TRADE/WP.4/CRP.134

15 February 1997

GERMAN POSITION ON TRADE/WP.4/R.840/Rev.3
(Message Design Rules)

SOURCE: GERMAN DELEGATION
STATUS: OFFICIAL NATIONAL DELEGATION POSITION
ACTION: FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION; GE.1; MARCH 1997, Agenda Item 3

GERMAN POSITION ON TRADE/WP.4/R.840/Rev.3
(Message Design Rules)

Document R.840/Rev.3 is made available for the March session of WP.4/GE.1.
Germany has taken the opportunity to review the document and supports it in general.

The following points summarise general concerns that Germany holds:

1. There should be a general rule stating that these rules are only applicable to newly developped messages, segments, composite data elements, data elements and codes (in the following called objects). Existing objects should not be changed only to apply these new rules. If there is any other reason to change an object than these rules should only be applied when it can be carried out in an upwards compatible manner.

2. The rule 24 should be copied analog to the sections for composite data elements rules
and simple data element rules (being the first rule in section 4.6 and 4.7).

3. Rule 56: In this rule an information about the data element length is missing (see Preface section, ii, f, last sentence). The following text shall be added to the end of rule 56: "An appropriate maximum length must be specified for each data element."

4. Rule 57: The sentence should read: "A coded simple data element shall be specified
with a data value representation of at least an..3."

The addition "... that has an associated UN/EDIFACT Code List ..." should be taken out to apply this rule also to all coded simple data elements.

5. Annex A, A.27 "message type": The definition of the term "message type" is recursiv, i. e. there is no more information than the term itself. To be consistent with the other objects it should read:

"Message tag: A code identifying a type of message." (Note: we are aware that the same error has occured in A.53 of ISO 9735 version 4, Annex A. This has to be aligned, too.)

Despite of the comments, Germany is able to approve R.840/Rev.3, but requests that the above points will be taken care of.

_____