Annex to the Memo regarding Statute no 1075 cocerning electronic invoice

Technical answers concerning. Standards in Statute Annex 1-4

Amendment to the hearing	Status	Comments

The transition period may for example be supported by the following:
- OIOUBL via OIOSI also supported during the first January 2011 to 1.st May 2011
- OIOXML via VANS also supported during the first May 2011 to 31 December 2011

	Status	Comments
	Already supported	
	Supported six months after 1 May 2011 see minutes.	

OIOUBL_INTRO_BEKENDTG.pdf

	Status
OIOUBL_INTRO_BEKENDTG.pdf shows the incorrect title "OIOUBL Guideline Datatypes" in Adobe Reader.	Changed
The document lacks page numbers on all sides with odd page numbers	Changed

OIOUBL_INTRO.pdf

	Status
OIOUBL_INTRO.pdf shows the incorrect title "OIOUBL Guideline Datatypes" in Adobe Reader.	Changed
The document lacks page numbers on all sides with odd page number	Changed
Page 7, bottom: An "m" too much in "CustommizationID"	Changed
Page 8, top: text "…customizationid ″OIOUBL2.0x″…" are changed to "…CustomizationID "OIOUBL-2.0x"…"	Changed
Page 11, middle: one of a total of 3 + 1 minimumprofiles for a public authority called so Procurement-OrdSimR-BilSim - with Response to Ordering Process.	Changed
Page 12, middle: "komplimenterer" changed to "komplementerer".	Changed

OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER_BEKENDTGØRELSE.pdf

	Status
OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER_BEKENDTGØRELSE.pdf only shows the title "OIOUBL Guideline Profiles" in Adobe Reader. The other OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf also shows "OIOUBL Guideline Profiles" as title. It would have been practical with a difference in the title.	Changed

Page 7, Section 3.1.1 in the end: The text uses other names under Summarization of a general profile-naming compared with Guide Line Profiles page 8-9. The concept of profile area "Procurement" and process level is not explained. The text is misleading.

The text in OIOUBL_Guide_Profiler_Statute replaces with text from OIOUBL_Guide_Profiles and also with a reference to OIOUBL_Guide_Profiles).

Page 8-9: The notice is not consistent with the rest of OIOUBL-material. The reason is that the Statute introduces two minimum profiles, which the public authorities must be able to support in the future, that is Procurement-BilSim og NES BasicBilling (profile5).

Commented in the attached letter

In itself OIOUBL-material only BilSim is acting as a minimum profile (one of a total of 3 + 1 minimum profiles) while BasicBilling is an optional profile.

Commented in the attached letter

OIOUBL Statute introduces also a so far voluntary profile as a mandatory minimum profile it is not mentioned in OIOUBL 2.02. The important information comes up first by close reading.

Commented in the attached letter

Page 9, Section 3.2.3: phrase: "As a former mentioned private companies requires only to register if they wish to receive OIOUBL documents. To send OIOUBL documents need not register themselves."
(Something similar is mentioned in INTRO-BEKENDTG.pdf)

Documented later down

 This sentence means that if the private Biller choose the profile Procurement-BilSim, he needs to register in the UDDI, or else he will not receive any negative business receipt which invoice recipient is allowed to send.

Documented later down

This means that if the private Biller chooses profile BasicBilling, and do not register, it is rather problematic with any negative technical response or a negative profile-receipt that can be generated automatically on the way to the recipient. This problem occurs because a negative response always mean that the document has not been received and that the Biller must respond. The sender may never know this and certainly not if he did not register.
These consequences should be clarified to anticipate potential conflicts around the "missing" and unpaid invoices. But it is also to prevent "inflation" in profiles on the way to an unregistered Biller (potential response receiver) the BilSim indicates that it is possible to send an electronic Reminder.
It is also to ensure traceability and the ability to continue to be in control of routing back to the invoice senders.

The following is added to the text of Section 3.2.3: It is importent to stress that if you use a profile where the recipient of similar documents may reject them with a (negative) ApplicationResponse it is a requirement that you register. In practice this means that the only profile that can be used if one does not register is "Billing Basic" profile.

On page 13, bottom
The sentence "The reason is technical refusal and not a rejection of a false profile because there ..." changed to "The reason to a technical rejection and not a rejcetion of a false profile is that there ..."

Changed

OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf

On page 10, section 3.2.1, finally: "... OIOUBL_2.xx)" changed to "... OIOUBL-2.xx)" with a hyphen instead of underscore.

Changed

On page 13, middle: the profile name Procurement-OrdAdv-BilSim is not shown in bold as the other profile names in the table of volunteer profiles.

Changed

On page 15, section 3.2.4, just above the table Table 3: "OrderSimR" changed to "OrdSim"

Changed

Page 18, Section 3.2.5: Bilaterally agreed profiles should describe whether and how such profiles should be registered in the UDDI, including how the specified "URI (Unique Resource Identifier) in the attribute" schemeID "should be registered, so profile name is unique in the UDDI.
It should be mentioned in OIOUDDI and related tools.

More deep in OIOUDDI. One should remember that schematron do not accept other profiles than those found in the codelist. IT can be necessary to change your own schematron also in the client.

Page 18-19, section 3.2.6: Title and content is divided over a page break..

Changed

Page 23 figure 7: Procurement-OrdAdv-BilSim-1.0 lacks an arrow from ApplicationResponse to OrderingAdvanced process, and an arrow from OrderingAdvanced process to BillingSimple process (like in figure 6).

Changed

Page 24 figure 8: Procurement-OrdSel-BilSim-1.0 lacks an arrow from ApplicationResponse to OrderingSellerInitiated process, and an arrow from OrderingSellerInitiated process to BillingSimple process (like in figure 6).

Changed

Page 26, middle: both Catalogue-CatSim-1.0 og Catalogue-CatSimR-1.0 set as minimum profiles, this is wrong because CatSimR, with Response - it is optional.

Changed

On page 30, middle:
says "... figure 15, ..." changed to "... figure 14, ..."

Changed

On page 30, middle:
The sentence "Årsagen er en teknisk afvisning og ikke en afvisning af en forkert profil skyldes, at der ..." changed to "Årsagen til en teknisk afvisning og ikke en afvisning af en forkert profil er den, at der ..."

Changed

OIOUBL_GUIDE_FAKTURA.pdf

This guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".   Changed

Page 13-14, Example in grey box: Classes PaymentMeans og PaymentTerms repeats without reason.   Changed

Compared with party names on page 15 there is some errors:
Page 73 the class AccountingCustomerParty is called Kundepart this should be Debitor.
Page 81 the class PayeeParty is called BetalingsModtagerPart this should be BetalingsModtager.
Page 85 the class BuyerCustomerParty is called Kundepart this should be Køber.
Page 91 the class SellerSupplierParty is called Kreditor this should be Sælger.

Changed

Page 143, AccountingCost: it is recommended to use AccountingCost (AccountingCostCode) on an invoice line in four specific profiles (BilSim, BilSimR og NES profile8, Billing Basic with dispute). There is no reason to use AccountingCost only in these cases.
There are typically more need to enclose a financialaccountnumber in AccountingCost after a prior electronic order as in the profile Procurement-OrdSimR-BilSim.
The recommendation should be deleted.

Deleted

OIOUBL_GUIDE_KREDITNOTA.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".   Changed

Compared with Party names on page 14 there are some errors:
Page 69 the class AccountingCustomerParty is called Kundepart this should be Debitor.
Page 77 the class PayeeParty is called BetalingsModtagerPart this should be BetalingsModtager.

OIOUBL_GUIDE_RYKKER.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".	Changed	
Compared with Party-names on page 11 there are some errors:		
Page 24 class AccountingCustomerParty is called Kundepart this should be Debitor.	Changed	
The guideline does not specify how some problematic totals must be calculated in a reminder. There is a reference to the general description of the classes in OIOUBL_GUIDE_BIBLIOTEK.pdf.		Create a FAQ with descriptive text + 2 examples! FAQ could be as follows: VAT calculation for a Reminder is special. A reminderline is inclusive of any VAT and shift the tax calcuation at header level applies only to any fees, interest, etc. Please note that if given a fee of a reminder, the following codelist used for fee reason: <cbc:AllowanceCharg eReasonCode listAgencyID="320" listID="urn:oioubl:code list:reminderallowance chargereasoncode-1.0">PenaltyFee</cbc: AllowanceChargeRea sonCode>. See also the attached examples.
It is about totals as "zero VAT" LineExtensionAmount, ChargeTotalAmount, "ZeroRated" TaxableAmount in TaxTotal and PayableAmount. Look at the comments in OIOUBL_GUIDE_TOTALER.pdf.	This will perhaps only be mentioned in an FAQ or in OIOUBL_GUIDE_TOTALER.p df	

Page 37, BalanceBroughtForwardIndicator below ReminderLine: here is the flag for any Opening Balance. It is not clear whether the case of a completed DebitLineAmount or CreditLineAmount or where it should be found. It is not mentioned how the opening balance should be understood..

Described in danish

There could be added the following to the FAQ: A Reminder process can not be started without the existence of an Invoice. A reminder process may consist of a sequence of Reminder document each of which refers to the previous Reminder document. In the ReminderSequenceNumeric you state the document sequencenumber (1,2,3,..n), and the type of Reminder is stated in the field ReminderTypeCode (with associated codelist). On ReminderlLine is a flag (BalanceBroughtForwardIndicator) which can indicate whether the line amount (Debit or Credit), is a balance carried over from the past.

OIOUBL_GUIDE_APPRESPONS.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".

Changed

OIOUBL_GUIDE_BIBLIOTEK.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".	Changed
Page 21, section 3.4 AllowanceCharge: AccountingCostCode refers to UN/CEFACT codelist 5189, but it is about AllowanceChargeReasonCode in AllowanceCharge. It must be a misplaced reference.	Reference to UN/CEFACT deleted
PAge 152, under InvoiceLine: AccountingCostCode defined as "Den kontostrengkode, …" og det samme er AccountingCost. AccountingCost should only be "Den kontostreng, …" without "kode". This equal definition for both appear several places in various guidelines.	Changed several places

OIOUBL_GUIDE_ORDRE.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".	
	Changed
Page 14, IssueTime: order date is probably also (like the IssueDate) assigned by the buyer and not the creditor	Changed
Compared with Party-names on page 12 there are some errors: Page 33 the class BuyerCustomerParty is called Kundepart it should be Køber. Side 41 the class SellerSupplierParty is called Leverandør it should be Sælger. Side 47 the class AccountingCustomerParty is called Kundepart it should be Debitor.	
	Changed
Compared to the consultation Corrections the following is also noted regarding Item 56: The cardinality of OrderAllowanceCharge on header level must be 0..n.	Ordre.AllowanceCharge shall have cardinality 0..n

OIOUBL_GUIDE_KATALOG.pdf

The guide has only the general title "OIOUBL Guideline".	Changed
Through the guideline are used "en katalog" and "et katalog".	Changed
Page 26, ProviderParty and page 30, ReceiverParty has both a PartyLegalEntity, where the example shows a "schemeName = CVR". The correct attribute is schemeID, and the value must be schemeID="DK:CVR".	Changed
Page 47, section 3.6.6 below ComplementaryRelatedItem: translated to "KomplimentærVare" several times - should be chaged to "KomplementærVare" with "e", which is the correct translation of the english word "Complementary...", and is used page 33 and 37.	Changed

Page 53, PriceAmount: in the example should be unitCode as attribute instead of currencyID. Generally, many of the examples have like attNavn = 'værdi', where the correct form is attNavn="værdi" dvs without blank spaces arround equal-sign and value in quotation marks.

Changed

Not important - will not be changed

OIOUBL_GUIDE_RABAT.pdf

Page 8-9, section 3.4 LegalMonetaryTotal in table: indicate that a AllowanceCharge may be "indicative", and not counted in ChargeTotalAmount or AllowanceTotalAmount, but it can be seen nowhere when, or how a AllowanceCharge may be "indicative", unless it exists at the line level where it is only informative.

The text on page 8 section 3.4 "(if it is merely illustrative it should not be included)" replaced with "(a possible discount on line level should not be included)"

OIOUBL_GUIDE_TOTALER.pdf

¨Page 8, section 3.5.1 LineExtensionAmount on Reminder:
Here calculated LineExtensionAmount as debit-amount minus credit-amount.
In consequence OIOUBL_GUIDE_RYKKER.pdf includes VAT calculation in a reminder only plus/minus in AllowanceCharge on the header-level.
This means that VAT calculation must consider the sum in line LineExtensionAmount as "TAX-free". Similary TaxableAmount in a "ZeroRated" TaxSubTotal set equal to "TAX-free" LineExtensionAmount, according to OIOUBL_GUIDE_SKAT.pdf.
The calculation will then calculate PayableAmount according to section 3.12 PayableAmount. This different handling should be described in a collection under each amount in OIOUBL_GUIDE_TOTALER.pdf about the Reminders special ways to handle certain amounts: already invoiced amount in LineExtensionAmount, new fees (deductions) in ChargeTotalAmount (AllowanceTotalAmount), and it is all blended together in a nonsense-total PayableAmount, not to be paid!

The text on page 8 section 3.5.1 "Rules of line total are the same as described above" is replaced with "Tax Calculation for a Reminder is special. A reminderline is inclusive of any VAT and the Taxcalculation on headerlevel applies only to any fees, interest etc."

Compared to the hearing is the following noted regarding section 34 and 35:
In section 34 is stated TaxExclusiveAmount to be the total Linesum before VAT, but in section 35 are stated: at that if it is declared it must be the sum of TaxSubtotal.TaxAmount and this includes only the amount? This we find contradictory and require further clarification.

Have already stated on page 9 section 3.6 "Note: The use of TaxExclusiveAmount is...."

Page 8, section 3.5.1 LineExtensionAmount on Reminder:
There are stated "The rule for line total is the same as dscribed above." – Presumably refering
to the rules in section 3.5, also to, at LineExtensionAmount is exclusive of VAT.
It is more correct to say, that LineExtensionAmount can be regarded as exclusive of VAT, even
if just a Reminders line amount is the total invoice from a VATinclusive Invoice/CreditNote.

Same point as above

OIOUBL_GUIDE_DATATYPER.pdf

Page 9, table in section 3.6: in the example occurs square bracekts around "[320 (ID for IT- og
Telestyrelsen)]".

[320 (ID for IT- og
Telestyrelsen] changed to just
"320".

Page 9, table in section 3.7.1: there is apparently notes "1)" to "4)" by the examples, but they are
not detailed.

We can´t find it

The scenarios have not been
involved in this hearing, but we
will look at them again

Ceomments for OIOUBL 2.02 Scenarios

The various scenarious are based on a series of profiles that are described in
OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf. Since the profiles play a significant role in
understanding the use of OIOUBL documents. It must be importent that there in
each scenario is a very clear presentation of the profiles and document to be used
in the scenario. Furthermore the same approach used to describe the profile and
OIOUBL documents the use of each scenario in order to ensure overview for the
reader.

Will be investigated

Section 2.2 The use of OIOUBL-profiles in the document OIOUBL catalog exchange
(CATEXE) serves as a good example of building the description of the use of
profiles and should be used as a model for construction of the other scenarios in
section 2.2. Here is the profile ID and documents used, summarised in a figure
building stated in the figure used in OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf, which gives a
good consistency and a good overview. For comparison can section 2.2 be
highlighted. The use of OIOUBL-profiles in OIOUBL procurement process for
advanced orders (ADVORD). For several reasons this section is clearly less
transparent.

Will be investigated

Table 1 is shared over page 10 and page 11 and it has the headlines Scenario title and Profile. Here is missing headline Profile-id (and maybe also comments as in CATEXE page 12). Furthermore, the profile SellerInitiatedOrderingToBillingSimple can not be identified in the document OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf.

The last pointlist setup on page 11 should be constructed as figure 1 page 12 in the document OIOUBL catalogue exchange (CATEXE), to create a better view.

In the document OIOUBL Basic Purchase process in section 2.2. The use of OIOUBL profiles page 9 in the botton of the table is a profile-id but have the extention "R" and this does not exist in the document OIOUBL_GUIDE_PROFILER.pdf. Based on Naming-section on page 10 it is stated how R is used, but the table on page 14 does not have the profile-id Procurement-OrdSimR-BilSim-1.0. The table should have all the profiles.

Scenarios OIOUBL Complex Delivery and OIOUBL Purchasing Process for Complex Organizations in Section 2.2 The use of OIOUBL-profiles are equal to the scenario OIOUBL Basic Procurement Process and the scenario OIOUBL Complex Payment Process in section 2.3 (which should be changed to section 2.2) should have the same structure as the document OIOUBL Purchasing Process for Advanced orders.. All scenarios should be changed so that section 2.2 is equal and based on the document OIOUBL Catalogue exchange. Furthermore the chapter 2 in the document OIOUBL Complex Payment Process is adjusted so that it looks like chapter 2 in OIOUBL Catalogue Exchange.

Will be investigated

Will be investigated

Will be investigated

Will be investigated

Will be investigated

OIOUBL_SCENARIE_COMPAY-DK.PDF

Page 28 bottom, the field PaymentMeans. PaymentMeansCode has a value 48, which is not defined in the codelist PaymentMeansCode. It should be 49 according to the codelist. It has not been possible to define the codelist – where is it?

Will be investigated - check also the codelist

Comments on Annex 3: OIORASP

Page 6. Upper box labeled "OIO RASP Profile 1.1". Should it not be 1.2?

Changed

Page 8. We consider the HTTP protocol SMTP far superior in stability and performance. It is therefore encourraging that the SMTP is only optional for a OIORASP provider.

Side 12. It is not possible to find the Digital Evidence of signature on an NITA homepage. Detailed placement should be indicated.

Proposed phased out by other NITA will cause to be made a note of "digital evidence"

Page 12. KMD believes that the digital signature which is returned from the RASP toolkit version 1.01 independently have legal validity. It would be desirable to have NITA will cause to be made a an operational guide to how to use RASP toolkit to achieve "digital evidence". note of "digital evidence"

Side 15. It would be desirable to have a custom Header element of type "AgreementId", so that the sender to receiver can refere to one of several possible agreements on the processing of the document at the receiver. The "EndpointContractUrl" from UDDI registration could be suitable as a value in "AgreementId". Specific for KMD not changed

Side 15. "OIO RASP messages should include SenderPartyType and ReceiverPartyIdentifierType header blocks." This should be supported by RASP toolkit. This is supported in 1.2

Page 15. Second last section is "should" spelled in lowercase. It should be SHOULD to be compliant with reading the instruction page 8. Changed

Page 18. In the form RASP custom header is set to ReceiverPartyIdentifierType and SenderPartyIdentifierType is mandatory. On page 15 is stated at RASP messages Changed on page 18 "should include" them. So optional. minOccurs="0"

Page 21. "but" instead of "by" Changed
Page 27. "SHOULD" instead of "should" Changed
Page 29. Good chart. No change

Comments on Annex 4: OIOUDDI

Generally to Annex 4:
To Understand the document you need knowledge of UDDI, which is a comprehensive specification.

The usual section with SHOULD, SHOULD NOT etc. are missing.
The design seems to be prepared for processes and process roles. But it is not clear if it is implemented. Only the XML samples show how to obtain processes and process roles on a registration.

Specifically to Annex 4:
Page 9: It should be indicated that an endpoint can be OIORASP compliant exclusively using HTTP protocol.

Page 10: Figure 2 would be clearer with headlines of boxes.

Representatives from PEPPOL project has proposed to change the naming of Annex 4: OIOUDDI, to OIOSMI (Service Metadata Interface) to ensure semantic interoperability between eBusinessregister and the corresponding records in PEPPOL. NITA has chosen to respond to the proposal Annex 4 in the Statute gets the title OIOSMI – the contents of the annex is unchanged.

Yes
Changed

See tModeller

Described in box
Not changed

Page 11: It is apparantly a design choice that a UDDI lookup only allows one row per lookup by EAN/document type. This will clarify the reader to draw attention to the derived requirements, where they occur.

A search on identifier + identifiertype + servicetype return the services from the UDDI that meets parameters. You can then look closer to these services to see if there is other secondary things to sort from. This is eg ProcessDefinition. The search is a standard UDDI v.3

Page 16: "Specifying these lookups is beyond the scope of this profile".
The XML code example is shown in "Endpoint lookup example XML". There should be operational instructions elseware if not contained in this document.

We have a new example and we refer to UDDI v3. spec.

Page 20: The XML example miss an explanation. What does the following mean:
```
<tModelBag>
  <tModelKey>
    uddi:2e0b404020-7a5e-8686-b33f54fd1f47
  </tModelKey>
<tModelBag>?
```
Is it an empty bag? Of what?

No, there is a tModel within it. We refer to the UDDI Spec and will make a new example
We will deliver new examples from live data and we will change SellerParty and BuyerParty

Page 23: There is a specific value: "clientRole". This is inconsistent with the values "SupplierParty"/"CustomerParty" indicated on p 43.
Page 23: It is in the XML not clear how the specified ProcessRole refers to a Process. Probably it is from the subsequent keyedReference, but it is not very clear.

New XML example

Page 23: Is it supposed that the business-related processes (Procurement-BilSim-1.0 eg.) subsequently shall handle keyedReference this way?

Page 43: Dispute with "clientRole" p. 23.

ProcessDefinition for Procurement-BilSim-1.0 is refered from ProcessRoleDefinition (Procurement-BilSim-1.0 BuyerParty og Procurement-BilSim-1.0 SellerParty). Look also at the diagram on page 8 to 12
Changed to SellerParty and BuyerParty

Comments on the hearing documents in addition

Information to IT-developers
Source: http://www.itst.dk/arkitektur-og-standarder/infrastruktur-og-felles-losninger/nemhandel/information-til-it-udviklere

KMD suggests that the guaranteed up time for critical servers will be published. Eg OIOUDDI and OCSP (OCSP and LDAP servers).

Generally the servers are running in normal workours - we might later publish further descriptions of uptime

KMD suggests that procedures and business processes related to discovery of security holes in RASP toolkit will be published
KMD find it very positive that: "… you as a developer can use the profileregistry webservice which is being developed by IT- og Telestyrelsen, and is expected to be ready after the summer 2009…", since the current approach is unnecessarily complex.

It will be analysed how an adequate publication should be

Thank you

Information til vareleverandører

Source: http://www.itst.dk/arkitektur-og-standarder/infrastruktur-og-felles-losninger/nemhandel/betydning-for-leverandorer-af-en-endret-bekendtgorelse

KMD believes that the digital signature which is returned from RASP toolkit version 1.01 only has the same legal validity as a receipt for a registered letter. It would be desirable to have an operating manual for how a user of the RASP toolkit gets "digital evidence".

ITST/NITA will cause to be made a note of "digital evidence"

General

included:

”OIOUBL Completing the instanses G41”.

Statute:

OIOUBL ApplicationResponse

OIOUBL Invoice

OIOUBL CreditNote

OIOUBL Reminder

Outside Statute:

OIOUBL Orders

OIOUBL OrderChange

OIOUBL OrderCancellation

OIOUBL OrderResponse

OIOUBL OrderResponseSimple

OIOUBL Catalogue

OIOUBL CatalogueDeletion

Changed