

## **eGov review of UBL 8.0 Distribution Package**

By Mikkel Hippe Brun, Independent Consultant, SchemaWorks and Brian Nielsen, The Danish National IT- and Telecom Agency on behalf of the Danish XML Committee

### ***Some thoughts on how the eGov review team can contribute***

We are by no means experts on business messages. We imagine that this may be the case for many other UBL-reviewers in the eGov context. So how can the eGov review team contribute?

Considering that we are not domain experts, we could approach the standard from a national view point. UBL will allow trade between companies in different countries, but many companies do not have any trading partners abroad. Some of the requirements in the UBL-standard may be irrelevant in a national context. There may likewise be extensions to the standard that are relevant in a national context an irrelevant in an international context.

We have tried to approach the standard with this in mind.

### ***Comments on UBL-ScopeActivityDiagram-0.8-draft-2.jpg***

The Scope Activity Diagram does not explain how an invoice may be reconciled if the received goods does not match the Dispatch Advice. The problem is that the invoice is reconciled against the original Dispatch Advice. What should happen in this situation? Should a new corrected Dispatch Advice be sent to the buyer or is the Delivery Recipient responsible for notifying the Buyer about the inconsistency? Is a message missing for this or is the procedure to send a new Dispatch Advice? The answer is not visible in the diagram.

### ***Identification of Payer/Payment for reconciliation of incoming payments***

In Denmark most payments are associated with an identifier which references the payer/payment in the Sellers internal ERP-system. The ID is generated by the Seller and is made part of the Invoice. This ID makes it possible to do an automated reconciliation of incoming payments. It is our belief that this ID may be of benefit in other countries as well. Without this ID – companies with many incoming payments will have to do the reconciliation by hand. This issue has been raised by the Danish Bankers Association and is explained by Carsten Pedersen ([cp@finansraadet.dk](mailto:cp@finansraadet.dk)) in the following mail:

In order to use the scenario in a simple invoice scenario in Denmark we need two additional elements in the PaymentMeans object. These elements could be added to the PaymentMeans object by expanding the Core Component Type under the rules in "Guidelines for a compatible customization of UBL schemas" (WD 5), or they could be added by including the two new elements in the PaymentMeans object in the UBL Invoice. The information is necessary when payment is done by use of Joint Payments Cards which is the default mean of payment in this scenario.

The two elements we need in PaymentMeans are:

\* PaymentID (Identification of Payor/Payment for reconciliation of incoming payments).

\* InstructionCode/Code for transfer forms (Identification of type and functionality of form).

Enclosed is an Excel sheet with handling information and flow:

Parties	Ultimate Beneficiary	Flow direction	Payor	Flow direction	Account Servicer Bank	Flow direction	Beneficiary Bank	Flow direction	Ultimate Beneficiary					
Business Flow	Create invoice with Payment Instruction	→	Create Payment based on Instruction	→	Debit payors account and transfer amount	→	Receive amount and credit ultimate beneficiarys account + advice	→	Receive advice and book amount in own ERP system					
References and Information	Reference Payment (Joint Payment Cards)													
References										Example	Definition	EDIFACT	Message	
Payment ID	Create ID	→	Registrate ID in Payment	→	Forward ID in transfer	→	Forward ID in advice	→	Receive and use in booking	123456789012347 (O n..25)	Identification of Payor/Payment for reconciliation of incoming payments	PAYMUL, Level C, SGGRP 11, SG RFF, DE 1153+CR	Payment, Statement OCR-ID	
Instruction Code/ Code for transfer forms (incl. giro)	Select form eg. code	→	Registrate code in Payment	→	Forward code in transfer	→	Forward code in advice	→	Receive and use in booking	71 (O n..2)	Identification of type and functionality of form	PAYMUL, Level C, SGGRP 11, SG PAI, DE 4435+A0199	Payment, Statement TF-Code	

### **Mandatory TypeCode in FinancialAccount found in UBL-Reusable-0.8-draft-3.xls**

It is not clear why TypeCode is a mandatory element in FinancialAccount. We cannot see any use for the element in a Danish national context. Will there be a standardized value list like “checking account, house loan account etc.”?

### **RequestedDeliveryDate and PromisedByDate should have representationTerm="DateTime" and not "Date"**

It is convenient to be able to specify a specific time for a delivery.