



CARM TCP DCT Project Updates – Record of Discussion

Thursday July 28th, 2022

12:00pm to 1:00pm – Virtual Session

<u>Trade Chain Member Participants</u>	<u>CBSA Guests</u>	<u>CBSA Member Participants</u>
<p>Marie Ryan Penny Bates Daniel Deslandes UPS</p> <p>Tomasz Jasniewicz Brane Ivanovic Descartes</p> <p>Carol Brown Kyle Campbell Pacific Customs Brokers</p> <p>Shannon Munson FedEx</p> <p>Hayley Shirliffe GHY International</p> <p>Laurie Pasher Anthony Buchanan Livingston International</p> <p>Kushal Patel Shaukat Khan Delmar</p> <p>Doug Watson Ed Pauli General Motors</p> <p>Sean Moore Rafael Estrada CANdata</p> <p>Peter Dotchin Kuehne-Nagel</p> <p>Joseph Blaskiewicz Jim Raiser MIC Customs Solutions</p> <p>Sravanth Durairaj Wisetech</p> <p>Catherine Jenkins Ava John Tanya Dietrich Sachin Trivedi Arlene Coates Russell A. Farrow Limited</p> <p>Peter Dawson DB Schenker of Canada</p>	<p>Kevin Horseman Stakeholder Engagement, CARM</p> <p>Andrew Wishart Project Executive, CARM</p> <p>Alia Janjua Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Kyle Ferguson Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Jay Li Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Juan Cosio Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Nirmit Shah Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Megan Wambolt Stakeholder Engagement, CARM</p> <p>Ben Kane Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Seppie Baker Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Brian Penny Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Gopi Ramachandran Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Jason Porteous Solution Delivery, CARM</p> <p>Thurstan Mathieson PMO, CARM</p>	<p>Jennifer Higgins Stakeholder Engagement, CARM</p> <p>Martin Desbiens Team Leader - B2B Development, CBSA-ASFC</p> <p>Lynn Anderson Superintendent, CARM / GRCA</p> <p>Ted Smye A/Manager, CBSA Assessment and Revenue Management (CARM) Branch</p> <p>Robert Bergeron Team Leader, ISTB, PSMD/CARM ISTB Liaison</p> <p>Parvaneh Hashemi Team Leader - B2B Development, CBSA-ASFC</p> <p>Jean-Philippe Morin A/Manager, CARM Business and Project Implementation / GCRA</p> <p>James Chen Contractor - Common Applications (B2Bi/CECP/BCD/ICS)</p> <p>Ramona Eryuzlu-Maillet Stakeholder Engagement, CARM</p> <p>Kerri Schleppe Manager, CARM PMO / CES</p> <p>Christian Figueredo Director, CARM Solution Delivery</p> <p>Andre Bertrand Business Readiness, CARM</p> <p>Cindy Fox Senior Project Officer</p>

Above list of core Working Members that were in attendance. Organizations may have brought additional SMEs to the session.

Agenda:
1: Project Update
2: ECCRD Schema: Namespace
3: CAD Forward Routing

Note: For detailed information on the agenda items, please see the PDF presentation material.

<p>Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and thank you: Alia thanked the TCPs for their time and commitment and introduced today's agenda • Project updates: Alia communicated that there will be a 2-month sprint from August to September where there will be a focus on scenarios In-progress; those pending end-to-end execution. If TCPs wish to continue, they are asked to submit detailed weekly plans for this duration. TCPs to see what they can complete between Aug-Sep. For TCPs choosing not to continue with DCT, the existing test environment can be used as a sandbox to test at your own pace and other items outside of DCT scope, but support will be on a best-effort basis. Weekly group TCP meetings will be reintroduced. Christian mentioned that TCP plans will allow CARM to allocate resources based on what TCPs want to get through as part of testing. The purpose is to provide a flexible situation where we can put resources towards where we can best support testing plans. • DN/SOA Schema: Through defect investigation a discrepancy was found in the sample schema for DN/SOA where the "namespace" was missing. Currently DN/SOA is being transmitted with a namespace included. However, this differs from what has currently been shared in the <u>sample</u> schema provided for R2. The ECCRD specifies the namespace should be in the schema, but it was found to be missing in the sample. This is currently in process to be resolved. Retesting will need to take place and TCPs may potentially need to complete system updates. This is considered a high priority issue. For next steps, an updated schema will be shared so these can be downloaded and uploaded to systems. Juan provided a description of the namespace. The namespace is a way to future proof the documents we are providing. So, if a new field or attribute in the near future or post-R2 were to be added, CARM would be able to number the documents in your systems so we can load those. There will be a new attribute on the xml at the root level. We are not changing any data related fields within the daily notice or SOA amounts. • CAD forward routing: Nimit led a discussion to recap the proposed solution and address the open items that were brought up at a previous meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some service providers noted that CARM responses (especially in an error message or a functional acknowledgement), there is a service provider BN15 on the CAD, but service providers don't know where to forward the file because there is no importer BN15 / identifier. In order for service providers to forward the response to their clients, additional fields for both incoming and outgoing CADs will be added to the routing message. To distinguish between BN15s, new role codes have been added as unique qualifiers. ○ There was feedback in a prior discussion to add information fields to help the receiver understand that this is a CBSA sender and a CAD message. The values may change for the functional definition, but the other three meta-data fields will remain static. ○ CARM will introduce changes in the pre-processing modules and additional checks/responses will be triggered should the validation fail (details in slide deck) ○ A rough estimate for TCP's development timelines was discussed. TCPs will need approximately 6 weeks of time to be ready to test. However, a "formal" document will be a pre-requisite to the 6-week window. ○ Related open item: TCPs asked if the CBSA BN15 can be used in the CAD messages as an additional sender/recipient instead of the service provider BN15. Answer: The CBSA BN15 cannot be leveraged for CAD routing purposes. • CBSA BN: Ted reiterated that the CBSA BN number will not be used as a sender/receiver ID. An addendum to the ECCRD that covers the changes to CAD routing will be shared with TCPs.

<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schema update to DN/SOA: Ben Kane to share updated schema that will be distributed to TCPs • ECCRD discrepancies discovered during Deep Cycle Testing: Testing team to explore what can be provided in terms of documentation for potential ECCRD updates short of a full, published ECCRD update • Test plans for August-September: TCPs have been asked for a plan of what they feel they can realistically commit to completing by the end of September • Timeline for CAD routing: Functional team will confirm development timeline.
--

<p>Appendix:</p> <p>Questions noted during the session</p> <p>Project Update questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marie - UPS: If we choose to use the sandbox instead of pre-selected scenarios, will we still use the same point of contact with questions about a CAD response <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alia: TCPs can reach out to the Deep Cycle Testing Team inbox with questions 2. Catherine – Farrow: Can a TCP use the sandbox while still doing DCT testing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alia: Yes, but TCPs that continue testing are requested to focus on their scenarios test plans. Support for TCPs that do not continue in DCT will be on a best effort basis. ○ Andrew W: The sandbox is not separate; it would be in the same environment and TCPs can still test scenarios and other functions.
--

Schema will Update questions

1. Laurie: Can you explain the namespace because we do get an importer and operator name coming back in the DN
 - Juan provided a high-level overview of what the namespace is and how it is used.
2. Peter: is this for the DN or SOA?
 - Ben: It is for both.
3. Laurie: We are currently seeing some information that does not make sense on the DN, will this address that?
 - An offline follow up on the specific defect being referenced was agreed upon
4. Marie: On the defect log, this defect has an ETA of September, does this mean we won't have this until that point? Reference to schema update.
 - Ben: this has been going back and forth between integration and PSCD and will want to prioritize, but this will require cross team effort to test things fully before we go and publish the results. This is the current due date, but we can discuss over the next week to see if there is anything we can do to move work around to see if there is any expediting of the timeline and involving all teams before commenting from a timeline point of view.
5. Peter: There are some tags that are missing from the SOA. Payload is not matching the ECCRD. Email will be sent with details
 - Nirmal: once you have finished documenting everything we can reconvene to align
 - Laurie: CBSS does not distinguish the DN date from where the amounts are coming from. Today it does separate the records by DN date so I'm not sure why it is being this way. Adjustments are coming in with the original pay due date of the original transaction. Came up because we are regenerating SOAs, but it shows the pay due date is not aligning.

CAD routing questions

1. Tomasz: this is both EDI/API?
 - The CAD routing solution is to fix routing issues with EDI. However, the solution drives changes to the schema which is common to both EDI and API channels.
2. Peter: Request to have this published within DCT timeline.
 - This will not be a part of DCT and could potentially be tested during the CES so that all TCPs are at the same starting point.