

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17**  
**Cards and personal identification**

**2007-01-31**

**ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17 N 3193**

**DOCUMENT TYPE: TEXT FOR PDTR BALLOT**

**TITLE: Ballot** – ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2 Identification cards – Guidelines – Reserved for ISO future use.

**BACKWARD POINTER: N**

**SOURCE: Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17**

**STATUS: Text for PDTR Ballot**

**ACTION ID: ACT**

**WORK ITEM:**

**DUE DATE: 2007-05-01**


**DISTRIBUTION** P, L and O-Members of ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17  
ISO/IEC JTC1 Secretariat and ISO/IEC/ITTF  
SC17/WG1

**MEDIUM: SERVER**

**NO. OF PAGES: 11**

---

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17, APACS, Mercury House, Triton Court, 14 Finsbury Square,  
London EC2A 1LQ, England;  
Telephone: +44 (0) 20 7711 6292; Fax: +44 (0) 20 7711 6299; e-mail [chris.starr@apacs.org.uk](mailto:chris.starr@apacs.org.uk)

	<b>ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2 Identification cards – Guidelines – Reserved for ISO future use.</b>	
	Date <b>2007-01-31</b>	Reference number ISO/JTC 1/SC 17 <b>N 3193</b>

THIS DOCUMENT IS STILL UNDER STUDY AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR REFERENCE PURPOSES.

ISO/JTC 1/SC 17  Cards and personal identification  Secretariat:  APACS for BSI	Circulated to P- and O-members, and to technical committees and organizations in liaison for: - discussion at - comment by - voting by (P-members only)  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2007-05-01</b></p> Please return all votes and comments in electronic form directly to the 17 Secretariat at APACS by the due date indicated.
---	---

---

**ISO/IEC PDTR**

**Title:** 14443.2 Identification cards – Guidelines – Reserved for ISO future use.

**Project:**

---

Introductory note:

In the WG8 report to the 19<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of SC17 in Paris. Mr Hegenbarth stated that WG8's report on Reserved for Future Use (RFU) (WG8 N874 R2) had received positive feed-back and comments and requested that the SC17 Secretariat ballot the document as a Type 3 Technical Report. The Secretariat agreed to commence the ballot as soon as the document was made available.

Medium: Server


No. of pages: 5

---



---

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17, APACS, Mercury House, Triton Court, 14 Finsbury Square, London EC2A 1LQ, England;  
 Telephone +44 (0) 20 7711 6292; Fax: +44 (0) 20 7711 6299; e-mail: [chris.starr@apacs.org.uk](mailto:chris.starr@apacs.org.uk)

	<b>Vote on Committee Draft ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2</b>	
	Date of circulation <b>2007-01-31</b> Closing date <b>2007-05-01</b>	Reference number <b>ISO/JTC 1/SC 17 N 3193</b>

ISO/JTC 1/SC 17 Cards and personal identification  Secretariat: APACS for BSI	Circulated to P-members of the committee for voting  Please return all votes and comments in electronic form directly to the SC 17 Secretariat here, at APACS, by the due date indicated.
---	---

<p><b>ISO/IEC PDTR</b></p> <p>Title: 14443.2 Identification cards – Guidelines – Reserved for ISO future use.</p> <p>Project:</p>
---

**Vote:**

- APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT AS PRESENTED
- APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT WITH COMMENTS AS GIVEN BELOW (See attached comment sheet)
- general:
- technical:
- editorial:
- DISAPPROVAL OF THE DRAFT FOR REASONS BELOW (use separate page as annex, if necessary)
- Acceptance of these reasons and appropriate changes in the text will change our vote to approval
- ABSTENTION (for reasons below):

---

P-member voting (National Body/Acronym):

Date:

Submitted by (Name/Signature):

---

Secretariat ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17, APACS, Mercury House, Triton Court, 14 Finsbury Square,  
 London EC2A 1LQ, England;  
 Telephone +44 (0) 20 7711 6292; Fax: +44 (0) 20 7711 6299; e-mail: [chris.starr@apacs.org.uk](mailto:chris.starr@apacs.org.uk)



STATEMENT OF KNOWN PATENTS	
Date of circulation 2007-01-31	Reference Number.
Date for return of this form 2007-05-01	ISO/IEC JTC1/SC17 <b>N 3193</b>

**ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2**

**Title:** Identification cards – Guidelines – Reserved for ISO future use.

**When considering the national vote on this item, please identify any known patents which may relate to the work item. Such identification should give a patent reference, date on which the patent was taken out (or applied for) and a brief description of the patent.**

**LIST OF ANY KNOWN PATENTS ON THIS PDTR. THE LIST SHOULD INCLUDE ALL PATENTS REGISTERED ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD THAT MAY IMPACT USERS OF THIS PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL STANDARD: (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary).**

**Note 1: Patents Statements from patent holders will be requested using the official JTC1 form.**

**Note 2: National bodies are not legally bound to complete this form. This is an informative document which members are encouraged to complete to the best of their ability.**

P-Member	
Date	Signature

Date: 2/26/2007

Document: 17n3193 ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 1	General		Ed	The document contains some material that is not needed. What is needed is the definition of the categories of values that can be defined in an ISO standard. and the associated testing	Simplify the document to restrict the discussion to the values of fields and specify that fields can contain three categories of values:  'Functional Values'  'Proprietary Values'  'Reserved for Future ISO Use'  The detailed comments presented below reflect this approach.	
US 2	Title		Ed	The title does not do justice to the contents.	One suggestion is: 'Guidelines – Values of fields that are Reserved for Future ISO Use'  But that should be improved.	
US 3	Introduction		Ed	Rephrase to reflect the content of the document.	Replace the first sentence with:  "This document describes the categories of values that can be assigned to fields including proprietary values and values that are reserved for future ISO use (RFU).	
US 4	1. Scope		Ed	Rephrase to reflect the content of the document.	Replace the first sentence with:  "The scope of the guideline is to define the categories of values that can be assigned to fields used in standards and the way to associate test methods with them. The expected result of following the guidelines is a better definition of the meaning, interpretation and testing of fields used in standards.	
US 5	2.1		Ed	Eliminate the terms ' Restricted Value' and 'data frame.'	Change the second sentence read: 'It shall not depend on Proprietary Values or RFU values in any other field.'	
US 6	2.2		Ed	A proprietary action is always non-ISO.	'Change the term to be Proprietary Action'	

Date: 2/26/2007

Document: 17n3193 ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Change the definition to 'an action, not defined by ISO, that is to be performed.'	
US 7	2.4		Te	The need for this term is not supported by the text as no default action other than to ignore the value can be defined.	Delete the clause	
US 8	2.8		ED	The definition is too complex.	Change to read: 'a value or values that has no associated action and that should not be used'	
US 9	2.9		Te	The three types of values given in 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 are exhaustive and 2.9 cannot exist.	Delete the clause.	
US 10	2.16		Te	This term is not needed. The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Delete the clause.	
US 11	4	First Paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Delete the first two sentences.	
US 12	4	First bullet	Ed	Types of fields are not defined in the document.	Delete the word 'type'	
US 13	4	Second bullet	ED	Types of fields are not defined in the document.	Change to read: 'The ISO-defined actions associated with each category of value for a field.'	
US 14	4	Third bullet	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change to read: 'The recommended testing procedure for the various values of data fields and the actions performed in response to these values, taking into account the fact that the values may be combinations of several categories of values.'	
US 15	5	Last paragraph	Te	Completeness of concept.	Change the last phrase to read: 'a variable length Functional Field with RFU values should be used instead.'	
US 16	5.1.	Heading	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change the heading to ' Contents of a fixed field'	
US 17	5.1.1	First Paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change to read: 'A fixed field should always be the ISO Fixed Value associated with it.'	

Date: 2/26/2007

Document: 17n3193 ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 18	5.1.2	First Paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Delete the words "in any data frame at any time"  Change the phrase " the sender declared as .." to read " the data field declared as.."	
US 19	5.2	Heading	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change to read: 'Use of a fixed field'	
US 20	5.2.1	First Paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change the first sentence to read: 'A process using a documented fixed field....'	
US 21	5.2.2	First Paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change to read: 'No testing of a fixed field is required as there is no ...'	
US 22	6	Third paragraph	Ed	Revise to be consistent with above changes and to state guidance.	Revise to read: "In case ISO RFU Values(s) are associated with a Functional Field, it is recommended that an ISO Default RFU Action be defined for each value and that the processor provide for the interpretation of such values. This will preserve the flexibility of assigning future value, either Functional or Proprietary, in the future."	
US 23	6	Fourth paragraph	Ed	Consistency with above changes	Delete the phrase 'by the receiver'	
US 24	6	Fifth paragraph	Te	A Functional Field should always be fully defined. Any undefined values should be RFU or treated as if they were declared to be RFU.	Delete the paragraph.	
US 25	6	Sixth paragraph	Te	The category 'ISO Restricted Values' should not exist.	Delete the references to this category.	
US 26	6.1	Heading	Ed	See US 16.	Change to 'Contents of a Functional Field'	
US 27	6.1.1	First paragraph	Ed	See 5.1.1	Change to read:  "The contents of a functional field should always be set to .."	

Date: 2/26/2007

Document: 17n3193 ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
US 28	6.1.2	First Paragraph	Ed	See 5,1,2	Delete the phrase "in any data frame at any time" Change the phrase " the sender declared as .." to read " the data field declared as.."	
US 29	6.2	Heading	Ed	See 5.2	Change to read: "Use of a functional field"	
US 30	6.2.1	First Paragraph	Ed	See 5,2.1	Change the first sentence to read: 'A process using a documented functional field....'	
US 31	6.2.2	Second paragraph	Ed	See 6.2.2	Change the text to read "... FAIL and the field should be declared ..."	
US 32	6.2.3	Second paragraph	Ed	See 6.2.2	Change the text to read "... FAIL and the field should be declared ..."	
US 33	6.2.4	Heading and first paragraph	Te	The term 'Restricted Value' is meaningless.	Delete the term 'restricted values' from the heading and the text.	
US 34	6.2.4	Second paragraph	Ed	See 6.2.2	Change the text to read "... FAIL and the field should be declared ..."	
US 35	7	First paragraph	Te	The RFU Default Value could have an associated Default Action associated with it. This will make it consistent with the use of RFU values in functional fields. An alternative would be to say that the ISO Standard Action is to ignore the field.	Change the second sentence to read: "The ISO Standard Action shall be to ignore the field."	
US 36	7.1	Heading	Ed	See US 16.	Change to 'Contents of an RFU Field'	
US 37	7.1.1	First paragraph	Ed	See 5.1.1	Change to read: "The contents of an RFU field should always be set to .."	
US 38	7.1.2	First Paragraph	Ed	See 5,1,2	Delete the phrase "in any data frame at any time" Change the phrase " the sender declared as .." to	

Date: 2/26/2007

Document: 17n3193 ISO/IEC PDTR 14443.2

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					read " the data field declared as.."	
US 39	7.2	Heading	Ed	See 5.2	Change to read: "Use of an RFU field"	
US 40	7.2.1	First Paragraph	Ed	See 5.2.1	Change the first sentence to read: 'A process using a documented RFU field....'  Delete 'by the receiver' from the second sentence.  Change the third sentence to read: 'Further, a process should not .... any RFU field might contain.'	
US 41	7.2.2	Second paragraph	Ed	See 6.2.2	Change the text to read "... FAIL and the field should be declared ..."	
US 42	8	First paragraph	Te	The standard is about the values of fields and not the transmission of data.	Change to read: '... should be ignored with respect to ISO Standard Actions ...'	
US 43	9	First paragraph	Te	The term 'Restricted Value' is meaningless.	Delete the phrase 'ISO Restricted Values from the text.	
US 44	9	Second paragraph	TE	The phrase (but minimum of 100) is not clear.	Delete the parenthetic phrase.	
US 45	9.1	First and second paragraphs	Te	The term 'Restricted Value' is meaningless.	Delete the phrases 'Restricted and 'Restricted value' from the text.	
US 46	9.2	First and second paragraphs	Te	The term 'Restricted Value' is meaningless.	Delete the phrases 'Restricted fields and 'Restricted value' from the text.	