waarop zij oorspronkelijk betrekking had.

2. Dergelijke wijzigingen worden niet toegestaan als het verzoek daartoe wordt gedaan na een van de volgende gebeurtenissen:

a) de douaneautoriteiten hebben de aangever in kennis gesteld van hun voornemen de goederen aan een onderzoek te onderwerpen;

b) de douaneautoriteiten hebben geconstateerd dat de gegevens van de douaneaangifte onjuist zijn;

c) de douaneautoriteiten hebben de goederen vrijgegeven.”

Lisette Wijnen

Adjunct Fiscaal Deskundige

FOD Financiën / Douane en Accijnzen / Toezicht, Controle en Vaststellingen

TCV Bilzen

Kruisbosstraat 16 3740 Bilzen

Tel: +32 257 584 99 / Gsm: +32 4707 584 99 / Dienst +32 257 52150

Dienst mail: da.tcv.emt.bilzen@minfin.fed.be”

Because of this new way of working, declarations that have been verified and on which anomalies have been established are left in the BTB applications in a status MRN and cannot be processed any further. In the PLDA web they are left in status “onregelmatigheden vastgesteld” Customs does not send any further messages.

In practice this means that no proof or document is received from customs by the importer or exporter in order to prove the regularly imported or exported goods.

On the other hand we understand that some customs offices demand a new electronic declaration without reference to the previous one, leaving the system with two declarations for the same shipment. The issue is also escalated to the WG “Algemene Bepalingen”, but it is necessary that PLDA provides a uniform and automated solution (as in NL,DE..)

An exhaustive e-mail has been sent to WG Algemene Bepalingen in order to supply a solution.

It's correct that PLDA has to provide a uniform and automated solution, but we are also waiting for a clear guideline of our experts. As long as we don't receive this guideline, PLDA will not be changed. An internal meeting will be organized to discuss which changes to PLDA have to be done.

Please report state of play.

Customs plans tomorrow a meeting in order to investigate the measures to be taken in PLDA. It is important for the VAT administration that a document of message is available proving the regularly authorized import or export of goods. Apparently a knowledge center/workgroup customs/excise/VAT will be established to treat this kind of issues.

Please advice state of play since the problem still exists.

There seems to be a circular letter published around this topic ?

But this seems not to remedy to the practical problems.

The topic should be treated in the WG uitgaan but also in the WG binnenbrengen ..

This causes issues especially in fiscal representations.

Awaiting update.

15. Declaration type D

The declaration type D is sent to customs before presentation of the consignment to customs in order to write off the GC.

However we have noticed that still declarations go wrong. They receive an MRN when submitted to customs, but later, after arrival of the ship, they receive again an error

Questions :

What checks are performed after the arrival of the vessel that cause these errors ?

What error messages can be expected ?

A complete validation is executed at the moment the goods arrive. For the moment there is a bug in the system which causes the weird errors.

AADA will investigate if it is possible to use a different functioncode in case an error has been found at the moment of the arrival of the goods (new validation results in an error after the MRN). Ticket 30291 has been created.

Please report state of play.

The solution is delivered in test. It will be taken into production with release 17.12.

Is the new functioncode activated ?

The functioncode hasn't been added yet. The solution delivered within PLDA17.12 has solved the weird error messages not the creation of the new functioncode. The creation of the new functioncode is foreseen in PLDA17.15 and 17.16

When will the new functioncode be available ? It is important to permanently resolve this issue.

In PLDA17.15 a new functioncode will be added to the SadResponse Message

50 = rejection of the declaration (type D, E, F) after the arrival of the goods

16. Issues test system

Would it be possible to copy again the EORI database to the test systems. Ziegler has 15000 correct declarations which are readily available to be sent to the test system for testing new applications but 1879 of declarations get now errors because the EORI numbers are not in the test database. This is also the case for the BTW verleggingen ET14000...

AADA will investigate if it is possible to update the test-DB of EORI or if it is possible to link PLDA-Test again to EORI-Prod.

Please report state of play.

*One of the two solutions will be carried out by customs :
Either a set of EORI numbers will be made available in the test system, or
The test system will be linked to the operational EORI database.
This issue must be resolved before the tests can start for the new Tarbel calculation*

This issue tests have always to be performed with 'contante betaling'.
Can the ET14000 authorizations be added again ?

Fodfin will verify how the ET14000 authorizations can be made available on ACC

The SIM environment has been adapted, but it is not clear if the ET14000 authorizations have been added to the ACC environment ?

ET14000-authorizations are available on ACC environment.

17. Declaration Type X

The declaration cannot be sent. Always the same error.
D_NO_SIMPLIFIED_DECLARATION_FOUND Geen enkele vereenvoudigde aangifte werd gevonden.
In the declaration case 40 refers to the MRN of the type B declaration.
Request to the customs helpdesk learns that up to today no release to a declaration type X was ever received in Belgium.
Will this type of declaration will be supported in future ?

The simplified declaration is available in PLDA. To link both declarations to each other the same LRN has to be used. Our Legal department will send me in the upcoming days the legal base of all the data elements that can be changed.

**As we understand the weight can be changed, but since the weight in a declaration for bulk cargo has its influence on the value also the value must be modified in relation to the weight.
Can this be adapted ?**

Further discussion with our legal department is necessary. Planning : after Brexit.

18. Communication Export flow

According one softwareprovider there is a problem with the communication of exportflow.

We have checked our systems and everything looks ok.

19. Next meeting R&D

17/1/2019 at 10:00 h as usual in the North Galaxy Building in Brussels.