As stated in the SDG Executive Summary (TRADE/WP.4/R.1240), the Group of Experts is expected to:
Note this document as being for information

* The present document is reproduced in the form in which it was received by the secretariat.

GE.96-
Introduction

In view of the detailed work carried out by EBES/TAG (shown in the annex to the submission of TRADE/WP.4/CRP.80 by the French delegation), and in view of the fact that many of the comments highlighted certain inconsistencies in the 9735 documents, SDG felt that it should respond in similar detail to these helpful comments. SDG has agreed with some 60-70% of the comments, and have made editorial changes to take them into account. A copy of this document has been forwarded to EBES/TAG.

With respect to dependency notes and repeating elements, the GE.1 resolution (approved by WP.4) stated:

“GE.1 directs that the techniques for the use of Dependency Notes and Repeating Elements shall not be applied to user directories until all of the concerns raised by users have been addressed. These shall be addressed in an enhanced version of the Message Design Rules to be applied for Version 4 of the syntax, and in the associated rules specified in the Technical Assessment Check List for use by the TAGs. The development of the additional design rules required for Version 4 shall be carried out in parallel to the ISO Fast Track process for 9735.

Dependency notes

The minutes state: "TAG is strongly in favour of a formal notation to specify notes at syntax, message and message implementation levels. But this notation should have the capability to apply to any type of condition."

It is worth recalling that the question of notes (originally called "syntax" and "usage" notes) started in a special group, formed at a JRT meeting some 3-4 years ago, was then passed on to the then JTAG, which in turn, passed it on to the SDG.

When SDG started on the subject, it was clear that the differentiation between the terms "syntax notes" and "usage notes" was not clear, so it was decided to use the term "dependency notes" (in place of syntax notes), which more properly describes their function. Having considered the subject, SDG put forward proposals not only for dependency notes, but also formal notation for usage notes. The result was that the then WE/TAG commented very strongly that "usage notes" were of no concern of SDG -and accordingly, they were dropped by SDG from the 9735/V.4 proposals. It was clear that all groups which had studied the subject from the outset, recognised that there is a distinct difference between dependency and usage notes.

The EBES/TAG comments then go on to say: "The notation defined in SDG does not satisfy these criteria. It has so many restrictions that even in the syntax it is able to cover only very few
notes.

    In UNB, 2 notes, none in a formal way,
    In UNG, 6 notes, one using the formal notation,
    In UNH, one note, not in formal notation,
    In UNS, one note, not in formal notation,
    In UNE, one note, not in formal notation,
    In UNZ, one note, not in formal notation."

It would appear from these comments that the difference between dependency notes and usage notes are perhaps not fully understood.

Reviewing the above comments shows the following:

    In UNB, 2 notes, none in a formal way,
    (Note 1. S001/0002. Shall be '4' to indicate this version of the syntax [the second note being an advisory footnote])

This Note 1. is a usage note, which has existed in 9735 for all previous versions of the syntax. The same is true for the comments directed against the UNS, UNE and UNZ segments.

    In UNH, one note, not in formal notation,

(The note is an advisory footnote, which is highly unlikely to be capable of being represented by any form of formal notation).

The EBES/TAG minutes go on to say:

    "The dependency notes (DN) are optional for use in the messages, but so far DN are added to segments automatically, they will apply to all messages using this segment."

    It should be recognised that DNs used in the syntax rules are transparent to the user. They are applied for the benefit of service providers in order to specify precisely the relationship rules which have to be observed in the syntax, to ensure that conformance to the rules is also observed by service providers.

    The only other place where SDG has specified DNs for use, is for Service Messages (for which SDG is the Message Design Group). As EBES/TAG are presumably aware, entities which appear in service directories cannot be specified for use in any user messages or directories.

    In so far as the use of DNs in user directories, as agreed at the March session of GE.1/WP.4, EBES/TAG are requested to make their input to the Message Design Rules (MDR) group, for consideration for inclusion in MDRs for Version 4 of the syntax.

UNS
The first comment states:

"The function of the UNS has to be clarified; is the purpose of the segment for sectionalisation or for anti collision?"

In 9735/Part 2, the function of UNS is stated as:

"To separate header, detail and summary sections of a message."

The UNS segment (and its note) is now identical to the first 1988 and subsequent versions of 9735. Further, it is in accord with the current revision of the batch Message Design Rules.

The EBES/TAG minutes go to say:

"SDG suggests to allow more than two UNS in a message and accordingly to use more than two codes. There are inconsistencies in the SDG proposal. If more than two UNS can be used in a message to identify other sections than Detail and Summary, the function of the segment should be changed accordingly. It is not the case."

It should be made clear that the proposal to allow more than two UNS segments in a message came in a WE/TAG submission, supported by two WE message design groups. Further, SDG stated this fact in an Executive Summary and suggested that if was a true requirement, then it should be handled via a submission to the Message Design Rules group. Since apparently this has not been followed up by EBES/TAG or by the relevant WE message design groups, accordingly, SDG has not amended the UNS specification.

The EBES/TAG minutes go on:

"TAG considers that UNS has to be used, as it was in the past, to sectionalise messages. Its function should not be changed and it should remain for upward compatibility reasons."

This comment is not understood. UNS remains as it was in Version 3 of 9735, and is still in accord with the batch Message Design Rules.

Repeating Techniques

At the end of these comments, the EBES/TAG minutes state:

"Concerning the usefulness of this technique, there is no consensus in TAG. Some members think that there is no established business need. Some (MD9 and 10) think that they are faced to cases for which this technique may be helpful."

This was discussed at the March UN/ECE/GE.1 meeting, and it was agreed that comments
should be submitted to the group responsible for the revision of the batch Message Design Rules for Version 4 of the syntax, for consideration. Accordingly, EBES/TAG are requested to make input to the MDR group.

**PART 1 - General comments**

The EBES/TAG comments state:

- "The changes should be clearly identified" - While little of the detail in Part 1 has changed, it is a complete re-draft of the relevant original text. In accordance with current ISO procedures, any changes/additions have been identified in a summary included in the "Introduction" of Part 1.

- "Problem with the Annex: It should be one annex for all the parts for better consistency" - AGREED - editorial changes have been made. In addition, since SDG felt that this was a constructive suggestion, the same concept has been applied to the service directories, which have also been incorporated into Part 1, which will permit easier maintenance.

- "There are a lot of inconsistencies in the terminology
  - 'use of 'object' instead of 'package'" AGREED, editorial changes have been made;
  - 'use of 'message' instead of 'message body'" AGREED, editorial changes have been made.
  - 'use of unusual terms ('user guide' instead of implementation guide') AGREED, editorial changes have been made to UNH.
  - 'incorrect use of terms (the word 'identification' is applied to a data element used only to reference)" - since no detailed reference as to the place where this occurred was given, SDG were unable to find this item.

- "Several MDG issues have been included and should be removed from the syntax (e.g. 'trigger segment should be mandatory one')" - SDG disagree with this comment. While rightly, the rule is reflected in the MDRs, in SDG's view this a basic and integral part of syntax, and should be included for the benefit of 9735 users outside the UN/EDIFACT process.

**PART 1 - Detailed comments**

For "Point 6 Character Repertoires", it states: "Is this issue really for I-EDI and batch-EDI or only for batch?"

The title of Part 1 is "Syntax rules common to all parts of this standard", - so, yes, it is available for I-EDI and for all other Parts.

The minutes go on to say: "There is no distinction between character set and character repertoire."

This is covered in the definitions. (See definition A.6, which refers to the definitions in A.10
and A.33. Character repertoires include character sets. In addition, it should be noted that the ISO standards for character sets include CR & LF. It was stated in the last SDG Executive Summary that a Service Directory Set (including codes) will be made available. This will be available for the September meeting of UN/ECE/GE.1.

**Point 7 - Syntax structures: 7.1 Interchange structure**

"Replace the words 'object(s) by the words 'package(s)' to align on Part 8 figure 1" - **AGREED** - However, also taking into account a comment from France, references in Part 1 to Security and Associated Data have been removed from the structures (showing them instead in their relevant Parts).

**Point 7.3 Message structure**

"Delete the sentence 'Identification shall not depend on a segment's status or a maximum number of repetition' (see definition of collision suggested under UNS)" - Since the definition of collision suggested has not been adopted in the MDRs, SDG have retained this sentence. Syntactically, if collision would have occurred without the intervention of a UNS segment, it is not necessary to look at the contents of UNS segment. It is sufficient that its tag is different to that of the colliding segments.

**Point 7.4 Segment group structure**

To delete the second part of the second sentence '.shall have a status of mandatory and a maximum number of occurrences of one' since this is not a syntactical issue but an MDG one." - See the comments re Point 7.3 above.

**Point 7.7 Composite data element structure**

"The sentence 'A component data element shall not be a repeating data element' is ambiguous. The sentence shall be replaced by 'The repetition technique shall not be applied to component data elements' - **AGREED**, the sentence has been deleted, and the subject covered by an editorial amendment to point 7.5.

**Point 7.9 Object structure (+Annex A from 52 to 55)**

"The usage and definition of the terms 'object' shall be aligned with part 8.**AGREED** - editorial changes made (except for A.53 & A.54, which are correct as they stand)."
PART 2

General comments

First bullet re Deletion: The current full revision has taken 8-10 years, and it is reasonable to assume that a similar period will apply. See also TRADE/WP.4/R.1187 recommended for approval by GE.1.

Second bullet re Service Code List: It has been pointed out in previous SDG Executive Summaries, that since code lists for syntax service coded elements are dynamic, these will be maintained under UNTDID procedures. The codes for Parts 3 and 8 will be removed, and are currently shown for information only. However, SDG agrees with the concept and the service code list directory which is current at the time of eventual ISO publication, will be included in Part 1 as an "Informative" annex.

Third bullet re Figures: AGREED - Editorial changes have been made.

Fourth bullet re qualification by position: It is unclear as to what is being referred to in this comment, with respect to Part 2. However, where it applied in Part 8 AGREED - an editorial change has been made.

Detailed comments

Re Point 5: AGREED, but handled in line with the comments made regarding to consistency with respect to the diagrams in the various parts.

Re Annex A 1.5 UNB: First and second bullets AGREED, editorial changes have been made.

Third bullet: The original element tag numbers from Versions 1, 2 & 3 have been retained for consistency, and in order not to disrupt existing implementations. (Note: MDRs do not apply to syntax or service messages).

Re UNG: First bullet AGREED, Note 5 was applied in error with respect to deletion, and is now used for a different purpose. Note 4 however is retained, since to retain these elements would both contravene the function of the segment, and duplicate the UNH segment.

Second and third bullets: AGREED, editorial changes have been made.

Re UNH: First/second/third/fourth bullets AGREED, editorial changes have been made.

PART 3

All comments (except the last) AGREED, editorial changes have been made. In so far as the comment on point 6.2 is concerned, it is the view of the interactive sub-group that these functions are
an integral part of the standard.

PART 8

Re General comments: AGREED, editorial changes have been made addressing the issue of character sets.

Re Detailed comments:

A.1.5
- first/second bullets: The names for 0800 & S020 have been specified in this way to retain consistency with other similar fields in the current syntax, which also use "reference" in their naming.

- third/fourth/fifth bullets - Editorial changes have been made in line with comments made from other delegations (however, it should be noted that the MDRs/TACs do not apply to 9735).

- sixth bullet -AGREED, editorial changes made.

Comment re Note 1: AGREED - editorial change made.