

Reference number of document: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17/WG1/TF3 N **009**

Date: 2003-03-24

Committee identification: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17/WG1/TF3

Secretariat: Steve Brunt for BSI

Title : Minutes TF3 2003-03 Barcelona

Author/Submitter : Secretariat

Requested action : for information

Document type: WG1 Committee Document
Document subtype: N/A
Document stage: N/A
Document language: E

MINUTES OF SC17/WG1/TF3

“COEXISTENCE OF TECHNOLOGIES”

BARCELONA MEETING MARCH 2003

1. The Meeting was opened by UT
2. The Agenda (TF3N003) was adopted, with the following changes:
 - JN requested to present a review of roles and relationships within SC17
 - UT noted that item 4 should refer to Copenhagen, not Harrisburg.
3. An Introduction and Roll Call of Experts was conducted and an attendance list circulated. The experts present were:
 - Uwe Truggelman [UT] (Convenor) (UK)
 - Steve Brunt [SB] (Secretary) (UK)
 - Felix Shvartsman [FS] (USA)
 - Richard Fayling [RF] (USA)
 - Joseph Naujokas [JN] (USA)
 - Akira Nakazawa [AN] (Japan)
 - Yoshikazu Yorimoto [YY] (Japan)
 - Laurence Robles [LR] (France)
 - Manuel Deloche [MDe] (France)
 - Erick Brisse [EB] (France)
 - Michel Dancygier [MD] (France)
 - David May [DM] (UK)
 - Denny Warwick [DW] (USA)
 - George Steele [GS] (USA)
 - Markus Slavik [MS] (Germany)
 - Stephan Woelki [SW] (Germany)
 - Martin Albrecht [MA] (Germany)
 - Gemma Deler [GD] (Spain)
 - Juan Jose Pertegas [JP] (Spain)
 - Murdoch Henretty [MH] (Visa)
 - Alan Finkelstein [AF] (USA)
 - David Main [DMn] (Visa)
4. The report on the Copenhagen meeting was accepted unchanged.

5. Work resulting from Coexistent Technology Procedures defined in SD2 (SC17N1868).

Nothing to report

6. Location of Fingerprint Sensor

At the last meeting a proposal was prepared that was circulated by UT to other Working Groups. Mark Kamers contacted TF3 (see TF3 N008) and expressed concern that it was proposed to locate the fingerprint sensor in the position normally occupied by the hologram. UT suggested that a formal response was required.

New documents introduced were TF3N007R from Japan and a document from Rinas (TF3N010). These, together with N008 were printed and distributed during the meeting.

Review of TF3N008 addressed the points raised by MK in turn:

- 1) Why standardise the position of the fingerprint sensor at all? This is the scope of the task force and its work item.
- 2) Liaison and coordination has been established with relevant groups and TF3 are working within their defined scope.
- 3) The hologram is placed on the card for security purposes. The fingerprint sensor can only enhance security.
- 4) Comment noted.

Action: UT will write a reply to MK.

TF3N010 considers the necessity of avoiding the magnetic stripe area to prevent disruption of the readback signal. DW pointed out that ISO/IEC 7811-2 and –6 already require the area identified in TF3N010 to be distortion free. It was agreed that the definition of the fingerprint sensor area should point this out.

TF3N007R considers the situation for cards with no magnetic stripe. There was concern that some cards without magnetic stripes are in fact inserted into readers that contain a magnetic stripe reader section.

LR presented two documents dealing with the overall approach. TF3N004 is a strategy proposal relating to NWI 2046 and 2047. TF3N005 deals specifically with NWI 2046. GD advised caution in changing standards to accommodate a situation that is not particularly stable. She listed a number of items that might, possibly, be incorporated into cards but noted that there was no common agreement as to which of the newly available technologies would be used. NJ noted that the US WG4 mirror had concluded that this is not a standardisation issue because it does not directly relate to interoperability. FS echoed GD's point "Why standardise situations that so far have not yet arisen?"

This is in fact dialectic between a specific approach and a wholistic approach. Do we say "these are the free areas, use them as you will" or "we have identified the free areas and propose that they should be used for these devices, located as follows . . .". MA noted however that it is desirable to encourage interoperability wherever possible.

JN suggested that it might be best to identify the "prohibitions", i.e. the areas to be avoided due to possible impact on the installed technologies. DM took a similar

view. It was proposed that an annex of 7810 might be an appropriate way of providing guidance.

UT proposed that TF3N002 will be changed to identify the free areas, the technologies that may be accommodated and the fingerprint sensor (as the item so far addressed specifically).

There was considerable discussion as to whether there should be coexistence guidance in an annex of 7810. This was left unresolved. LR volunteered to act as project editor and was so appointed.

Returning to the Japanese proposal in TF3N007R to include the additional area when there is no magnetic stripe. Upon a show of hands, it was accepted.

GS noted that it was not logical to specify one particular face of the card. Upon a further show of hands, it was decided not to specify the face.

7. Battery in Card

JN reported that the US is expected to have a contribution on this item at the next meeting.

8. Guideline to SC17 standards

Roles and relationships within SC17

JN had prepared a draft of the proposed document. The current draft is presented to elicit views on format and presentation. He hopes to be able to present a working document for review at the next meeting. It was agreed to distribute this document for comment.

Action: JN will supply a PDF file (allocated number TF3N011) to SB for distribution. SB will collect, collate and distribute comments.

9. AOB

9.1 Membership, corresponding membership and mailing list of WG1/TF3

SB noted that TF3 was setting up its own mailing list. UT stated that most of the additional recipients of TF3 documents are already on the WG1 "Extra" list but that this would be supplemented with specific TF3 "Extra" correspondents. SB mentioned the convenors of other SC17 working groups.

9.2 URI

YY raised the issue of URI considerations. UT invited the TF3 experts to refer back to National Bodies for a view on what, if anything, should be done in this area.

10. Closure of meeting

The next meeting will be held during the series of WG1 and Task Force meetings in Paris in June 2003. The exact date and time of the meeting will be advised later.