

SPEC 2000M	REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION	1. Request No. RC 01/IP/04 Date: 11.02.2004
2. From: Roger Jevons Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Date: 28.01.04		To: IPET
3. SPEC 2000M Reference: 1A - 6, paragraph 5.1		
4. Description Of Request for Clarification: <u>Processing of master update messages</u> An IPPN has an established master status. A draft UIPICO message is issued with a CAS segment CHG:D. Later, e.g. at the PAM, it is decided that this CSN is not deleted and the master UIPICO is issued with the CAS segment CHG:R. What processing should the Customer undertake on the receipt of such a message? Should the master UIPICO be rejected because the CSN with CHG:R does not exist due to having been deleted by the draft UIPICO? (The master should have contained CHG:N to re-introduce this CSN.) Or Should the master UIPICO be processed successfully against the established master status which existed prior to the issue of the draft UIPICO. (This is based on the fact that the draft is only a proposal for a change and the status of an IPPN is only updated by a master message.) Please clarify which is correct		
5. Answer Provided: The correct method is the second one, because the draft is simply the first iteration of the change and should not be written to the project until it has been agreed at master. This is assuming of course that there is a change on this particular CSN from its status in the IPPN master. If the CSN has not changed, then it need not be provided in the master UIPICO and it remains at its previous status from the master IPL.		