

Question No.	Subject area	Page/paragraph No.	Question/Issue	Response
1	Communication/Engagement		Please can we have a summary which clearly identifies changes from the existing UK system specification	A document will be produced reflecting the changes and circulated as soon as possible.
2	Communication/Engagement		Could we be provided with a detailed process flow of UK code ordering and downloading, technical specifications, points of contact and troubleshooting paths	This information will be shared as part of the UK ID Issuer User Guide document.
3	Communication/Engagement		Please provide details of the support SLA. Do we have an escalation process for urgent/special requests?	The incident management process was presented to stakeholders as part of the IWG meeting in February. During hypercare Dentsu will provide a special escalation path via a dedicated inbox that will be shared with stakeholders during the upcoming IWG meeting.

4	Communication/Engagement	Pg 91	<p>Product_return description to include "return from retail?" ... at the moment the description only describes return following complete or partial non-delivery</p>	<p>Reverse logistics are captured in the regulation as normal flows, therefore the flag "product return" is for partial or non-complete delivery, not for reverse logistics. Reverse logistics are expected to be Dispatch (3.3) + Arrivals (3.4) like a normal product movement. This is the intention of the UK Regulation, not the technical specifications. HMRC are currently looking at the policy and current approach for returns and will provide a further update at the next IWG meeting.</p>
5	EOID/FID validation	Pg 56 / paragraph 1	<p>This suggests that there will be a way to validate if a customer EOID and FID are both valid within the repository and if they are both active. At the moment there is no API to validate the information that has been provided by our customers, Is there a new message type that would allow an EO to validate a customer ID at the point of the customer keying so that we can feedback directly to that customer.</p>	<p>Validation of EOID/FID as referenced here relates to the validations carried out against transmitted messages which contain EOIDs and/or FIDs, i.e. the system checks that the EOIDs/FIDs are present and correct. This should not be confused with the separate functionality with which an EO can check the existence and validity of EOID/FID provided to them by another EO. Full details of this functionality will be covered in the separate UK ID Issuer User Guide.</p>

6	EOID/FID validation		<p>When can we expect specifications for the EOID/FID validation interface: What is the expected usage, i.e mandatory or ad-hoc? Limitations on volumes that can be checked at once?</p>	<p>Full details of the EOID/FID validation functionality will be included in the UK ID Issuer User Guide. Please also see response to question above</p>
7	ID Issuer		<p>Please can you provide the code format for codes to be issued by Dentsu:What will be the new ID code prefixWhat are the expected identifiers to be used? (e.g. 5R ISSUERID : SERIAL PRODUCTCODE YYMMDDHH)Which parts of the code is considered the serialisation element for Dentsu as the ID issuer? (assume (a)ID Issuer id + (b)Serial Code)Terminology for the long code, human readable code vs code issued from ID issuer are very confusing and leads to confusion.... is there no simpler way to document this clearly?</p>	<p>Full details of the unique identifier format for upUIs/aUIs/EOID/FID/MID will be set out in the UK ID Issuer Guide document.</p>
8	ID Issuer		<p>Is there any information about accessing the Denstu ID issuer platform and who our customers would contact if there were any difficulties?</p>	<p>Full details of the ID Issuer platform including how to create incident tickets will be explained in the UK ID Issuer Guide.</p>

9	ID Issuer		<p>The current UK system allowed for the retention and ongoing use of EOIDs/FIDs/MIDs provided by a non-UK ID issuer which were issued before 01 January 2021. Will this functionality remain after 01 July 2022 when Dentsu's UK system goes live. Will existing EOIDs/MIDs/FIDs be transferred to the new system or will businesses need to reregister. Will these arrangements be the same for newly registered businesses and facilities?</p>	<p>As part of the mobilisation of Dentsu's UK system, the current UK supplier must transfer to Dentsu all existing traceability & registration data. This includes EOIDs/FIDs/MIDs which were issued by an EU ID Issuer prior to 1 January 2021. Successful data transfer will ensure the UK system retains the functionality which allows for reporting using these non-UK IDs. As of now, any new business or facility must be registered for a UK EOID/FID with the UK ID Issuer, i.e. if a new facility is in the EU you will need separate EU and UK FIDs for each system. Further updates will be provided at the next IWG meeting.</p>
10	ID Issuer		<p>How do we create new EOID/FID/MID after transition to Dentsu's system</p>	<p>Full details on how to register for new EOIDs/FIDs/MIDs will be included in the UK ID Issuer User Guide</p>
11	ID Issuer		<p>When ordering codes, do you perform validation against the UK CEG system for the TPID?</p>	<p>There is no link between the UK CEG & T&T systems so no such validation is carried out at the point of ordering codes</p>

12	Migration		<p>Is there any communication about when the test system will be available for both the new UK gateway and repository and the ID issuer? Any issues during testing will be raised via the service portal, however, do we have any point of escalation, or ability to discuss urgently any critical issues? Are we planning any combined sessions to share experience? How do we request credential to environments for sending messages and also for ID issuer? (QA, Production, etc) Will existing users be transferred for Dentsu Portal users?</p>	<p>An update on migration timelines, including testing period will be covered in the next industry meeting to be scheduled by HMRC for late March. This will include details of how businesses can access and use QA and Production environments and technical call to support businesses during testing. Businesses will need to register within Dentsu's dedicated UK support portal. A section on how to request credentials for the UK Gateway API and the UK ID Issuer API will be described in the UK ID Issuer Guide.</p>
13	Migration		<p>Are we expecting to have a transition period when we switch from DLR to Dentsu, where messages may not be processed? I assume all historical data will be transferred from DLR to Dentsu?</p>	<p>An update on migration timelines, including the switchover period and migration of existing data will be covered during the upcoming industry meetings to be scheduled by HMRC.</p>
14	Migration		<p>To ensure that all identifier codes (EOID, FID, MID) have been migrated to new system, is it possible for Dentsu to cross-check based on a list provided by manufacturer?</p>	<p>Yes, this could be possible. This point can be jointly explored during the next IWG. All data that can be shared with Dentsu to support quality assurances of the migration is welcomed.</p>

15	Code-pairing		If factory is located in EU and printed codes come from EU ID Issuer we need to send 3.1a code pairing message and not print 2 codes. In this instance will code ordering only be required through EU ID Issuer or through the UK ID Issuer also	As now, manufacturers will still be required to purchase both EU and UK codes for product destined for GB. The EU code is printed on the packet and the UK code must be digitally associated/code-paired
16	Code-pairing		Is it correct that, when producing for XI (NI) Code pairing is not required?	That is correct, the UK ID Issuer provides one XI code for each product which is to be used for reporting, separately, into both EU and UK systems
17	Code-pairing	Pg 11	The "numbering" for Paring message has changed from 3.0(in DLR) to 3.A1 (in Dentsu), any specific reason or rational behind this?	This was amended to reflect the actual name used in the relevant UK Regulation provision, namely message 3.A1 in Annex II.

18	Code-pairing	Pg 70	<p>Based on the definition upUI/(M) has two parts, (a) issuer id and (b) middle block --> however, looking at the pairing message, this seems to require the following parts of the UK code for pairing. Part (a) issuer + (b) Serial + (c) Product Code Hence i could imply the "middle block" is part (a) + (b) + (c) please confirm? (you can see how this quickly gets confusing)</p> <p>Please confirm my understanding and Logic for Pairing code structures: PAR message has upUI(L) (part a,b,c,d) paired with UK Code upUI(M) (part a,b,c) ?</p> <p>If the above is correct, you will never receive upUI(s) version of the UK code as specified on page 70...</p>	<p>Clarification: PAR message has upUI(L) (part a,b,c,d) of the Printed Code (Foreign Code) paired with UK Code upUI(M) (part a,b,c).</p> <p>The upUI(s) version of the UK Code is the version issued by the UK ID Issuer and therefore known by the Gateway. However, the upUI(s) version of the Printed Code (Foreign Code) will never be known by the Gateway. Amendment introduced to reflect this properly.</p>
----	--------------	-------	--	--

19	UK Gateway	Para 2.2.2	Why are NI related messages supposed to be submitted to the EU router instead of the EU primary repository?	Diagram of 2.2.2 shows a blue arrow from the Economic Operator internal system to the Primary Repository. This is to demonstrate that manufacturers and importers have to report NI messages to the Primary Repository, while all other Economic Operators must report their messages to the EU Router. Both need to report NI messages also in parallel to the UK Gateway .
20	UK Gateway	Para 3.2.5.1.	Is there any particular reason why the ID code limit for reporting is 10k rather than the 50k as seen in the EU system? Parity of reporting limits would be better for internal reporting systems.	The performance requirements as per SLA are different in the UK and EU systems. On the EU side, the response time is 60 seconds, while, on the UK side, the response time is an average of under 1 second for 99% of the messages. This limit therefore had to be adjusted accordingly

21	UK Gateway	Para 3.2.2.1	<p>On one side there is statement "The Gateway assigns a unique chain of characters that uniquely identifies each message, called RecallCode." and on the other side the code, that serves as recallCode, is provided by EO who submitted the message. So Dentsu UK Gateway seems to be following on DLR approach with recallCode. The EU approach when Gateway generates a recallId is preferred. Alternatively, a bit more straight forward specification for handling the code/recallCode is appreciated, although the approach seems to be clear.</p>	<p>This is not correct. The only message where the recall code is provided by Economic Operators is the Recall message (RCL), used to cancel a previously submitted message. The UK Gateway generates the recall code for every message received. This is one of the major differences from the DLR system and will be further detailed in a separate document. We noticed that there was a mistake in many JSON examples linked to the request where the Code field was specified. This mistake was corrected.</p>
22	UK Gateway		<p>Is there an authentication credential for each specific EOID submitting the message ?</p>	<p>Yes, this is described in section 3.1.3 where OAUTH is specified. The process to get these credentials will be specified in the UK ID Issuer Guide document.</p>
23	Message Structure	Pg 68	<p>In the JSON Request sample: What is the field "Code"? In this example, there is no apUIs, can we omit the field or do we have to specify the field with equivalent JSON null value?</p>	<p>This has been corrected for this and all other messages. The field "Code" is part of the acknowledgment message only, not part of the submitted request. "Code" is the recall code returned by the UK Gateway for every message transmitted.</p>

24	Message Structure	Pg 69	<p>In the Description of Fields table, "upUI --> List of paired codes" is not a List, but rather a single object. Whereas "upID --> Code pairing details" is a "list of code pairing details", please can you review and updated the description of these fields. Additionally the field "upUI Printed_Code" and "upUI Paired Code" in the example and historically is called "Printed_Code" and "Paired_Code" respectively, please update the fields to reflect the example JSON.</p>	<p>While we agree with the comments (upUI is a single JSON element, upID is a list of N elements of pairs), we do not wish to change the field names or descriptions as the wording used is identical to that in the UK Regulation. Amended to the message example are now included to also reflect the names of the Regulation.</p>
25	Message Structure	Pg 76	<p>Please provide more details about the usage and information of the "Information" boolean field? What is this? How and when should this be used?</p>	<p>This value has been removed as it is not part of the current scope</p>
26	Message Structure	Pg 96	<p>"Product_return": "true" --> this is incurred according to the specifications. Please update the example JSON UI_Type in the example is a string ... this should be an integer What is the "Code" field ? (this field is in most of the example JSON messages)</p>	<p>The "Code" field has been removed, this was a mistake. The JSON example message was changed to integer. Note that boolean values can be represented with true/false or 1/0 respectively.</p>
27	Response times		<p>Please confirm the contractually agreed response time for messages? (e.g. 1 second or is this a best endeavours) Can this be added to the specifications?</p>	<p>Dentsu is contractually required to ensure an average response time of below 1 second for 99% of all messages (monthly).</p>