

IPC-1755A

2020 - March

Responsible Sourcing of Minerals Data Exchange Standard

Supersedes IPC-1755-WAM1-2

March 2017

An international standard developed by IPC



JEITA
Documents



Document Sharing Hub

The Principles of Standardization

In May 1995 the IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee (TAEC) adopted Principles of Standardization as a guiding principle of IPC's standardization efforts.

Standards Should:

- Show relationship to Design for Manufacturability (DFM) and Design for the Environment (DFE)
- Minimize time to market
- Contain simple (simplified) language
- Just include spec information
- Focus on end product performance
- Include a feedback system on use and problems for future improvement

Standards Should Not:

- Inhibit innovation
- Increase time-to-market
- Keep people out
- Increase cycle time
- Tell you how to make something
- Contain anything that cannot be defended with data

Notice

IPC Standards and Publications are designed to serve the public interest through eliminating misunderstandings between manufacturers and purchasers, facilitating interchangeability and improvement of products, and assisting the purchaser in selecting and obtaining with minimum delay the proper product for his particular need. Existence of such Standards and Publications shall not in any respect preclude any member or nonmember of IPC from manufacturing or selling products not conforming to such Standards and Publication, nor shall the existence of such Standards and Publications preclude their voluntary use by those other than IPC members, whether the standard is to be used either domestically or internationally.

Recommended Standards and Publications are adopted by IPC without regard to whether their adoption may involve patents on articles, materials, or processes. By such action, IPC does not assume any liability to any patent owner, nor do they assume any obligation whatever to parties adopting the Recommended Standard or Publication. Users are also wholly responsible for protecting themselves against all claims of liabilities for patent infringement.

IPC Position Statement on Specification Revision Change

It is the position of IPC's Technical Activities Executive Committee that the use and implementation of IPC publications is voluntary and is part of a relationship entered into by customer and supplier. When an IPC publication is updated and a new revision is published, it is the opinion of the TAEC that the use of the new revision as part of an existing relationship is not automatic unless required by the contract. The TAEC recommends the use of the latest revision. Adopted October 6, 1998

Why is there a charge for this document?

Your purchase of this document contributes to the ongoing development of new and updated industry standards and publications. Standards allow manufacturers, customers, and suppliers to understand one another better. Standards allow manufacturers greater efficiencies when they can set up their processes to meet industry standards, allowing them to offer their customers lower costs.

IPC spends hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to support IPC's volunteers in the standards and publications development process. There are many rounds of drafts sent out for review and the committees spend hundreds of hours in review and development. IPC's staff attends and participates in committee activities, typesets and circulates document drafts, and follows all necessary procedures to qualify for ANSI approval.

IPC's membership dues have been kept low to allow as many companies as possible to participate. Therefore, the standards and publications revenue is necessary to complement dues revenue. The price schedule offers a 50% discount to IPC members. If your company buys IPC standards and publications, why not take advantage of this and the many other benefits of IPC membership as well? For more information on membership in IPC, please visit www.ipc.org or call 847/597-2809.

Thank you for your continued support.

©Copyright 2020. IPC International, Bannockburn, IL, USA. All rights reserved under both international and Pan-American copyright conventions. Any copying, scanning or other reproduction of these materials without the prior written consent of the copyright holder is strictly prohibited and constitutes infringement under the Copyright Law of the United States.



JEITA

IPC-1755A

Responsible Sourcing of Minerals Data Exchange Standard

Developed by the Conflict Minerals Data Exchange Task Group (E-31h) of the Supplier Declaration Subcommittee (E-31) of IPC in partnership with the following associations:

RMI – Responsible Minerals Initiative

JEITA – Japan

Electronics and Information

Technology Industries Association

Supersedes:

IPC-1755-WAM1-2 -

March 2017

IPC-1755-WAM1 - March 2015

IPC-1755 - March 2014

Users of this publication are encouraged to participate in the development of future revisions.

Contact:

IPC

3000 Lakeside Drive, Suite 105N

Bannockburn, Illinois

60015-1249

Tel 847 615.7100

Fax 847 615.7105

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Acknowledgment

Any document involving a complex technology draws material from a vast number of sources across many continents. While the principal members of the Conflict Minerals Data Exchange Task Group (E-31h) of the Supplier Declaration Subcommittee (E-31) are shown below, it is not possible to include all of those who assisted in the evolution of this standard. To each of them, the members of the IPC extend their gratitude.

Supplier Declaration Subcommittee	Conflict Minerals Data Exchange Task Group	Technical Liaison of the IPC Board of Directors
Chair Walter Jager ECD Compliance	Chair Nikki Johnson Total Parts Plus, Inc. Co-Chair Aidan Turnbull BomCheck	Bob Neves Microtek Laboratories
Conflict Minerals Data Exchange Task Group		
Douglas Aylward	Chuck LePard, DXC Technology	Joel Sherman, KEMET Electronics Corp.
John Ciba	Ashfaquzzaman Syed, DXC Technology	Andreas Schiffleitner, Kerp Center of Excellence Electronics & Environment
Gianluca Esposito	Walter Jager, ECD Compliance	Mitchell Holtzer, MacDermid Alpha Electronics Solutions
William Haas	Gail Sutherland, ERM	Leanne Mallini, Maxim Integrated
John Plyler	Joji Nakamura, Fujitsu Limited	David Bowen, Molex, LLC
Emile LaPlante, Amphenol Printed Circuits, Inc.	Thomas Gardeski, Gemini Sciences, LLC	Akimasa Yamakawa, Murata Manufacturing Co. Ltd.
Martha Coopersmith-Gray, Amphenol TCS	Alyssa Newman, Google Inc.	Yossy Moran, MY eDMAC
Adam Wheeler, Anthesis Group	Randall Flinders, GreenSoft Technology Inc.	Bill Hargin, Nan Ya Plastics Corporation
Henry Sanftleben, Aptiv	Larry Yen, GreenSoft Technology Inc.	Keith Howell, Nihon Superior
William Olson, ASM America	Beverley Christian, HDP User Group	Atsumi Shinobu, Nikon Corp
Valerie Kuntz, Assent Compliance Inc.	Marelle Fogel, Hewlett-Packard	Technology Research Planning
Travis Miller, Assent Compliance Inc.	Jennie Hwang, H-Technologies Group	Naoko Hirose, Nikon Corporation
Michael Beauchesne, BAE Systems	Eliot Kim, Infinera	Joyce Choi, Nordson ASYMTEK
Brenda Baney, BCubed Consulting, Inc.	Forrest Christian, Innovation Machine Ltd.	Shiho Ichimura, Panasonic
Aimee Siegler, Benchmark Electronics Inc.	Raiyomand Aspandiar, Intel Corporation	N. Nagaraj, Papros, Inc.
Poh Poh Gan, Bose Corporation	Susan Dreveny, Intel Corporation	Hisashi Awata, Pioneer Cooperation
Kurk Kan, Bose Corporation	Bryan Fiereck, Intel Corporation	Ashlee Raulston, Qorvo
Bakul Wadgaonkar, Bose Corporation	Ife Hsu, Intel Corporation	John Sharp, Qorvo
Eric Straw, Collins Aerospace	Marcus Khoo, Intel Corporation	Richard Horvath, Qualcomm Technologies Inc.
Manish Patel, Cummins Inc.	Tolga Yaprak, iPoint Inc.	David Pinsky, Raytheon Company
Thanh Huynh, Dassault Systemes	Neil Smith, Isola Group SARL	Gary Schmalfeld, Raytheon Company
Jean-Pierre Theret, Dassault Systemes	Kazuko Andersen, JEITA	Hillary Amster, Responsible Minerals Initiative
Michael Zepp, Dassault Systemes	Jason Synstelien, John Deere Electronic Solutions	Catherine Tyson, Responsible Minerals Initiative
Dock Brown, DfR Solutions		
David Fitton, Diodes Incorporated		
David Carnevale, Dolby Laboratories		

Michael Wurzman, RSJ Technical
Consulting

Stephan Herget, SAP America

Richard Berman, Seagate Technology

Larisa Vishkovetsky, Seagate
Technology

Tedie West, Siemens

Matt Thorn, Source 44 LLC

Daijo Kusumi, Sumitomo Electric
Device Innovations, Inc.

Brian (Seokjoo) Kim, SupplierSoft

Balu Sharma, SupplierSoft

Kenji Satoh, Taiyo Yuden Co., Ltd.

Hiroshi Kobayashi, TDK

Mark Frimann, Texas Instruments
Inc.

Tord Dennis, The Compliance Map

Stephen Tisdale, Tisdale
Environmental Consulting LLC

Masumi Fukuoka, Toshiba
Corporation

Tomoko Sasaki, Toshiba Corporation

Emma Owens, Total Parts Plus, Inc.

Revati Pradhan-Kasmalkar, Trimble

Bret Bruhn, TTM Technologies

Stephen Edward, TTM Technologies

Meaghan Jones, TTM Technologies

James Cramer, WSP

Susie Xi, Zebra Technologies
(Shanghai) Co., Ltd

Table of Contents

1 SCOPE	1	5 DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR A RESPONSIBLE MINERALS SOURCING DECLARATION	4
1.1 Purpose	1	5.1 Requester Information	4
2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	1	5.1.1 Company Information	4
2.1 IPC	1	5.1.2 Request Information	4
2.1.1 IPC-T-50	1	5.1.3 Contact Information	5
2.2 International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	1	5.1.4 Other Descriptions	5
2.2.1 3166-1	1	5.2 Product Information	5
2.2.2 3166-2	1	5.2.1 Requester Product Number	6
2.3 Informative References	1	5.2.2 Requester Product Name	6
2.3.1 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Section 1502)	1	5.2.3 Manufacturer's Product Number	6
2.3.2 Regulation(EU) 2017/821 of the European Parliament and of the European Council of May 17, 2017	1	5.2.4 Manufacturer's Product Name	6
2.3.3 Responsible Minerals Assurance Process (RMAP) Conformant Smelter List	1	5.2.5 Manufacturer's Product Version	6
2.3.4 European Commission's Responsible Global Smelter List	2	5.2.6 Manufacturing Site	6
2.3.5 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas	2	5.2.7 Effective Date	6
3 REQUIREMENTS	2	5.2.8 Effective End Date	6
3.1 Terms and Definitions	2	5.2.9 Instance ID	6
3.1.1 3TG	2	5.2.10 Instance ID Authority	6
3.1.2 Conflict Minerals Reporting Template (CMRT)	2	5.3 Supplier Information	7
3.1.3 Conflict Minerals	2	5.3.1 Company Information	7
3.1.4 Covered Countries	2	5.3.2 Response Status	7
3.1.5 Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs)	2	5.3.3 Contact Information	7
3.1.6 Division	3	5.3.4 Other Descriptions	7
3.1.7 DRC Conflict Free	3	5.4 Declaration Specifics	8
3.1.8 Person Described	3	5.4.1 Commitment to the Data Provided in a Completed Declaration	8
3.1.9 Product	3	5.4.2 Legal Statement	8
3.1.10 Recycled or Scrap Sources	3	5.4.3 Supplier Signature	8
3.1.11 Requester	3	5.5 Attachments	8
3.1.12 Smelter	3	6 QUERY LIST	9
3.2 Changes in Requirements	3	6.1 3TG Reporting	9
4 DESCRIPTION OF THE DECLARATION CLASSES	3	6.1.1 Use of 3TG	9
4.1 Company Class	3	6.1.2 3TG Sources	9
4.2 Product (or List of Products) Class	3	6.2 Due Diligence	10
4.3 User-Defined Class	4	6.2.1 Have you established a responsible minerals sourcing policy?	10
		6.2.2 Is your responsible minerals sourcing policy publicly available on your website?	10
		6.2.3 Do you require your direct suppliers to source the 3TG from smelters whose due diligence practices have been validated by an independent third party audit program?	11
		6.2.4 Have you implemented due diligence measures for responsible sourcing?	11

6.2.5	Does your company conduct, Conflict Minerals survey(s) of your relevant supplier(s)?	11	6.5.6	Does your company conduct cobalt supply chain survey(s) of your relevant supplier(s)? ...	14
6.2.6	Do you review due diligence information received from your suppliers against your company's expectations?	11	6.5.7	Do you review due diligence information received from your suppliers against your company's expectations?	14
6.2.7	Does your review process include corrective action management?	11	6.5.8	Does your review process include corrective action management?	14
6.2.8	Is your company required to file an annual conflict minerals disclosure	11	Appendix A	Field Mapping and Descriptions	15
6.3	Smelter Identification List	11	Appendix B	List of Covered Countries	19
6.3.1	Metal	11	Appendix C	3TG List	20
6.3.2	Smelter Identification	11	Appendix D	Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs)	21
6.3.3	Smelter Country	12	Appendix E	Verification Guidance	22
6.3.4	Smelter Contact Information	12	Appendix F	The SEC Conflict Minerals Rule, pursuant to Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank	23
6.3.5	Does 100% of the smelter's feedstock originate from recycled or scrap sources?	12	Appendix G	IPC-1751A Fields Not Relevant to IPC-1755	26
6.3.6	Proposed Next Steps	12	Appendix H	IPC-1755A XML Schema	27
6.3.7	Name of Mines	12	Reference List A	Resource for identifying CAHRAs	32
6.3.8	Location (country) of Mine(s)	12			
6.3.9	Comments	12			
6.4	Cobalt Reporting	12			
6.4.1	Use of Cobalt	12			
6.4.2	Cobalt Sources	13			
6.5	Cobalt Due Diligence	13			
6.5.1	Have you established a publicly available cobalt sourcing policy?	13			
6.5.2	Does your policy cover, at a minimum, all risks in the OECD Due Diligence Guidance Annex II Model Policy, as well as the worst forms of child labor?	13			
6.5.3	Have you implemented due diligence measures for cobalt in the declaration scope indicated above?	14			
6.5.4	Do you require suppliers to exercise due diligence over the cobalt supply chain in accordance with the OECD Due Diligence Guidance?	14			
6.5.5	Do you require your direct suppliers to source cobalt from smelters whose due diligence practices have been validated by an independent third-party audit program?	14			

Tables

Table 5-1	Applicability of Product Information Data Fields to Appropriate Declaration Class	7
Table A-1	IPC-1755 Data Fields Name Mapping to Descriptive Sections in the Standard	15
Table A-2	Query ID Values for Reporting About An Organization's Products Using ConflictMetalQueryList	17
Table A-3	Query ID Values for Reporting About An Organization's 3TG Due Diligence Process Using General Queries	17
Table A-4	Query ID Values for Reporting About An Organization's Products Using Cobalt Specific Queries	18
Table A-5	Query ID Values for Reporting About An Organization's Cobalt Due Diligence Process Using General Queries for Cobalt	18
Table B-1	Covered Countries	19
Table C-1	3TG	20

Responsible Sourcing of Minerals Data Exchange Standard

1 SCOPE

This standard establishes the requirements for exchanging data between suppliers and their customers in regard to the responsible sourcing of minerals. This standard originally addressed conflict minerals within the scope of the Dodd-Frank Act in the US and now addresses global responsible minerals sourcing.

To meet the needs of a broad range of users, this standard provides flexibility in the scope of the products covered within a single declaration.

This standard applies to business-to-business transactions. It is not intended to be **used** by the general public when making purchasing decisions. This standard is not a compliance guide.

1.1 Purpose This standard is intended to benefit suppliers and their customers by providing consistency and efficiency to the responsible sourcing of minerals data exchange declaration process. It establishes standard electronic data exchange formats that will facilitate and improve data transfer along the entire global supply chain.

2 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

The following documents can be used as references to the extent specified herein. The revision of the document in effect at the time of solicitation **shall** take precedence.

2.1 IPC¹

2.1.1 IPC-T-50 Terms and Definitions for Interconnecting and Packaging Electronic Circuits

2.2 International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

2.2.1 3166-1 Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country codes

2.2.2 3166-2 Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 2: Country Subdivision codes

2.3 Informative References

The following references are related to the standard but are not required for usage of the standard.

2.3.1 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Section 1502)² Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires that all companies that file reports with the SEC disclose their use of conflict minerals.

The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is the agency responsible for developing and enforcing conflict minerals reporting rules under Section 1502.³ The SEC rules implementing Section 1502 are found in 17 CFR part 240 and 249b.

Note: Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act will be referred to in this standard as Section 1502. The SEC rules implementing Section 1502 will be referred to in this standard as the SEC rules.

2.3.2 Regulation(EU) 2017/821 of the European Parliament and of the European Council of May 17, 2017⁴ Laying down supply chain due diligence for European Union (EU) importers of tin, tantalum and tungsten, their ores, and gold originating from conflict-affected and high-risk areas.

2.3.3 Responsible Minerals Assurance Process (RMAP) Conformant Smelter List Responsible Minerals Assurance Process (RMAP) Conformant Smelter List is a published list of smelters and refiners which have undergone assessment

1. <http://www.ipc.org/ContentPage.aspx?Pageid=Standards>

2. <http://www.sec.gov/about/laws/wallstreetreform-cpa.pdf>

3. <http://www.sec.gov/news/press/2012/2012-163.htm>

4. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:L:2017:130:FULL&from=EN>

through the RMAP, a program of the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) or industry equivalent program (such as Responsible Jewelry Council or London Bullion Market Association) and have been validated to be in conformance. If a smelter or refiner is not on the list, it has either not completed an RMAP assessment or is not in conformance with the RMAP protocol.

A list of smelters and refiners which have been validated to be conformant to the RMAP can be found at <http://www.responsiblemineralsinitiative.org>.

2.3.4 European Commission's Responsible Global Smelter List (We will consider adding the European Commission's (EC) list when it becomes available.)

2.3.5 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas The mission of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is to promote policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world.

The OECD has authored the "OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas."⁵ As per Section 1502, any person described must conduct a due diligence assessment in accordance to a nationally or internationally recognized framework.

3 REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements are applicable to all of the Responsible Sourcing of Minerals Data Exchange Standard processes.

3.1 Terms and Definitions All terms are in accordance with IPC-T-50 and certain terms have been listed below to assist in interpretation of this standard. Additional terms defined by this standard are included below. (See Appendix F for further information regarding the requirements for Section 1502.)

3.1.1 3TG 3TG are the metals derived from conflict minerals as identified in Appendix C.

3.1.2 Conflict Minerals Reporting Template (CMRT) The CMRT is a commonly used industry reporting form for conflict minerals due diligence, produced and maintained by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to be in conformance of this standard.

3.1.2.1 Cobalt Reporting Template (CRT) The CRT is a commonly used industry reporting form for cobalt due diligence, produced and maintained by the Responsible Minerals Initiative (RMI) to be in conformance of this standard.

3.1.3 Conflict Minerals Conflict minerals covered by Section 1502 are columbite-tantalite (coltan), cassiterite, gold, wolframite, and their derivatives.

The SEC rules define and limit the covered derivatives of columbite-tantalite (coltan), cassiterite, and wolframite to tantalum, tin, and tungsten, respectively.

The U.S. Secretary of State can, at any time, add other minerals to this list if the minerals are determined to be financing conflict in the DRC or an adjoining country.

3.1.4 Covered Countries The SEC rules define covered countries to include: Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Angola, Burundi, Central African Republic, the Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. See Appendix B for the list of covered countries.

3.1.5 Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas (CAHRAs) Conflict-affected and high-risk areas are areas in a state of armed conflict, fragile post-conflict areas, as well as areas witnessing weak or non-existing governance and security, such as failed states, and widespread and systematic violations of international law, including human rights abuses. See Appendix D for more information on CAHRAs.⁶

5. <http://www.oecd.org/investment/guidelinesformultinationalenterprises/46740847.pdf>

6. Official Journal of the European Union, Commission Recommendation (EU) 2018/1149 of 10 August 2018
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H1149&from=EN>

3.1.6 Division A division is a defined unit of business which performs a specific service or produces a specific category of products.

3.1.7 DRC Conflict Free Products that do not contain conflict minerals that directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups in the DRC or an adjoining country.⁷

3.1.8 Person Described A person described is a person who is required to file reports to the SEC and for whom conflict minerals are necessary to the functionality or production of a manufactured product.⁸

3.1.9 Product Any substance, material, sub-part, part, sub-assembly, or assembly up to a completed original manufacturer's assembly that is the subject of a declaration.

3.1.10 Recycled or Scrap Sources Recycled or scrap sources are recycled metals that are reclaimed end-user or post-consumer products, or scrap processed metals created during product manufacturing. Recycled metal includes excess, obsolete, defective, and scrap metal materials that contain refined or processed metals that are appropriate to recycle in the production of tin, tantalum, tungsten and/or gold. Minerals partially processed, unprocessed or byproducts from other ores are not included in the definition of recycled metal.

3.1.11 Requester The party initiating the IPC-1755 communication when using the Request/Reply communication mode. The requester is the recipient of the supplier's response.

3.1.12 Smelter A smelter or refiner company is a company that procures and processes mineral ore, slag and/or materials from recycled or scrap sources into refined metal or metal containing intermediate products. The output can be pure (99.5% or greater) metals, powders, ingots, bars, grains, oxides or salts. The terms "smelter" and "refiner" are used interchangeably throughout various publications. For clarification purposes, within this standard they will be referred to as a "smelter."

3.2 Changes in Requirements A number of external factors may drive the need for updates to this standard including: changing or new legal requirements, or advances or improvements in industry due diligence practices through experience gained in implementing conflict minerals due diligence.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE DECLARATION CLASSES

The Responsible Sourcing of Minerals Data Exchange standard is supported by an XML schema. IPC-1755A aligns with 1755A schema version 2.0.

This standard supports three classes of responsible sourcing of minerals disclosure: company, product or list of products, and user-defined (as defined in 4.1 through 4.3). This standard provides the user with the ability to respond to queries (see 6 Query List) at the company, product or list of products, or user-defined class. Indication of declaration class is **mandatory**.

4.1 Company Class A company level disclosure **shall** include responses to the query list (see 6 Query List) for all the products manufactured by the company completing the declaration. Customers wishing to receive information only on the products supplied to them should request reporting via the user-defined class. As discussed in Section 5.2, this standard is based on the concept of products regardless of what declaration class is used. Therefore, if the user is reporting responsible sourcing of minerals data at the company level, they will be reporting responsible sourcing of minerals data on all products they manufacture.

4.2 Product (or List of Products) Class A product or list of products disclosure **shall** include one set of responses to the query list for those product(s) specified by the company.

Product is defined in 3.1.9. The description of the product or list of products **shall** be identified using the Product Identification fields in Section 5.2.

7. 2010 United States legislation, Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Section 1502
<http://www.sec.gov/about/laws/wallstreetreform-cpa.pdf>

8. <http://www.oecd.org/investment/guidelinesformultinationalenterprises/46740847.pdf>

4.3 User-Defined Class The user-defined class allows a user to describe the scope to which the responsible sourcing of minerals disclosure is applicable. The scope of this class **shall** be defined in a text field as agreed to by the supplier and requestor. This disclosure may apply to a company's specific division or category of products. A category of products is a group of products that can be described by an industry recognized generic term (e.g., capacitors). When using this class, the user **shall** provide responses to the query list for each applicable mineral used in the products of the specified user-defined class.

5 DATA REQUIREMENTS FOR A RESPONSIBLE MINERALS SOURCING DECLARATION

This section provides the principles and details necessary for declarations between members of a supply chain. This section also contains generic information regarding trading partners. The data requirements for the declaration process management concepts consist of two modes of data exchange. The first mode is that of "Request/Reply" where a user wishes to obtain information about a product. The second mode is that of "Distribute" where a supplier wishes to make product information available to customers.

This standard is published outside of the IPC-175x series of data exchange standards. All fields relevant to conflict minerals data exchange are discussed in this standard. Other fields included in IPC-1751A that are not relevant to conflict minerals data exchange are included in Appendix F. In order to facilitate a seamless integration of this standard to the 175x series of data exchange standards, the plan for integration is explained in Appendix G.

5.1 Requester Information This information describes the company and person who are requesting a declaration. This information is only relevant when a Request/Reply mode is being followed. This section contains several data fields that identify the company and the individual requesting a particular declaration.

Each field is described in the following sections.

5.1.1 Company Information

5.1.1.1 Company Name This field identifies the legal name of the company requesting the declaration document. This field is *mandatory*.

5.1.1.2 Company Unique ID This field is used by industry to uniquely identify the requester company. For example, in the U.S. a Dun & Bradstreet Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number is a commonly used unique identification (ID). This field is *optional*.

5.1.1.2.1 Unique Identity This field identifies the name or known designation of the requester company. This field is *optional*.

5.1.1.2.2 Unique ID Authority This field identifies the organization that assigns the unique ID. In the example above, Dun & Bradstreet would be the authority assigning the unique ID. This field is *optional*.

5.1.2 Request Information

5.1.2.1 Request Date This field identifies the date when a user requests a declaration document. All date fields use the XML date format. This field is *mandatory*.

5.1.2.2 Request Document ID This field identifies the request to help the user and supplier reference the communication. A revision method should be established to identify different configurations of the same request. The methodology may be simply a single letter or date that establishes the appropriate linkage. This field is *optional*.

5.1.2.3 Comment This field provides additional information to the supplier regarding the request. This field is *optional* (see Section 5.1.4.1).

5.1.2.4 Respond By Date This field identifies the date when the supplier is expected to respond to the request for information. This field is *optional*.

5.1.2.5 Internal Supplier ID This field identifies a company's internal designator for a supplier. It might be a name or a supplier identification code. This field is *optional*.

5.1.3 Contact Information

5.1.3.1 Contact Name This field identifies the name of the person to contact with questions about the request for declaration. This field is *mandatory*.

5.1.3.2 Contact Title This field identifies the title of the contact person. This field is *optional*.

5.1.3.3 Comment This field provides additional information to the supplier regarding the requester contact information. This field is *optional* (see Section 5.1.4.1).

5.1.3.4 Contact Phone This field identifies the telephone number for the contact person. This field consists of two attributes: the first is the phone number and the second is the phone type, e.g., business, personal, mobile, etc. There may be multiple phone listings for the requester contact. This field is *mandatory*.

5.1.3.5 Contact Email This field identifies the email address for the contact person. This field consists of two attributes: the first is the email address and the second is the email type, e.g., general office, personal, department, etc. There may be multiple email listings for the requester contact. This field is *mandatory*.

5.1.3.6 Additional Contact Information – Address The requester may provide a physical address as part of the requester contact information. These fields are *optional*.

5.1.3.6.1 Internal Any internal routing information necessary.

5.1.3.6.2 Street The street number and name.

5.1.3.6.3 City The name of the city.

5.1.3.6.4 State A code in accordance with ISO 3166-2 which represents the state or province where the contact is located.

5.1.3.6.5 Country The two-character code in accordance with ISO 3166-1 which represents the country where the contact is located.

5.1.3.6.6 Zip Code The postal code.

5.1.3.6.7 Comment Additional comments related to the contact or contact information.

5.1.4 Other Descriptions

5.1.4.1 Requester Comments or URL for Additional Information This field provides additional information to the supplier, such as definitions of the authorized representative field in the supplier information section, submission instructions, additional contact information, or other information. These can be provided either directly or by a URL address which shows where the additional information can be obtained. If a URL is provided, it should be of the form **http(s)://xxx.xxxx.xxx**. This field is *optional*.

5.1.4.2 Business Information – Attachment Many attachments may accompany the request for information that is exchanged between the user and the supplier. This field is *optional*; however, when initiated, several attributes are *mandatory*. The first of these is the name of the attachment since multiple attachments may be attached and the comments provided should reference the appropriate one. The second is the file type which defines the method that may be used to read the data. The third is the data file itself.

5.2 Product Information The IPC-175x series of standards are based on declarations for products (as defined in 3.1.9) manufactured by a company. Declarations can be made for a single product or a group of products including all the products manufactured by a company.

The product object is an identification of a product or group of products to which information is associated using the IPC-1755 schema. The declaration **shall** contain one or more product objects or group of product objects. Each product object may represent one or more products as defined in the product ID fields. The product object contains the identifying information which the requester selects if in Request/Reply mode, or which the supplier chooses if in the Distribute mode.

The product object may contain a single product number, multiple product numbers, or a single product number representing an entire family of products. The requester and supplier are advised to clarify the correspondence between requester product identification and supplier product identification to ensure that supplier information associates correctly with requester product numbers.

Sections 5.2.1 through 5.2.10 provide information identifying each product object of interest.

5.2.1 Requester Product Number This field identifies the requester's number for each product included in the product object. This field is only applicable in the Request/Reply mode. The requester is cautioned to include only those product numbers for which requested information will be identical. A new product object may be defined for other products or product families for which a different response is anticipated. The first product number listed in the product object definition is the primary one for database structuring purposes as necessary in specific implementations of the required schema. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class.

5.2.2 Requester Product Name This field identifies the name of each product in the requester's system corresponding to each product number. This field is only applicable in the Request/Reply mode. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class.

5.2.3 Manufacturer's Product Number This field identifies the number for each product in the supplier's (manufacturer's) system as perceived by the requester. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class. In the Distribute mode the supplier would provide the Manufacturer's Product Number.

5.2.4 Manufacturer's Product Name This field identifies the name for each product in the supplier's (manufacturer's) system as perceived by the requester. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class. In the Distribute mode the supplier would provide this entry for each product number.

5.2.5 Manufacturer's Product Version This field identifies the version of the product in the supplier's (manufacturer's) system as perceived by the requester. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class. In the Distribute mode the supplier would provide this entry for each product number.

5.2.6 Manufacturing Site This field identifies the site at which the product is manufactured as perceived by the requester. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class. In the Distribute mode the supplier would provide this entry for each product number.

5.2.7 Effective Date This field provides the date upon which the information provided in an IPC-1755 declaration becomes effective. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class. If not provided, the effective date for all information provided is assumed to be the date of the response.

5.2.8 Effective End Date This field provides the date after which the information provided in an IPC-1755 declaration is no longer effective. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class.

5.2.9 Instance ID The Instance ID field is provided to allow either the requester or the supplier the means to further specify each product to which the declared information applies. That is, a requester may want to provide specific serial numbers of the products for which he is requesting a declaration, or a supplier may want to provide a SKU number, a lot code, a date code, an RFID number, etc. These would be entered in the Instance ID field. Instance IDs are associated with one particular product number only. The Instance ID field comes with a secondary field that is an *optional* open field to use in one-to-one correspondence with each Instance ID. There may be one or more Instance IDs associated with each product in a declaration. See Table 5-1 for reporting obligations based on declaration class.

5.2.10 Instance ID Authority The Instance ID authority is the entity that issued the Instance ID. It becomes *mandatory* only if there is an Instance ID. The authority may be defined as the supplier in the absence of any other assigning authority.