

**Disposition of comments on:
CD ISO/IEC 10373-6:2011/PDAM6 — Identification cards — Test
methods — Part 6: Proximity cards — AMENDMENT 6: Alternating
between PICC and PCD functionalities**

Reference documents:

Ballot is in SC17 N 4517 = WG8 N 1904

Ballot Result is in SC17 N 4616 = WG8 N 1933

Project Editor:

Peter Raggam, Germany

The following pages provide the details of the comments and detailed information about their resolutions, how WG8 had tried to resolve each received comment from the CD Ballot (PDAM) at the WG8 meeting held in New Orleans, U.S.A., on 2012-09-26/28.

WG8 carefully addressed the comments from Belgium, Finland and Switzerland, having disapproved the PDAM. Unfortunately no delegate from those countries had attended the ballot resolution meeting in order to let WG8 learn that it may have resolved their negative positions. WG8 had the impression that the comments from Belgium and Finland have shown that the intention and the contents of the PDAM have been misunderstood, so that their negative positions had to be rejected. The negative position from Switzerland, however, could be resolved from WG8's point of view. Namely, the cooperation between SC17/WG8 and SC6/WG1, requested by Switzerland, is being performed, so that any possible conflict between the relevant standard of SC6 and the PDAM is seen unlikely by WG8.

According to the advice from the SC17 Secretariat WG8 decided by WG8 Resolution 52.02 (contained in WG8 N 1958) to issue the new text of 10373-6:2011/Amd.6, i.e. WG8 N 1956, for DIS 10373-6:2011/DAM6 balloting.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2012-06-04	Document: SC17 N 4517 ISO/IEC10373-6/PDAM6
------------------	---

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

This file contains all comments to ISO/IEC 10373-6 PDAM 6

Comments are ordered along clauses.

BE	1		GE	Belgium disapproves this standard, because of no interoperability with ISO/IEC 21481		Rejected There is no presented reason to believe that there are any interoperability issue between the two standards.
FI			ge	This amendment is not needed as the ISO/IEC 14443-3:2011/PDAM 3 project should be stopped too.	Stop the project.	Rejected: This standard is not seen as an alternative to ISO/IEC 21481 but as complementary standard.
CH	All		ge	17N4517 specifies the testing requirements for the proposed functionality. Our disapproval is a consequence of our disapproval of 17N4513.		Resolved by comment resolution of 14443-3 PDAM3
JP1	1		ge	In the scope of this base standard(ISO/IEC 10373-6:2011), there is no description of test method which is specific to proximity extended device.	Replace "This part of ISO/IEC 10373 defines test methods which are specific to proximity cards and objects, and proximity coupling devices," by "This part of ISO/IEC 10373 defines test methods which are specific to proximity cards and objects, proximity coupling devices and proximity extended devices,"	Accepted
FR1	6		ed	typo	Replace sub clause with	Accepted

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2012-06-04	Document: SC17 N 4517 ISO/IEC10373-6/PDAM6
------------------	---

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					subclause Check the complete text for similar words	
FR2	6		ed	typo	Replace clause with Clause Check the complete text for similar words	Accepted
JP2	6.3	2nd bullet	ge	Subclause 6.2 in ISO/IEC 10373-6 includes the "6.2.2 Static electricity test", which is currently defined in ISO/IEC 10373-1/Amd.1. This static electricity test is intended for ID-1 card. Taking into account that PXD size is not restricted to ID-1 size, it is no use of specifying static electricity test for PXD in this standard.	Clarify the positioning of static electricity test for PXD.	Resolved by explanation The static electricity test is intended for ID1 size PICCs. For different PICC form factors other standardized ESD tests should apply.
JP3	8.3.2.1.1		ed	For font style consistency.	Replace "t _{cyc} " and "t _{diff} " by "t _{cyc} " and "t _{diff} ", respectively.	Accepted
JP4	8.3.2.1.2		ge	The criteria for "The PXD shall not be in close proximity to another PXD, PCD or PICC" are ambiguous. Magnetic field? Distance? or else?	Reconsider the purpose for this subclause.	Resolved Shall replaced by should
DE 1	8.3.2.1.4	Second dash	te	Requirement is not clear	Replace second dash with: "- for each t _{cyc} the PICC mode duration (RF field off) is longer than the PCD mode duration (RF field on)."	Accepted
DE 2	8.3.2.1.4	Third dash	te	Because of statistical reasons the test may go fail. Mandate to rerun the test.	Replace third dash with two new dashes and a note: "- the PICC mode durations vary,	Resolved

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2012-06-04	Document: SC17 N 4517 ISO/IEC10373-6/PDAM6
------------------	---

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					"- the minimum and maximum PICC mode durations differ by at least t_{diff} , otherwise the test goes FAIL. NOTE Due to statistical reasons the test may fail and the lab may rerun this test."	
JP5	8.3.2.1.4		ed	For font style consistency.	Replace " t_{cyc} " and " t_{diff} " by " t_{cyc} " and " t_{diff} ", respectively.	Accepted
US 1	8.3.2.2.1.2 Test conditions	8.3.2.2.1.2	T	"The PXD shall not be in close proximity to another PXD, PCD or PICC." Should be allowed to have the reference PICC or PCD	"The PXD shall not be in close proximity to another PXD, PCD or PICC excluding the reference PICC or PCD"	Resolved by JP4
JP6	8.3.2.2.1.2		ge	The criteria for "The PXD shall not be in close proximity to another PXD, PCD or PICC" are ambiguous. Magnetic field? Distance? or else?	Reconsider the purpose for this subclause.	Resolved by JP4
US 2		8.3.2.2.1.4	E	Confusing grammar	The test is a "PASS" if all the following conditions are met in each cycle otherwise the test is a "FAIL".	Resolved by: The test result is PASS...
US 3		8.3.2.2.2.4	E	Confusing grammar	The test is PASS if the PXD resumes its automatic mode alternation, possibly after application of the error handling or PICC presence check rules, with the PICC mode first, otherwise the test is a "FAIL".	Resolved by: The test result is PASS...

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2012-06-04	Document: SC17 N 4517 ISO/IEC10373-6/PDAM6
------------------	---

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB ¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment ²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
JP7	8.3.2.3.1.3		ed	The numbering of steps is incorrect.	Correct the numbering.	accepted
FR3	8.3.2.3.1.5		te	Only one answer (ATQA or ATQB) shall be allowed if the PXD in PICC mode supports Type A and Type B	Replace the paragraph with: The test is PASS if the PXD response is only one valid answer to request (Type A or Type B) in each of the two test procedures, otherwise the test goes FAIL.	Resolved by new sentence
JP8	8.3.2.3.2.1		ed	(1) "REQ/WUP" is not defined. (2) For consistency with the base standard.	For (1), replace "a valid REQ/WUP command" by "a valid REQA/WUPA or REQB/WUPB commands" For (2), replace "POWER OFF state" by "POWER-OFF state".	Accepted
JP9	8.3.2.3.2.3	step i)	ed	"REQ" is not defined.	Replace "a REQ command" by "a REQA or REQB command".	Resolved Request command
FR4	8.3.2.3.2.3	Step j)	ed	Missing word	Replace Send a WUP command of the Type which was answered in step c) or d) and there is a PXD response with Send a WUP command of the Type which was answered in step c) or d) and check there is a PXD response	Accepted

¹ **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.