

The
Directory Audit Team
REPORT

On the audit of the

D02A Directories

13th of May to 15th of May 2002

Team members :

Chair : M. D. Conroy
A. Dechamps
M. Dill
G. Spadin (remote)

UN/Secretariat : M. Pikart, C. Meza

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION..... 3

2. MIXED USE OF “ISE” AND “IZE” ENDINGS..... 3

3. ATTENTION TO THE CHANGE INDICATORS..... 3

4. USE OF THE TERM “SCOPE” IN MESSAGE DMRS. 4

5. DMRS INSTALLED IN THE D02A DIRECTORY RELEASE..... 4

6. STATISTICS ON INSTALLED DMRS..... 4

7. DATES FOR THE NEXT DAT MEETING..... 4

8. RECAPITULATION OF DAT RECOMMENDATIONS..... 5

1. Introduction.

DAT is pleased to announce that the D02A directory has been produced in compliance with the EWG procedures and we consider it satisfactory for implementation.

This to all intents and purposes is the last DAT meeting in its present form. DAT would therefore like to take this occasion to warmly thank the UN/Secretariat team for all the work they have put in to ensure that each of the directories were produced in a timely basis and in compliance with the user DMRs that sometimes needed a significant amount of interpretation.

I, as DAT chair, would like also to extend my appreciation to the members of DAT who sacrificed a considerable amount of their time to ensure that the audit was correctly and professionally carried out.

The DAT as a whole would also like to thank the members of T1 for their dedication to the task of ensuring the DMR process and constantly working to improve the quality of the output to the UN/Secretariat. It is thanks to such dedication that we have arrived at a process which can be carried out in a reasonable lapse of time and which produces directories of an excellent quality.

2. Mixed use of “ise” and “ize” endings

DAT has noted that there are a number of cases where words have been spelt indifferently with an “ise” or an “ize” ending. It would be preferable that the spelling within the directory was consistent.

RECOMMENDATION 1 :

DAT recommends that T1 set up a project to ensure that all words were consistently spelt within the directory.

In this same context the code “LF” for data element 7161 has been modified in the course of the “self-explanatory codes” project and introduced terms which do not appear to be correct English (legalisation, legalising).

RECOMMENDATION 2 :

DAT recommends that T1 endeavour to find the correct terms for this code.

3. Attention to the change indicators

DAT has noted a number of cases where the DMR change indicators have been incorrectly positioned (either at “N” when it should be “Y” or vice-versa). This creates problems during the automatic process by either ignoring modifications or indicating modifications that have not occurred. In many cases these errors were only picked up only because of another error occurring within the DMR.

RECOMMENDATION 3 :

DAT recommends that T1 stress to all groups the significance of incorrectly filling out the change request in this respect.

4. Use of the term “scope” in message DMRs.

The scope paragraph within the message boilerplate does not contain user text. However the word “scope” has been used within certain DMRs and included text. The result has been the introduction of text incorrectly into the message boilerplate. In some cases the text in question has been the mandatory text for the field of application. In addition there was a case where the modifications were included in the “business justification” thus making it haphazard to implement.

RECOMMENDATION 4 :

DAT recommends that T1 ensure that message boilerplate DMRs only contain the text that has to be changed all other text should be excluded. The text to be corrected should be clearly identified in the DMR in the order of the boilerplate.

5. Copying and pasting to the DMR form

A good deal of trouble was caused by a DMR (DELFOR message) containing text which was copied from a word file and pasted into the DMR. The result was lines in a disorganised fashion as line feeds had been included. DAT suggests that T1 produce a paper explaining how this process should be carried out.

6. DMRs installed in the D02A directory release.

See attached file : DAT-REPORT-D02A-Part-2-of-2.xls which contains the complete list of the DMRs installed and the error processing carried out against them.

7. Statistics on installed DMRs.

	Number of system generated DMRs	Number of DMRs user generated	Number of DMRs forwarded to CWG	TOTAL	ERRORS
EDED	6	2		8	2
EDCD/IDCD	0	0	0	0	0
EDSD/IDSD	0	1		1	0
UNCL	302	46	7	355	24
EDMD/IDMD		45		45	4
MIDs					
TOTAL	308	94	7	409	35
		101			
Percentages	76,62%	23,38%			8,71%

8. Dates for the next DAT meeting.

The next DAT meeting has not been planned at this time.

9. Recapitulation of DAT recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION 1 :

DAT recommends that T1 set up a project to ensure that all words were consistently spelt within the directory.

RECOMMENDATION 2 :

DAT recommends that T1 endeavour to find the correct terms for this code.

RECOMMENDATION 3 :

DAT recommends that T1 stress to all groups the significance of incorrectly filling out the change request in this respect.

RECOMMENDATION 4 :

DAT recommends that T1 ensure that message boilerplate DMRs only contain the text that has to be changed all other text should be excluded. The text to be corrected should be clearly identified in the DMR in the order of the boilerplate.