Disposition of comments on:
FCD ISO/IEC 10373-6:2011/PDAM11 — Identification cards — Test methods — Part 6: Proximity cards — AMENDMENT 11: Test methods for the exchange of additional parameters

Reference documents:
>   Ballot is in SC17 N 4212 = WG8 N 1823
>   Ballot Result is in SC17 N 4319 = WG8 N 1837

Project Editor:
Erich Reisenhofer, Austria

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 FCD Ballot (FPDAM) at the WG8 meeting held in Song-Do, Korea, on 2011-09-28/30.

According to the advice from the SC17 Secretariat WG8 decided by WG8 Resolution 50.10 (contained in WG8 N 1847) to issue the new text of 10373-6:2011/Amd.11, i.e. WG8 N 1861, for FDIS 10373-6:2011/FDAM11 balloting.

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**	**Proposed Editors Disposition**
JP1	Whole documents		ge	It is not clear at FPDAM ballot stage whether there are any known patents regarding ISO/IEC 10373-6/Amd.11. Even though ISO/IEC takes no position concerning the evidence, validity and scope of the patents, the patents known at this time should be disclosed.	Disclose patents regarding ISO/IEC 10373-6/Amd.11.	Resolved: Will be resolved at SC17 Plenary meeting in Song-Do
JP2	Whole documents	Table G.60	ge	The title of ISO/IEC 10373-6/Amd.11 is "Exchange of additional parameters". In this document, however, there are several changes which have no relation with "Exchange of additional parameters". For example, " removing Line No 10 in Table G.60" is outside scope of "Exchange of additional parameters" This causes confusion and inconvenience because the people who have no relation with the test methods for optional S(PARAMETRS) and do not know the presence of ISO/IEC 10373-6/Amd.11 may miss the removal of "Line No 10 in Table G.60".	Reconsider "removing Line No 10 in Table G.60" in the light of the title and scope of ISO/IEC10373-6/Amd.11. Same requirements apply to other changes which have no relation with "Exchange of additional parameters".	Resolved by changing the title to "Exchange of additional parameters, block numbering, unmatched AFI and TR2"
FR1	all		ed	For the FDAM ballot, the instructions in italics should follow the ISO rules: - no mention of the amended document (already in the page header) - reference to a clause/subclause (when applicable)	Replace *Page 141 of ISO/IEC 10373-6:2011,* with *Page 141, G.5.4.2* And so on for all instructions	Acc.
NL2	Generic		TE	Since the coding of S(PARAMETERS) is ambigious and The RFU setting allows confusion with S(DESLECT) as explained in document in **wg8n1818r1** the requirement specification should be corrected, afterwards the test methods in 17n4212 should be corrected before any more progress on 10373-7/Amd11 can be achieved	Resolve EMVCo claims on "non backwards compatibility in WG8 N1818" : Correct test methods to avoid misinterpretation with S(DESELECT)	Resolved by planned Technical Corrigendum

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 – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

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**	**Proposed Editors Disposition**
NL1	Page 141	Scenario 66	TE	The coding of S(Parameters) overlaps with the coding of S(DESELECT) since it differs only in the setting of a RFU bit to 1. Legacy PICCs are never obliged to check RFU bits and may ignore the meaning since it has not been specified. Consequently legacy PICCs may interpret S(PARAMETERS) as S(DESELECT) and respond with S(DESLECT) response	Resolve EMVCo claims on "non backwards compatibility in WG8 N1818" : Add an additional PICC reaction Response 3: S(DESELECT) response	Resolved by planned Technical Corrigendum
JP3	G.5.6	Title	ed	For font style consistency.	Spell the title "G.5.6 PICC reaction on S(PARAMETERS) blocks" in bold style.	Acc.
FR2	New G.5.6		ed	Use bold font for "G.5.6 PICC reaction on S(PARAMETERS) blocks" title		Acc.
JP4	G.5.6.2		ed	Steps No. is wrong.	Replace second "a)" by "b)" and "b)" by "c)"	Acc.
FR3	G.5.6.2	Step a	ed	There are 2 steps a)	Renumber steps	Acc.
FR4	G.6	Table G.63	ed	The text "PICC reaction on S(PARAMETERS) blocks" is split on 2 lines	Use same columns widths as in original Table G.63 so that this text fits on a single line	Acc.

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 – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

NOTE   Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

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	Proposed Editors Disposition
FR5	H.5.4		ed	There is usually no comma before the word "and"	*Replace* S-block shall have an INF field of one byte only when it is a WTX block, an INF field of n byte(s) (n ≥ 0) when it is a PARAMETERS block, and no INF field otherwise (see ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008, 7.1.1.1 and ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008/Amd.1). *with* S-block shall have an INF field of one byte only when it is a WTX block, an INF field of n byte(s) (n ≥ 0) when it is a PARAMETERS block and no INF field otherwise (see ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008, 7.1.1.1 and ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008/Amd.1). *or with* S-block shall have - an INF field of one byte only when it is a WTX block, - an INF field of n byte(s) (n ≥ 0) when it is a PARAMETERS block and - no INF field otherwise (see ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008, 7.1.1.1 and ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008/Amd.1).	Resolved by: S-block shall have either - an INF field of one byte only when it is a WTX block or - an INF field of n byte(s) (n ≥ 0) when it is a PARAMETERS block or - no INF field otherwise (see ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008, 7.1.1.1 and ISO/IEC 14443-4:2008/Amd.1).

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 – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10