

Response to email written by Francis on April 2, 2004

Dear Francis,

Many thanks for your e-mail.

Firstly I would like to stress that you (USA) have done everything you needed to do and did it all totally correctly. You worked with WG8 and got them on board in regard to a cheap, throw away contactless card and brought the work item up through SC17 where it was approved.

The work item proposed by France appears to tackle similar issues but from the start point of WG1, as the "owner" of the thin flexible cards, being responsible for developing a cheap throw away contactless version of a 15457 card.

Once the NWI was presented to SC17 by France (a new procedure because prior to the JTC1 plenary last year, SC17 only balloted work item proposals from their own working groups) there was no choice but to ballot it. Being concerned that the work item might well cause confusion in the national bodies, I did seek clarification from France (and from WG1) as to how it differed from the WG8 new work item and their explanation was included with the proposal.

At the end of the day it is the national bodies that will vote on the work item and it is possible that those national bodies confused by the French work item may well vote against it. In the event that it too is approved, then I hope WGs 8 and 1 will liaise closely and each concentrate on their respective strengths. Of course, that begs the question as to whether the resulting deliverable is amendments to 14443, particularly Part 1, or 15457, or complementary amendments to both. What the industry does not need is rival contradictory standards.

I hope this has clarified how I dealt with the work item and why I had no option but to ballot it.

Do come back to me if you have any other questions.

With best regards,
Freda Bennett
Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17

Freda Bennett
Standards Consultant
Standards and Security Unit
APACS
Mercury House
Triton Court
14 Finsbury Square
London EC2A 1LQ
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7711 6292
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7711 6299
E-Mail: freda.bennett@apacs.org.uk

Email written to SC17 Secretariat on April 2, 2004

"FC Consulting" <fc.consulting@earthlink.net> 02/04/2004 20:07:49
Dear Freda,

I'm writing you this email to try and get a better understanding of why the NP SC17N2491 has been issued. We have just completed the balloting of the NP SC17N2438 with the approval results in document SC17N2489 which is on the same subject.

The NP in SC17N2438 was submitted by the USA through the WG8 group after the November 2003 WG8 meeting in Paris. Now I see that the SC17N2491 is submitted to SC17 from France and asked to have the project assigned to the WG1 group. As I read both of these NPs I believe we are proposing the same standard work and directing it to two different groups.

I would like to suggest that the already approved NP covers the subject and any detail that is missing could be added into the working draft during the develop process. Also, it was stated in the SC17N2438 NP that the WG8 group would cooperate and liaison with SC17/WG1 on this work.

Therefore I see this new NP SC17N2491 as a repeat of the activity in NP SC17N2438.

Thank you for reviewing this subject and I look forward to an answer from you.

Best Regards,

Francis Christian
Chairman INCITS B10.5

FC Consulting
15628 Via Marchena
San Diego CA 92128
Ph: 858-485-5568