

**SPEC  
2000M****REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION****1. Request No. Issue No.**

RC04/IP/01-2

**Date:** 31 October 2001**2. Originator:**

Marc Willem  
AECMA Project Manager  
NAMSA

**Date:** 24 October 2001

**To:**

G. Holland

**3. SPEC 2000M Reference****4. Description Of Request for Clarification and Answer Provided:****Question**

During the testing of IP messages for the NH90 project encountered the following problem was encountered.

The participants in the test loaded a draft CSNIPD and then, on receipt of the master, deleted the draft and loaded the master. The recipients then produced IPL printouts from their systems and these were compared with the originator's database. Differences were identified in relation to parts data that appeared on the draft CSNIPD but which was not present on the master CSNIPD. In some instances such data was retained in the recipients' systems and appeared on the IPL although it was not present on the master. The result was therefore that the sender and recipients had different data in their systems at the end of the test. This is clearly unacceptable for the NH90 project and is against the aims of AECMA Spec 2000M.

The explanation given by the software providers was that it was not possible to delete data due to the restrictions of parts data commonality.

The root of the problem appears to be that the CSNIPD message is a total re-statement of the IPPN and contains no indication of what has been changed since the last issue. Whereas the structure data for the IPPN can be deleted and re-inserted, parts data cannot be deleted due to parts data commonality and must be updated, but the new CSNIPD message does not provide details as to what exactly is to be updated.

Have any other organisations also encountered the above problem and if so how have they solved it? How would you suggest that this problem is solved?

The NH90 community would be very grateful if you could provide us with an answer as soon as possible.

**Answer**

When a draft IP presentation is updated to Master, the Master completely replaces the Draft. There is no need to indicate what has been changed because the process is simple working towards the Master standard of the same presentation; the Draft being an intermediary step.

The problem you seem to have with the Parts Data Commonality is recognising the point at which this is considered to be established for a given Part Number. The Spec defines this as being "when the first IPPN containing that part reaches Master standard" (see 1A-3 Paragraph 3.3).

If the Draft IPPN being transmitted in the test contains parts that have not reached Master standard (with previous IPPNs), then none of those parts records should be written to the parts database. When the Master is issued, all the parts data must be repeated because it is this (Master) presentation that is the vehicle for establishing the parts data record.

On the other hand, if some parts had reached Master (with a previous IPPN) and were therefore contained in the database, the submission of the Master (or Draft for that matter) would not need to contain the full parts data. It would only need to include the PN and NSCM in the CAS segment to give reference to the part. When the Master IP presentation is printed, it should then pick up the full parts data from the database (which has been established through Parts Data Commonality).