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Introduction

Issues arising from the last SDG meeting are divided into two sections in this document. Section 1 lists substantive issues which were not resolved at the meeting, while Section 2 identifies those issues which, (based upon the decision approved at the last session), should be submitted to the Message Design Rules development group.

Those listed under Section 1 include a response from the SDG, arising from its discussion on the issue.

If the submitters of the outstanding substantive issues wish to pursue them, (or indeed if anyone has any additional substantive comments), SDG strongly recommend to GE.1 that the submitters should be requested to send their comments directly to the ISO Secretariat for TC 154. In this way, the comments will be formally controlled and addressed under the ISO process.

Similarly, SDG recommends that issues listed under Section 2, (related to comments on "Dependency Notes" and "Repeating Elements"), should also be sent directly to the Secretariat of the Message Design Rules group for consideration.

SECTION 1 - UNRESOLVED SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

General - all parts

SDG document no.: SDG/CN.4
Submitter: Norway
Issue: Conformance shall include Part 4 (CONTRL)
SDG comment: SDG do not see that support for Part 4 should be enforced in the standard, any more than for example, support for options covered by other
parts (such as security) should be enforced. However, it should be noted that the conformance statement in parts 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 has had editorial changes made to it.

**SDG document no:** SDG/CN.5  
**Submitter:** Sweden  
**Issue:** Separate documents (standards) for parts 2 and 3 should be combined into one  
**SDG comment:** This issue has been the subject of discussion in WP.4 over several years. WP.4 have since the start supported the presentation as separate parts of one international standard.

**9735/Part 1**

**Original UN document no.:** CRP.80 (March session)  
**SDG document no:** SDG/CN.8 annex  
**Submitter:** EBES TAG  
**Issue:** All issues raised.  
**SDG comment:** All of the issues raised (of which a significant majority have been agreed and implemented by means of editorial changes), have been responded to in a separate "R" document, a copy of which has also been forwarded direct to the EBES TAG Secretariat.

**Original UN document no.:** CRP.80 (March session)  
**SDG document no:** SDG/CN.8 annex  
**Submitter:** EBES TAG  
**Issue:** Identification of changes in Version 4 compared to Version 3  
**SDG comment:** Major changes will be identified in the "Introduction". It is not feasible to publish the revised documents with revisions marks, as version 4 represents a complete redraft.

**Original UN document no.:** CRP.80 (March session)  
**SDG document no:** SDG/CN.8 annex  
**Submitter:** EBES TAG  
**Issue:** Identification of elements in the message structure shall not depend on the status or maximum number of repeats  
**SDG comment:** In SDG's opinion this is an important element in defining the characteristics and rules for syntax structures, and as such should be part of the syntax specification.

**Original UN document no.:** CRP.80 (March session)  
**SDG document no:** SDG/CN.8 annex  
**Submitter:** EBES TAG  
**Issue:** Rules for trigger segments are an MDR issue, not syntax  
**SDG comment:** In SDG's opinion, while accepting that the issue has to be part of the MDRs, it is also an important element in defining the characteristics and rules for syntax structures, and as such should be part of the syntax specification, particularly for users of 9735 outside the EDIFACT process who may not have access to the EDIFACT MDRs.

**Part 3**

**SDG document no:** Comment raised in previous SDG minutes  
**Submitter:** SDG  
**Issue:** Dialogue reference number should be mandatory  
**I-EDI group comment:** The dialogue reference is conditional in a number of actual implementations of interactive EDI.

**SECTION 2 - ISSUES RELATED TO DEPENDENCY NOTES & REPEATING ELEMENTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE MDR GROUP (MDRG)**
SDG document no.: SDG/CN.4  
Submitter: Norway  
Issue: Repeating elements: Norway propose that repetition of segment qualifiers should not be allowed  
SDG comment: Submit to MDRG (SDG supports this issue)

SDG document no.: SDG/CN.5  
Submitter: Sweden  
Issue: Comment 1: We are not in favour of introducing repeating data elements in the batch part of EDIFACT.  
Comment 2: Dependency notes should not be defined in the syntax for use in EDIFACT Directories generally.  
SDG comment: Submit to MDRG

SDG document no.: SDG/CN.6  
Submitter: UK  
Issue: Comment 1: The UK does not support the use of the repetition separator for Batch EDI.  
Comment 2: The UK does not support the use of dependency notes in the syntax.  
SDG comment: Submit to MDRG

SDG document no.: SDG/CN.7  
Submitter: Germany  
Issue: Comment 1: We feel that Dependency notes are not a syntactical issue.  
Comment 2: Regarding the usage of UNS segment it is not clear whether it should be used for anticollision purposes or section separation.  
Comment 3: We are not in favour of using the repeating technique in batch EDI.  
SDG comment: Submit to MDRG

SDG document no.: SDG/CN.8 /Annex  
Submitter: EBES/TAG  
Issue: Use of dependency notes and repeating elements  
SDG comment: These comments have been responded to in a separate "R" document. Input on these issues should be made to MDRG

SDG document: SDG/CN.41  
Submitter: Denmark  
Issue: Comment 1: Dependency notes: Should this be included in the syntax, or in the message design guideline? The dependency should be optional for the designers, but not for users. Denmark is positive towards the use of the dependency notes.  
Comment 2: Repeating data elements: We need further documentation about the exact use of repeating data elements (i.e. how to use), due to lack of general rules in version 4.  
SDG comment: Submit to MDRG

SDG document: SDG/CN.41  
Submitter: Denmark  
Issue: Decimal mark - We think that the old use of UNA (with either comma or decimal point) should be kept.  
SDG comment: SDG has to follow existing ISO standards, in this case ISO 6093 - Representation of numerical values, which permits both. In practice it is thought that users will still continue to use one or the other in interchanges. However, a proposal to this effect could be submitted to MDRG