

SPEC 2000M	REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION	1. Request No. RC 06 / IP / 06-2 Date: 4 October 2006
2. From: Roger Jevons Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Date: 22.09.2006		To: IPET
3. SPEC 2000M Reference: 1A – 6A, Page 13		
4. Description Of Request for Clarification: <p>Clarification is requested whether it is allowed to submit changes to data elements which are listed in the “data element matrix for updating” as category 2 changes on a category 1 (UPIPCO) message.</p> <p>The Spec 1A-6A page 13 states:</p> <p>Column one shows those data element changes which should be presented in Category 1 messages and column two lists those which can be covered by Category 2 messages.</p> <p>Clarification is requested concerning the use of the expression “can be”. Does this mean “must be” or does it represent an option to submit the changes on a category 2 message but does not exclude the option to submit them on a category 1 message.</p> <p>Clarification is also requested concerning the presentation of category 2 changes in a category 1 (UPIPCO) message. Does the specification allow for the UPIPCO to contain all currently unsent category 2 changes within the IPPN. This would mean that included within the UPIPCO would be changes to part and location records not impacted by the category 1 changes.</p>		
5. Answer Provided: <p>The S2000M allows Category 2 changes to be included within a Category 1 message. This inclusion may cover all Category 2 changes for that IPPN, or just those Category 2 changes that are associated with items subject to a Category 1 change. The method of processing Category 2 changes is subject to agreement between Customer and Contractor.</p> <p>Where an IPPN has only Category 2 changes (i.e. no Category 1 changes) then the UPIPCT must be used. Also, Category 1 changes must always be submitted in the UPIPCO message.</p>		