



IATA SIS Production

Major Release 1.3 Communication

Version No: 1.0

REVISION HISTORY LOG

Version Ref	Creation Date
V1.0	29-Jan-2013

This document may not be disclosed, reproduced, copied, recast, reformatted or transmitted in any form by any means electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system without the express and prior written permission of the International Air Transport Association.

© Copyrights Reserved International Air Transport Association 2013

Table of Contents

- 1. *Major Release 1.3 Deployment Schedule*..... 4
- 2. *Scope of Major Release 1.3*..... 4
- 3. *Appendix A* 20
 - Table 1: CMP #496 / Match specifications & Outcome for Reference Data Fields**.....20
 - Table 2: CMP #501 / Scenarios where Additional Coupons(s) / AWB(s) can be added in a Subsequent Rejection**22
 - Table 3: CMP #515 / Examples/Scenarios which will Fail/Pass Validations**23
 - Table 4: CMP #539 / Examples of Numbering and Outcomes**24

1. Major Release 1.3 Deployment Schedule

The deployment of Major Release 1.3 is planned to be executed for start of the May P1 2013 clearance.

The deployment including SIS Production downtime is currently planned to occur after Apr P4 2012 period closure i.e. on May 7th, 2013 and after 1700 EST. Final details regarding the time of implementation will be circulated prior to the release.

The validation changes will be deployed in the Sandbox environment in early April for your reference. We will confirm this date via bulletin shortly. We ask that you test your files through the Sandbox prior to the implementation of Release 1.3 in May P1.

2. Scope of Major Release 1.3

CMP #	Subject	Affected Billing Categories	Affects Record Structure?	Changes in Validation?
459	Validation of Original Billing Amounts in SIS Rejection Memos	PAX / CGO	No	Yes
464	Increase of VAT Description Field	MISC / UATP	Yes	Yes
473	Field Part Number for Engineering to be Extended to 40 Characters	MISC	Yes	Yes
480	11 digit ticket / FIM numbers being captured	PAX	No	Yes
496	Validation of reference data against the member profile	PAX / MISC / CGO / UATP	No	Yes
500	Query on Billing History Using only Ticket Number Field	PAX / CGO	No	No
501	Re-rejection of a RM that has no Coupon Breakdown	PAX	No	Yes
515	Location Code to be Made Mandatory for All Invoices	MISC	No	Yes
533	RAM A13 New Validations and New Charge Code	MISC	No	Yes
534	Tax Issues in MISC and UATP Invoices	MISC / UATP	No	Yes
538	One Way Agreements Not Sent for BVC	PAX	No	No
539	Line Item Detail in IS-XML Not Provided Uniquely	MISC / UATP	No	Yes

The list of CMP (Change Management Process) items covered in this Major Release are described in greater detail in the table below.

Some changes may have an impact on SIS Users so we recommend to go through the below section in details for evaluating the possible impacts (please refer to Applicability and Change sections within each CMP).

CMP item	Scope	CMP Release Scope Summary
459	Validation of Original Billing Amounts in SIS Rejection Memos	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>SIS does not validate the correctness of Billed/Allowed Amounts of RMs and compare it with the Amounts of the rejected transaction(s). This leads to acceptance of RMs containing inconsistent amounts by the system, which causes problems to the Billed Member when such RMs are processed.</p> <p>With this CMP, RMs will be subjected to such checks. If Billing History linking is successful and the rejected transaction(s) is/are available in SIS, the Billed/Allowed Amounts of RMs will be compared to the Amounts of the rejected transaction(s).</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validations will be applied for IS-IDEC/IS-XML/IS-WEB on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PAX Non-Sampling RMs (all stages) b. PAX Sampling RMs (Forms F and XF) c. CGO RMs (all stages) <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PAX – The following amounts will be validated against the previous stage transaction’s values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gross Amount b. Tax c. ISC d. Other Commission e. Handling Fee f. UATP

		<p>g. VAT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CGO – The following amounts will be validated against the previous stage transaction’s values: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Weight Charges b. Valuation Charges c. Other Charges d. ISC e. VAT 2. In the event that the values provided do not match the previous stage transaction, a non-correctable error will be given. <p><i>Note: This validation will provide a warning in case of mismatched data for a period of time after implementation. After the warning period, the system will provide a non-correctable error in case of mismatched data.</i></p>
464	Increase of VAT Description Field	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>Currently in SIS the length of Tax/VAT Text field is of 50 characters for all billing categories. This is creating issues for MISC billings as some Tax/VAT billings require more than 50 characters for Tax/VAT Text.</p> <p>The basic requirement of this CMP is to increase Tax/VAT Text for Billing Categories MISC and UATP to 150 (one hundred fifty) characters.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MISC / UATP billings only • IS-XML / IS-WEB screens for MISC • Output files <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-XMLs</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of TaxText node will be increased to 150 characters <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. This increased length is applicable only for MISC and UATP billings at all levels of the invoice b. For PAX and CGO, the maximum acceptable length remains as 50

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-WEB</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of 'Tax Text' has been increased to 150 in both the text box and the column in the grid of the Tax Breakdown popup. 2. The length of 'Description' has been increased to 150 in both the text box and the column in the grid of the VAT Breakdown popup. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>OUTPUT Process</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MISC/UATP Legal Invoice PDF: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In column 'VAT Text' of section VAT Breakdown: if the text contains 150 characters, it is wrapped and shown completely b. In column 'Tax Text' of section Tax Breakdown: if the text contains 150 characters, it is wrapped and shown completely 2. MISC/UATP Detailed Listing PDF: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Field Tax Text: if the text contains 150 characters, it is wrapped and shown completely 3. Output MISC/UATP IS-XML files to Billed Members and Billing Members: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. TaxText will have an increased length of 150
473	Field Part Number for Engineering to be Extended to 40 Characters	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>For field Part No., the existing length of 25 characters is no longer sufficient. The length of this field needs to be increased to 40 characters. This affects MISC invoices only.</p> <p>Impact is on the IS-XML processing and IS-WEB screens of MISC.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MISC billings only • IS-XML / IS-WEB capture and payable screens for MISC • Output files <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-XMLs</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of the following field needs to be increased from 25 A/N to 40 A/N <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. InvoiceTransmission\Invoice\LineItemDetail\AircraftDetails\PartNo

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-WEB</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of field “PartNo” in Line Item Detail screen (Aircraft Details), has been increased from 25A/N to 40 A/N <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Output Process</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Output MISC IS-XML files to Billed and Billing Members: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Field InvoiceTransmission\Invoice\LineItemDetail\AircraftDetails\PartNo increased to 40 A/N 2. MISC Detailed Listing PDF: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Field Part No.: Size increased to 40 A/N
480	DATA ISSUE- 11 digit ticket / FIM numbers being captured	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>Due to inheritance of legacy from Old-IDEA, the SIS PAX record structures retained the size of Ticket/Document Number as 11.</p> <p>As per IATA RESO 1720, the length of a ticket/document number should not exceed 10. Since the record structures allowed 11 digits, some prime billings / Rejection memos have been billed where the size of a ticket/document number is 11.</p> <p>With this CMP, the size of ticket/document number will be restricted to 10 digits in all records where ticket/FIM/document numbers can be reported.</p> <p>For any tickets/rejections that have been billed with an 11 digit ticket number, further rejections will be achieved by settling differences via Billing Memos without a coupon breakdown.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change is applicable in the following records: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-Sampling Prime Coupon 2. Sampling Provisional Prime Coupon (Form A) 3. Sampling Form C Coupon 4. Sampling Form D Coupon 5. Non-Sampling RM coupon breakdown 6. Sampling RM coupon breakdown (Form F/XF) 7. Non-Sampling BM coupon breakdown 8. Non-Sampling CM coupon breakdown <p><u>Change:</u></p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any Ticket/FIM/Document number having size of 11 digits will result in Error-Non-Correctable 2. Error message → Size of Ticket/Document Number is greater than 10 digits <p><i>NB: Details to be found via next ISPG update</i></p>
480	DATA ISSUE- 11 digit ticket / FIM numbers being captured	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>Due to inheritance of legacy from Old-IDEA, the SIS PAX record structures retained the size of Ticket/Document Number as 11.</p> <p>As per IATA RESO 1720, the length of a ticket/document number should not exceed 10. Since the record structures allowed 11 digits, some prime billings / Rejection memos have been billed where the size of a ticket/document number is 11.</p> <p>With this CMP, the size of ticket/document number will be restricted to 10 digits in all records where ticket/FIM/document numbers can be reported.</p> <p>For any tickets/rejections that have been billed with an 11 digit ticket number, further rejections will be achieved by settling differences via Billing Memos without a coupon breakdown.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change is applicable in the following records: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-Sampling Prime Coupon 2. Sampling Provisional Prime Coupon (Form A) 3. Sampling Form C Coupon 4. Sampling Form D Coupon 5. Non-Sampling RM coupon breakdown 6. Sampling RM coupon breakdown (Form F/XF) 7. Non-Sampling BM coupon breakdown 8. Non-Sampling CM coupon breakdown <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any Ticket/FIM/Document number having size of 11 digits will result in Error-Non-Correctable 2. Error message → Size of Ticket/Document Number is greater than 10 digits

496	Validation of reference data against the member profile	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>The primary objective of this CMP is to ensure that the Billed Member does not receive invoices with incorrect Reference Data related to the Billed Member.</p> <p>This CMP applies in cases where Reference Data is provided in the IS-IDEC or IS-XML files.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This CMP applies for all Billing Categories and all submissions formats with the exception of IS-WEB manual capture screens. • The following fields are subject to this new validation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Member Legal Name b. TAX/VAT Registration # c. Add. TAX/VAT Registration # d. Company Registration ID e. Address Line 1 f. Address Line 2 g. Address Line 3 h. City Name i. Country Code j. Postal Code <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If both Location ID and Reference Data are provided for the Billed Member, it will not result in a validation error 2. If both correct LocationID and Reference Data are provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Reference Data provided will be matched against the Member Profile fields of the provided Location ID of the Billed Member b. If 'Main' or 'UATP' are provided as the Location IDs, then the case of the provided Location ID will not matter. I.e. even if 'mAIN' is provided as the Location ID, the Member Profile Location ID 'Main' will be used for
-----	---	---

		<p>validation.</p> <p>3. If location ID is not provided, but Reference Data is provided:</p> <p>a. For PAX/CGO/MISC: Reference Data provided will be matched against the Member Profile fields of Location ID 'Main' of the billed Member</p> <p>b. For UATP</p> <p>i. If Location ID 'UATP' exists for the Billed Member, then Reference Data provided will be matched against the Member Profile fields of Location ID 'UATP' of the Billed Member</p> <p>ii. If Location ID 'UATP' does not exist for the Billed Member, then Reference Data provided will be matched against the Member Profile fields of Location ID 'Main' of the Billed Member</p> <p>4. Matching logic will be case-insensitive and will compare the "Trimmed" value (no spaces).</p> <p>Please refer to Table 1 in Appendix A for details.</p> <p>5. For a predetermined period following implementation, a validation warning will be provided in case of incorrect reference data. It is the member's responsibility to obtain the latest Member Profile reference data of their billing partners from SIS.</p> <p>6. <u>The field 'Country Name' will be disregarded when provided. Population of Country Name will always be done automatically by the system, based on the Country Code provided in the Member Profile. This applies for both Billing and Billed member Reference Data.</u></p>
500	Query on Billing History Using only Ticket Number Field	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>The current 'Billing History and Correspondence' of PAX/CGO do not allow the user to query on tickets/AWBs by just using the ticket/AWB number. Other mandatory search criteria required are the Billing Year/Month and the Member Code.</p> <p>With this CMP, the screen will offer greater flexibility in querying transactions without entering the Member Code and Billing Year/Month.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IS-WEB – PAX and Cargo Billing History Screen <p><u>Change:</u></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>PAX Billing History and Correspondence Screen</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following fields will no longer be indicated as mandatory: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Year / Month b. Billing Period c. Member Code 2. A new, "All", value will be added to the existing dropdown 'Billing Code'. 3. For a basic search based on Billing Code, the following fields will be mandatory: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Billing Year/Month (value should not equal Please Select) c. Billing Code (value should not equal 'All') d. Member Code (non blank/valid value) 4. For a search based on just a memo number, the following fields will be mandatory: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Transaction Type selected as Rejection Memo, Billing Memo or Credit Memo c. Memo Number (non blank value) 5. For a search based on just ticket number, the following fields will be mandatory: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Transaction Type selected as Prime Coupon c. Issuing Airline (non-blank/valid numeric value) d. Document Number (non-blank numeric value) • <u>CGO Billing History and Correspondence Screen</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following fields will no longer be indicated as mandatory: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Year / Month b. Billing Period c. Member Code 2. Basic search on Member Code will behave as per current logic. The following
--	---

		<p>fields will be mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Billing Year/Month (value should not equal Please Select) c. Member Code (non blank/valid value) <p>3. For a search based on just a memo number, the following fields will be mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Transaction Type selected as Rejection Memo, Billing Memo or Credit Memo c. Memo Number (non blank value) <p>4. For a search based on just AWB number, the following fields will be mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Billing Type (value should be Payables or Receivables) b. Transaction Type selected as Prime AWB c. Issuing Airline (non-blank/valid numeric value) d. AWB Serial Number (non-blank numeric value)
501	Re-rejection of a RM that has no Coupon Breakdown	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>In its current state, the system does not allow additional Coupons/AWBs to be added in the rejection process (as compared to the previous rejection when Billing History linking succeeds).</p> <p>If the program successfully links 2 stages of rejections, but detects that the higher stage of rejection has a Coupon/AWB that does not exist in the lower stage of rejection, Error-Non-Correctable is thrown.</p> <p>This leads to problems for carriers when rejections are raised without Coupon/AWB breakdowns; or in FIM rejections where some Coupons are not included when they should be (the missed out Coupons / AWBs cannot be added back to the rejection process).</p> <p>With this CMP, airlines receiving rejections will have the ability to add Coupons/AWBs to the next rejection stage under some conditions/scenarios. Error will not be thrown in such cases.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX Non-Sampling RMs and Cargo RMs • Validations - IS-IDEC, IS-XML, IS-WEB Screens

		<p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-IDEC / IS-XML</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a Stage 2 or Stage 3 RM is successfully linked to the previous stage RM: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Linking logic should accept new/additional Coupon(s) / AWB(s) under certain scenarios <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-WEB</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a Stage 2 or Stage 3 RM is successfully linked to the previous stage RM: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Linking logic should accept new/additional Coupon(s) / AWB(s) under certain scenarios <p>Please refer to Table 2 in Appendix A for Scenarios</p>
515	Location Code to be Made Mandatory for All Invoices	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>Currently, Location Code is mandatory for only certain combinations of Charge Category/Charge Code.</p> <p>With this CMP, Location Code will become mandatory for every combination of Charge Category/Charge Code.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MISC invoices only (Debit and Credit Memos) • IS-WEB and IS-XML <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-XMLs</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new validation has been introduced: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location Code is always mandatory at either Invoice level or Line Item level b. If Location Code is defined at Invoice level, it cannot be defined for any Line Item. Violation of this rule will result in Error-Non-Correctable c. If Location Code is not defined at Invoice level, then it should be defined for every Line Item. Violation of this rule will result in Error-Non-Correctable

		<p>2. Error text in detailed validation report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If Location Code is not provided at Invoice Level, and it is not provided at the Line Item level → “Location Code is missing. It should be provided either at Invoice level or Line Item level” b. If Location Code is provided at the Invoice Level, and it is provided at the Line Item level → “Location Code cannot be provided at Line Item level since it is provided at the Invoice level” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-WEB</u> <p>1. A new validation has been introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Location Code is always mandatory at either Invoice level or Line Item level b. If Location Code is defined at Invoice level, then user cannot define Location Code at any Line Item level c. If Location Code is not defined at Invoice level, then Location Code will be a mandatory field at every Line Item level <p>Please refer to Table 3 in Appendix A for examples.</p>
533	RAM A13 New Validations and New Charge Code	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>This CMP is related to changes in IATA RAM 2013, Chapter A13 (MISC Billing).</p> <p>There are changes in validation rules for some combinations of Charge Category / Charge Codes. Also, a new Charge Code ‘GSA Contract’ has been added for Charge Category ‘Service Provider’.</p> <p>Summary of Charge Cat / Charge Code Changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engineering / Loans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing Line Item Detail field ‘AircraftTypeCode_ICAO’ changes from Mandatory to Recommended Always 2. Engineering / Sales and Purchase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing Line Item Detail field ‘AircraftTypeCode_ICAO’ changes from Mandatory to Recommended Always 3. Ground Handling / Lounge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. New Line Item Detail field ‘PassengerName’ added b. It will be Recommended Always 4. Ground Handling / Mishandling Baggage

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing Line Item Detail field 'MishandledTypes' changes from Recommended to Mandatory b. Existing Line Item Detail field 'PassengerName' changes from Recommended to Mandatory c. Existing Line Item Detail field 'WaypointCode @Type' changes from Recommended to Mandatory <p>5. Partner Alliance / MISC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Optional Charge Code Type added at Line Item level b. Can have value "Commission" <p>6. Service Provider / GDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing optional Line Item Detail field 'ProductId' will now be dictionary defined b. Valid values are GDF1 / ICP1 / IHH1 / GSS1 <p>7. Service Provider / GSA Contract (New Charge Code)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Field 'PONumber' (AN 35) will be a Recommended Always field at the Invoice Header level b. Field 'ContractNo' (AN 25) will be a Recommended Always field at a Line Item Detail level <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MISC Transactions • IS-WEB and IS-XML <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Validations (IS-WEB and IS-XML transactions)</u> <p>1. Validations have been added / removed based on the Charge Code changes listed above</p>
534	Tax Issues in MISC and UATP Invoices	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>Members are facing issues because field TaxSubType/Tax Name of Tax is not being validated today.</p> <p>With this CMP, this value will start being validated. A list of dictionary defined values will be included in the IS-XML Standard at a later date prior to the implementation of Release 1.3.</p>

		<p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IS-XML (MISC and UATP) • IS-WEB MISC Create Invoice / Credit Note screens <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-XML</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Value of TaxSubType will be validated when TaxType = Tax 2. Values will be dictionary defined 3. If an incorrect value is provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Warning or error (*) will be reported at the level at which validation failed, i.e. Lineltem, LineltemDetail or InvoiceSummary (*) Warning issued for 3 months after implementation, then will switch to Validation Error as Error-Non Correctable) b. Warning/error text: Invalid value of TaxSubType • <u>IS-WEB Capture Screens (MISC)</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change required for members 2. Attributes of “Tax Name” needs to be changed in the Tax Breakdown popup. Change is applicable in the popup called from the following screens: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Invoice Header screen b. Line Item screen c. Line Item Detail screen 3. Additional changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Field will change from text box to a dropdown b. Values for this dropdown will be populated from the master which holds valid values for field ‘VAT SubType’ in the VAT breakdown popup
538	One Way Agreements Not Sent for BVC	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>As per the current functionality of the system, a PAX invoice is sent for BVC only if both the Billing Member and Billed Member are BVC participants.</p>

		<p>This sometimes causes a problem in cases of one way agreements, where only the Billing Member is a BVC participant and the Billed Member is not. In some one-way agreement cases, the Billing Member may want the invoice to pass through BVC. This CMP provides a solution for such cases.</p> <p>SIS Ops will have an override master which will define the Billing Member and the Billed Member for whom BVC should be done (even if the Billed Member is not a BVC participant).</p> <p>This master will be only referred to if the primary profile check indicates that BVC should not be done; and if the Billing Member is a BVC participant, but the Billed Member is not.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX BVC Process <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>More Billings will be subjected to BVC</u> 2. No changes required for members
539	Line Item Detail in IS-XML Not Provided Uniquely	<p><u>Reason:</u></p> <p>As per current system functionality, there is no validation to check duplicate Line Item Detail (LID) DetailNumbers within a Line Item for MISC/UATP IS-XML files. This allows IS-XML files with duplicate LID DetailNumber (within a Line Item) to pass validation and be saved successfully.</p> <p>Such duplicates lead to issues in processing of the output IS-XML by Billed Members.</p> <p>After implementation of this CMP, duplicate LID DetailNumbers within a Line Item will fail validation.</p> <p><u>Applicability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IS-XML – MISC/UATP invoices only <p><u>Change:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>IS-XMLs</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new validation will be introduced to validate incoming IS-XML file for duplicate LID DetailNumbers within a Line Item 2. If a duplicate LID DetailNumber is detected for a Line Item, it will result in

		<p>Error-Non-Correctable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Error message text → Duplicate LineltemDetail DetailNumber found within Lineltem <p>3. Other than this validation, sequencing of DetailNumbers will not be checked. For example a Line Item having five (5) LIDs with DetailNumbers as 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 will be considered as valid and will successfully pass validation.</p> <p>Please refer to Table 4 in Appendix A for examples.</p>
--	--	--

3. Appendix A

Table 1: CMP #496 / Match specifications & Outcome for Reference Data Fields

REFERENCE DATA FIELD(S) IN FILE		MATCHED WITH MEMBER PROFILE LOCATION ID FIELD (LABEL AS PER IS-WEB)	IMPACTING SYSTEM PARAMETER IN CASE OF MISMATCH		OUTCOME IN CASE OF MISMATCH	SEE NOTE
IS-IDEA	IS-XML		NAME OF PARAMETER	VALUE		
Company Legal Name	OrganizationName1 + OrganizationName2	Member Legal Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Member Legal Name'	Warning	Warning	1
Company Legal Name	OrganizationName1 + OrganizationName2	Member Legal Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Member Legal Name'	Error	Error	1
Tax/VAT Registration ID	TaxRegistrationID	Tax/VAT Registration #	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Tax/VAT Registration #'	Warning	Warning	
Tax/VAT Registration ID	TaxRegistrationID	Tax/VAT Registration #	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Tax/VAT Registration #'	Error	Error	
Additional Tax/VAT Registration ID	AdditionalTaxRegistrationID	Add. Tax/VAT Registration #	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Add. Tax/VAT Registration #'	Warning	Warning	
Additional Tax/VAT Registration ID	AdditionalTaxRegistrationID	Add. Tax/VAT Registration #	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Add. Tax/VAT Registration #'	Error	Error	
Company Registration ID	CompanyRegistrationID	Company Registration ID	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Company Registration ID'	Warning	Warning	
Company Registration ID	CompanyRegistrationID	Company Registration ID	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Company Registration ID'	Error	Error	
Address Line 1	AddressLine1	Address Line1	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 1'	Warning	Warning	
Address Line 1	AddressLine1	Address Line1	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 2'	Error	Error	
Address Line2	AddressLine2	Address Line2	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 2'	Warning	Warning	
Address Line2	AddressLine2	Address Line2	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 2'	Error	Error	

REFERENCE DATA FIELD(S) IN FILE		MATCHED WITH MEMBER PROFILE LOCATION ID FIELD (LABEL AS PER IS-WEB)	IMPACTING SYSTEM PARAMETER IN CASE OF MISMATCH		OUTCOME IN CASE OF MISMATCH	SEE NOTE
IS-IDEC	IS-XML		NAME OF PARAMETER	VALUE		
Address Line3	AddressLine3	Address Line3	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 3'	Warning	Warning	
Address Line3	AddressLine3	Address Line3	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Address Line 3'	Error	Error	
City Name	CityName	City Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'City Name'	Warning	Warning	
City Name	CityName	City Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'City Name'	Error	Error	
Country Code	CountryCode	Country Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Country Code'	Warning	Warning	2
Country Code	CountryCode	Country Name	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Country Code'	Error	Error	2
Postal Code	PostalCode	Postal Code	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Postal Code'	Warning	Warning	
Postal Code	PostalCode	Postal Code	Outcome of Mismatch on Billed Member Reference Data field 'Postal Code'	Error	Error	

Note 1:

1. OrganizationName1 and OrganizationName2 of the IS-XML will be concatenated/merged and then matched with the Member Profile
2. "Trimming" will happen on the concatenated/merged value
3. While concatenating/merging these two fields, no additional space(s) will be added at the end of OrganizationName1. Conversely, no additional space(s) will be added at the beginning of OrganizationName2
4. While concatenating/merging these two fields, any additional space(s) provided at the end of OrganizationName1 will not be removed. Conversely, any additional space(s) provided at the beginning of OrganizationName2 will not be removed

Note 2:

1. Though the IS-WEB label shows 'Country Name', it is only a display value
2. The real value stored internally is the Country Code
3. So effective only Country Codes are matched with each other
4. This will be a case sensitive match.

Table 2: CMP #501 / Scenarios where Additional Coupons(s) / AWB(s) can be added in a Subsequent Rejection

#	TYPE OF RM	ADDITIONAL COUPON(S) / AWB(S) CAN BE ADDED IF:
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX Non-Sampling • Stage = 2 • Source Code = Any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level And <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 RM does not contain any Coupons
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX Non-Sampling • Stage = 3 • Source Code = Any 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level And <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 RM does not contain any Coupons
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX Non-Sampling • Stage = 2 • Source Code = 45 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level • No other condition (even if the stage 1 RM contains some coupons, it will be possible to add new coupons in stage 2)
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAX Non-Sampling • Stage = 3 • Source Code = 46 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level • No other condition (even if the stage 2 RM contains some coupons, it will be possible to add new coupons in stage 3)
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CGO • Stage = 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level And <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 RM does not contain any AWBs
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CGO • Stage = 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 RM is found, i.e. linking succeeds at an RM to RM level And <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 2 RM does not contain any AWBs

Table 3: CMP #515 / Examples/Scenarios which will Fail/Pass Validations

EXAMPLE #	LOCATION CODE AT INVOICE LEVEL	NO. OF LINE ITEMS IN INVOICE	LOCATION CODE INFORMATION AT LINE ITEM LEVEL	RESULT
1	None (not provided)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 4 → ABCDE For Line Items 5 to 10 → None (not provided) 	Fail
2	None (not provided)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 4 → ABCDE For Line Items 5 to 9 → XYZ For Line Item 10 → None (not provided) 	Fail
3	ABCDE	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 4 → ABCDE For Line Items 5 to 10 → None (not provided) 	Fail
4	ABCDE	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 4 → ABCDE For Line Items 5 to 9 → XYZ For Line Item 10 → None (not provided) 	Fail
5	ABCDE	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 10 → ABCDE 	Fail
6	ABCDE	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 4 → ABCDE For Line Items 5 to 10 → XYZ 	Fail
7	None (not provided)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 10 → XYZ 	Pass
8	None (not provided)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 6 → ABCDE For Line Items 7 to 10 → XYZ 	Pass
9	None (not provided)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 10 → None (not provided) 	Fail
10	ABCDE	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Line Items 1 to 10 → None (not provided) 	Pass

Table 4: CMP #539 / Examples of Numbering and Outcomes

#	INVOICE #	LINE ITEM #	NO. OF LINE ITEM DETAIL RECORDS	DETAILNUMBERS OF LINE ITEM DETAIL RECORDS	OUTCOME
1	INV1	1	5	10, 20, 30, 40, 50	Pass, no duplicate DetailNumber exists with a Line Item
		2	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	
2	INV2	1	5	10, 20, 30, 40, 50	Pass, no duplicate DetailNumber exists with a Line Item
		2	5	10, 20, 30, 40, 50	
3	INV3	1	5	10, 10, 30, 40, 50	Fail, duplicate DetailNumber exists for Line Item #1
		2	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	
4	INV4	1	5	10, 10, 30, 40, 50	Fail, duplicate DetailNumber exists for Line Item #1 and Line Item #2
		2	5	1, 2, 3, 3, 5	
5	INV5	1	3	0, 1, 2	Fail, as DetailNumber = 0 This is an existing validation