

CEN/ISSS WS/BIIXX

Known issues

BII / UBL 2.0 MAPPING

Business Domain: Any

Business Process: All

Document Identification: CEN/ISSS WS/Known issues

Version: 1.0

Release: Pending

Date of approval: Pending

Content

This document contains a list of known issues regarding mapping to the UBL 2.0 syntax that has not yet been fully resolved or concluded within the current versions of the WG1 deliverables.

1 7	ransaction data models	3
1.1	Invoice	3
1.2	Order	3
1.3	Catalogue	3
1.4	Catalogue delete request	4
1.5	Catalogue request	4
1.6	Application response	5
1.7	Quote	5
1.8	Quote request	5
1.9	Statement	6
	No	_
2 (General	/
2.1	Party classes	7
2.2	Attachment	7
2.3	Quantities, units and packaging	7
2.4	Price	

1 Transaction data models

1.1 Invoice

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
The invoice line in UBL does not provide for specification of invoicing period that applies to the particular line. Example of use is when a there is a line for as subscription service.	Accepted.
Support for specifying payment terms for tax. A particular tax may have to be paid immediately or later. Example is IT case where codes [D]: IVA ad esigibilità DIFFERITA (postponed) and [I]: IVA ad esigibilità IMMEDIATA (immediate) are used.	Rejected as syntax issue.
Provide for shipment information including number of parcels, gross weight and cube.	Accepted.
To facilitate split payment in invoices there needs to be a clear link between each payment and its due date and payment means. To facilitate this, a payment amount element should be added to the payment means class, that works together with the due date.	Under discussion.

1.2 Order

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
Need possibility to provide catalogue reference at header level.	Accepted.
Order should provide for stating payment terms at least basic information such as textual note.	Accepted.

1.3 Catalogue

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
The Catalogue related data models do not include the required element for Catalogue transaction ID in addition to the Catalogue ID.	Accepted.
The item instance class does not specifically provide for "Best before dates".	Accepted.
There is no certification info on the item. Some item may be certified by different certifications bodies and such certification may be important or even mandatory in some industries such as healthcare.	Accepted
Need possibility to provide certification and environmental info.	Accepted
Hierarchical packing structure, upwards and downwards, and their measurements and markings.	Accepted
- Sales units contain items but there may be different quantity of items in a sales unit. E.g. paint that is sold in 1L, 5L, 10L	

and 100L units. It is always the same paint but prices pr. Litre vary greatly with packaging sizes.	
- The item is usually packed into different box levels and any one of those may be the sales unit.	
- Different parts of the logistics chain use different packaging levels and need to identify them.	
- The item pack can also be broken up. E.g. toothbrushes are usually stocked and moved in boxes or at minimum in cartons but small vendors may actually get deliveries pr. piece and end point sales is pr. piece.	
- Packing Levels (attempt to structure but not complete. A class may not use it self as a direct subclass)	
o Measurements	
о Туре	
o Markings	
o Content	
There is no support for bar code identifications. Bar codes are usually based on existing numbers such as a particular standard ID number (GTIN) but the encoding can be based on different standards such as EAN13, EAN128 various US code schemas and more frequently 2D codes. There is different bar coding for different packaging levels.	Accepted.
The actual version ID does not seem to have relevance to the action, that is, it does not mater if the version is 1.0, 2.0 or 3.0 the action is always the same. We could use more positive control identifiers such as "Replace" and "Update" meaning that he transaction is either a replace version or an update versions.	Accepted.

1.4 Catalogue delete request

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
Catalogue delete request requires effective date.	Accepted.

1.5 Catalogue request

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
Specification of item information in requests differ from the other docs in the way that in requests the need is often to provide ranges i.e. a laptop should.	Accepted.
- Have a hard drive with minimum 300 Gb	
- Screen size between 15 and 17 inches.	

There may also be a need to specify the importance of an attribute such as required, favourable. Further if the specification is being made in a tendering situation there may be a need to provide weight for the requirement.	Accepted.
The additional attribute class needs to allow for sequencing of both attributes and attribute groups. Used so that attributes can be processes in logical order e.g. in order of importance.	Accepted.

1.6 Application response

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
The document does not support appeal information.	Accepted
The document does not provide for specifying the sender and the receiver roles. Since this is a generic document the sender and the receiver may have different roles such as buyer and seller, debtor/creditor etc. and since both partners in a collaboration may be using the application response they can both be the sender or receiver party but acting in different roles.	Rejected. Specified by the context of referenced document.
The Response reference identifier should not be mandatory. In the application response the document that is being responded to is identified in a separate document reference class. If the reply applies to the whole document then the response reference identifier is redundant. The application response also provides for replying to specific sections in the line reference.	Accepted.
The response document does not provide an effective date, e.g. when the document is used for accepts the effective date of the acceptance may be later than the issue date. For example a new catalogue may be accepted but effective from end of month.	Accepted.

1.7 Quote

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
Support for quote request reference on quote line.	Accepted.

1.8 Quote request

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
Document does not support specification of a due date for the quote.	Accepted.
Does not support requested validity period for the quote.	Accepted.
Quote request does not support buyer info. Assumes originator is the same as buyer.	Accepted.

1.9 Statement

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
The payment means class is 01, but in invoice it is 0n. The logic for allowing multiple payments means classes applies equally to the statement as to the invoice.	Accepted

2 General

2.1 Party classes

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
There is a need to be able to provide information about parties such as their type (e.g. Government, military, private, Law etc.), their activities (e.g. manufacturing, health etc.) as well as company dossier type of information (e.g. number of employees, turnover, form of incorporation etc.). This could be a new common class that could be included in the party classes on an appropriate level.	Mapped to different elements.
It is not possible to give general party information such as company telephone, company email, fax etc Currently it is only possible to give such information for contacts and persons within the party contact or person.	Accepted.
It is inconvenient not being able to give a contacts title of function class. Using the person class creates confusion because then both classes contain the name so what name is what?	Accepted.

2.2 Attachment

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
The attachment class should provide for electronic signature.	Accepted
UBL does not provide for information about compression algorithm for attached files.	Mapped to current model.

2.3 Quantities, units and packaging

Status for UBL 2.1
Guideline depends on resources

2.4 Price

Description	Status for UBL 2.1
UBL document should provide for using VAT inclusive price and amounts.	Accepted.