ISO/IEC JTC 1 N 9099

2008-05-27

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

Document Type: **Summary of Voting/Table of Replies**

Document Title: **Summary of Voting on JTC 1 N 8972 – Request for Approval of EPCglobal Inc. as an Approved RS Originator Organization (ARO)**

Document Source: **JTC 1 Secretariat**

Reference:

Document Status: **Although the majority of National Bodies voting approved this request, several National Bodies submitted significant comments along with their vote. Therefore, SC 31 is instructed to review and respond to the comments submitted on the request prior to any further action being taken by JTC 1.**

Action ID: **Information**

Due Date:

No. of Pages: **28**

Secretariat, ISO/IEC JTC 1, American National Standards Institute, 25 West 43rd Street, New York, NY 10036; Telephone: 1 212 642 4932; Facsimile: 1 212 840 2298; Email: lrajchel@ansi.org

Result of voting

Ballot Information:	
Ballot reference:	JTC001-N-8972
Ballot type:	CIB
Ballot title:	**SC 31 Request for Approval of EPCglobal Inc. as an Approved RS Originator Organization (ARO)**
Opening date:	2008-02-26
Closing date:	2008-05-26
Note:	**This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for a three month letter ballot. Please submit your vote via the online balloting system** **.**

Member responses:	
Votes cast (26)	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (CNI) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (UNI) Jamaica (BSJ) Japan (JISC) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MSA) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (SNZ) Nigeria (SON) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
Comments submitted (1)	Sweden (SIS)
Votes not cast (13)	Algeria (IANOR)

	Belgium (NBN) Côte-d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Ecuador (INEN) Iran, Islamic Republic of (ISIRI) Kenya (KEBS) Malaysia (DSM) Pakistan (PSQCA) Philippines (BPS) Saudi Arabia (SASO) Slovenia (SIST) Uruguay (UNIT) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

Questions:	
Q.1	"Does you National Body approve the request for approval of EPCglobal, Inc. as an Approved RS Originator Organization (ARO)?"

Answers to Q.1: "Does you National Body approve the request for approval of EPCglobal, Inc. as an Approved RS Originator Organization (ARO)?"		
12 x	**yes**	**Australia (SA)** **China (SAC)** **Czech Republic (CNI)** **Ireland (NSAI)** **Italy (UNI)** **Jamaica (BSJ)** **Japan (JISC)** **Korea, Republic of (KATS)** **Netherlands (NEN)** **Nigeria (SON)** **Singapore (SPRING SG)** **USA (ANSI)**
10 x	**abstain**	**Denmark (DS)** **Finland (SFS)** **Germany (DIN)** **India (BIS)** **Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)** **Malta (MSA)** **New Zealand (SNZ)** **Norway (SN)** **Spain (AENOR)** **Switzerland (SNV)**
4 x	**no**	**Canada (SCC)** **France (AFNOR)** **South Africa (SABS)** **United Kingdom (BSI)**

Comments from Voters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:

Canada (SCC)	***Comment File***	2008-05-20 05:08:57
CommentFiles/Canada(SCC).doc		
France (AFNOR)	***Comment File***	2008-05-26 20:21:59
CommentFiles/France(AFNOR).doc		
Germany (DIN)	***Comment File***	2008-05-08 13:22:46
CommentFiles/Germany(DIN).doc		
South Africa (SABS)	***Comment File***	2008-05-19 16:36:24
CommentFiles/SouthAfrica(SABS).doc		
United Kingdom (BSI)	***Comment File***	2008-05-21 14:57:31
CommentFiles/UnitedKingdom(BSI).doc		

Comments from Commenters		
Member:	Comment:	Date:
Sweden (SIS)	***Comment***	2008-04-23 14:56:26

Yes with comments.

Sweden finds it strange that EPCglobal Inc. should need its own liaison with SC31. We suggest that SC31 invite GS1 (EPCglobal's parent organisation) to clarify ownership of any referring standards to ensure that there is no parallel input.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date:	Document:

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
				Canada does not approve EPCglobal as an ARO as this is a limited membership organization based on fee for membership, thus limiting membership in the organization.		

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: 2008-05-26	Document: **JTC 1 N 8972**

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
FR			Ge	JTC 1 has recently submitted two requests for Approval of GS1 and EPCglobal Inc. as Approved RS Originator Organizations (ARO) for vote within JTC 1. Considering the comments and results of the similar vote on the first request regarding GS1 (see JTC 1 N 9065), the French mirror committee of JTC 1 cannot approve the request in JTC 1 N 8972 for the time being and invites JTC 1 to forward the request to SC 31 for examination and discussion at itsToronto Plenary Meeting in June.		

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.

Germany would like to abstain on JTC 1 N 8933 and JTC 1 N 8972.

There are at present two JTC 1 votes dealing with requests for acceptance as Approved RS Originator Organizations. These ballots have been initiated on behalf of GS1(Global Office) and EPCglobal Inc., see JTC 1 N 8933, with a deadline of May 8, 2008, and JTC 1 N 8972, deadline May 26, 2008.

Unfortunately, to our knowledge, the members of the affected subcommittee, namely SC 31, have not received any advance information from GS1/EPCglobal about the reasons behind their applications to become AROs for SC 31 standards. We furthermore feel after thorough study of both documents that the information that is given in the filled-in application forms is not sufficient to allow us a well thought-through judgement regarding the requests.

Germany requests GS1/EPCglobal to present their applications at the forthcoming meeting of SC 31 from June 2 to June 6, 2008 in Toronto, where the national bodies should be given the opportunity to ask questions and to discuss the applications.

We believe that such an explanation would not only benefit the national bodies that are participating in SC 31 but also the ARO applicants.

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008/05/15	Document: **JTC001-N-8972**

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
ZA1	All		ge	See attached letter below.	Disapprove	

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.

SABS

Comments on JTC001-N-8972 by the South African national body (SABS)

2008-05-15

Having reviewed the statement included in JTC001-N-8972, the national body of South Africa (SABS) does **not approve** the recognition of EPC Global as an ARO.

It is our opinion that the statement has not addressed various substantive issues. In addition, South Africa is deeply concerned by the increasing tendency of international organizations to use the JTC 1 processes to circumvent the consensus-building process that is the corner-stone to the success and international acceptance of ISO and IEC standards. The ability of large multi-national organizations to influence many national bodies, with the resultant block-voting over-riding legitimate issues raised by other countries, is also of concern.

This request from EPC Global must be considered together with JTC001-N-8933 wherein GS1 requested recognition as an ARO as well as with JTC001-N-8918, wherein EPC Global requested a Category C liaison with SC 31. EPC Global is a joint venture between GS1 (formerly known as EAN International) and GS1 US™ (formerly the Uniform Code Council, Inc.). It is an organization set up to achieve world-wide adoption and standardization of Electronic Product Code (EPC) technology.

In clause 2.2 (a) of the ARO template, in response to the question "*What is the flexibility of the ARO candidate to apply changes to an RS if so requested during the process of balloting a referencing standard?*", EPC Global responds that "*There is some flexibility to do such …*" (our emphasis on "some" which is very vague) This also avoids the issue of what becomes of the JTC 1 standard being balloted while the EPC Global standards development or amendment process runs its course and also skirts the issue of future collaborative development.

In clause 3.2 of the ARO template, the response states (in part) " *EPC Global expects however that the submitted specifications will be adopted with substantially the same content as submitted. GS1 requests that any change or improvement proposals be cycled back through a EPC Global technical committee for inclusion in errata (if the correction of a defect) or a future version (if in the nature of amendment or revision), to be developed by EPC Global.*" As mentioned earlier, standards development by EPC Global is focussed on the needs of their members, and would exclude the participation of other experts from JTC 1.

The meaning of the last sentence in GS1's response to clause 3.2 is not clear (i.e. "*If substantive changes are advisable, EPC Global expects to seek to offer them for re-transposition by ISO, after EPC Global approval under its usual rules, as it is a EPC Global policy to ensure convergence and avoid duplicate standards*". If it is EPC Global 's intention to seek convergence, then JTC 1's PAS or 'Fast track' mechanisms are more suitable, although they do transfer future control of the standard from EPC Global to JTC 1.

The objectives of EPC Global and GS1 are, rightly, to benefit their members. The technical expertise of their many members in a large number of countries that participate actively in JTC 1 is not questioned. Their extensive involvement in JTC 1 has benefited the international standards development process. However, we consider it essential that the responsibility for any normative requirements of an international standard remains within JTC 1, since the needs of the community served by JTC 1 is considerably larger than that addressed by the EPC Global/GS1 membership, and the needs also span a wider spectrum of users.

In conclusion, we consider it essential that JTC 1 and its SCs have the right to modify or to add features to any standards in order to meet the needs of the international users of the ISO/IEC standards. This right should include control over all contributions from GS1 or EPCglobal.

SOUTH AFRICAN BUREAU OF STANDARDS - Established in terms of Section 2 of the Standards Act, 1945, as amended

Gauteng Head Office:
1 Dr Lategan Road, Groenkloof
Private Bag X191
Pretoria 0001
Tel: +27 (0) 12 428 7911
Fax: +27 (0) 12 344 1568

Western Cape:
Liesbeek Parkway, Rosebank
PO Box 615 Rondebosch
Cape Town 7701
Tel: +27 (0) 21 681 6700
Fax: +27 (0) 21 681 6701

Eastern Cape:
30 Kipling Road (cnr. Diaz and Kipling Roads). PO Box 3013, North End
Port Elizabeth 6056
Tel: +27 (0) 41 391 8400
Fax: +27 (0) 41 391 8427

Kwazulu Natal:
15 Garth Road, Waterfall Park
PO Box 30087
Mayville 4058
Tel: +27 (0) 31 203 2900
Fax: +27 (0) 31 203 2907

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2008.05.21	Document: **IOS./IEC JTC 1 N8972**

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
GB			Ge	The UK draws attention to attention to the issue of IP and suggests that any EPCGlobal standards/documents that are normatively referenced in an ISO standard should be subject to the ISO Patent policy		

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.

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
BSI 4	Template	Foreword	Ed	The wrong template being used was revealed both by the footer of the cover page and the Foreword. The Foreword in the draft document states: *International Standards are drafted in accordance with the rules given in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 3*.	Foreword should state: ISO (the International Organization for Standardization) is a worldwide federation of national standards bodies (ISO member bodies). The work of preparing International Standards is normally carried out through ISO technical committees. Each member body interested in a subject for which a technical committee has been established has the right to be represented on that committee. International organizations, governmental and non-governmental, in liaison with ISO, also take part in the work. ISO collaborates closely with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on all matters of electrotechnical standardization. International Standards are drafted in accordance with the rules given in the ISO/IEC Directives, Part 2. The main task of technical committees is to prepare International Standards. Draft International Standards adopted by the technical committees are circulated to the member bodies for voting. Publication as an International Standard requires approval by at least 75 % of the member bodies casting a vote.	

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.

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
BSI 4 Cont					Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. ISO shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights. Technical Committee ISO/IEC JTC 1, *Information technology*, Subcommittee SC 31, *Automatic identification and data capture techniques* prepared ISO 24753.	
BSI 5	Introduction	1st Para	Ed	In the 4th line the word appropriate is used; however the same word is used in the same sentence in the 3rd line; it does not read well.	Change "appropriate" in the 4th line to "corresponding".	
BSI 6	1		Ge	It is unclear whether the Scope includes management of the battery on a battery-assisted passive tag that contains no sensor functionality. Note that clause 5.1.5 seems to restrict the scope to batteries used on sensor tags, but this may be in error	Change first sentence of para 1 to read: This International Standard defines a minimum application protocol to support sensors and the monitoring of batteries in conjunction with RFID tags utilizing the air interface as defined in ISO/IEC 18000 series. Clarify scope to include tags with batteries but no sensors, and modify clause 5.1.5. if necessary Change to "~ in conjunction with passive, **battery-assisted**, and active RFID tags	
BSI 7	1	2nd Para 1st Sent	Ed	There are two thoughts in this sentence and it would read better to separate them. How the sensor(s) are connected to the RFID tag should be stated a little more generically. We should stress that the communication is always through the RFID tag, as far as this protocol is concerned.	Change sentence to read: This application protocol for sensors applies to RFID tags irrespective of their operating frequency. This application protocol is agnostic to how the sensor(s) are connected to the RFID tag; however the communication between the interrogator and the sensor(s) is always through the RFID tag.	

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.

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
BSI 8	1	2nd Para 3rd Sent	Ed	The sensors do not announce their sense activity. Sensors are just simple devices that detect a change of state in the physical environment; it is the tag that determines the context of that change. In addition, the units of measure are not applicable to all sensor activity, e.g. light detection or door open.	Proposed text: This will allow the interrogator and application to understand a compliant sensor's characteristics and process its information without prior knowledge of that sensor.	
BSI 9	1	2nd bullet	te	Time is a good example and while batteries are not sensors they are measured by a battery life indicator (sensor)	Change the note to read: The measurement of time or battery life may be considered as separate sensory functions.	
BSI 10	Scope	¶3 Bullet 2	Ed	The list should not include a full stop	Remove the full stop from bullet 2	
BSI 11	1		Ed	Please fix doubled period at end of last paragrah	Delete extra period	
BSI 12	3	¶4	Ed	Additional space between *Functions,* and *Communication*	Remove extraneous space	
BSI 13	4.1	Title	Te	Change of title for 4.1 to "Terms and definitions" as per the ISO-IEC directives	Change of title for 4.1 to "Terms and definitions" as per the ISO-IEC directives	
BSI 14	4.1	All	Te	ISO 10241 defines the structures of vocabulary terms. The following have not been applied to the definitions in 24753 — *. . . the definition shall not begin with an article. [5.2.5(d)]* — No final full stop. [6.2.11] — The definition shall consist of a single phrase describing the concept denoted by the term. [6.2.11]	Structure the definitions according to ISO rules.	

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.

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
BSI 15	4.1		Te	The style for “definitions” is the style “Definition”.	Apply the correct style to “definitions”	
BSI 16	4.1.1		ed	The process used to determine the information that resides in the Calibration TEDS to support correction.	process used to determine the information that resides in the Calibration TEDS to support correction	
BSI 17	4.1.2		Ed	The collection of samples acquired by a sensor (or applied by an actuator) in response to a trigger command.	collection of samples acquired by a sensor (or applied by an actuator) in response to a trigger command	
BSI 18	4.1.3		Ed	A sensor that detects a of state change in the physical world. The fact that a change of state has occurred and/or instant in time of the change of state, not the state value, is the “measurement.”	sensor that detects a state of change in the physical world Note The fact that a change of state has occurred and/or instant in time of the change of state, not the state value, is the “measurement.”	
BSI 19	4.1.4		Ed	A device between the Transducer modules and the network. The NCAP performs network communications, TIM communications, and data conversion or other processing functions.	device between the Transducer modules and the network that performs network communications, TIM communications, and data conversion or other processing functions.	
BSI 20	4.1.5		Te	Simplify the definition and make it applicable to item management.	Change the definition to read: device that detects a change in the physical environment and converts a physical parameter into an electrical signal	
BSI 21	4.1.6		Ed	The defined memory area of an RFID tag that specifies the logical location of the sensor memory.	defined memory area, of some tag architectures and air interface protocols, that specifies the logical location of the sensor memory	
BSI 22	4.1.x		Ed	“Sensor Data Processor” is not defined, even in Clause 9 where it is used	Add to Definitions	

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.

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
BSI 23	4.1.7	1st Para	TE	The sensor driver is not an application it is more of an intermediary interface.	Change the definition to read: defined process to transfer sensor related data between sensor processor and the RF tag through the appropriate air interface	
BSI 24	4.1.8		TE	Smart transducers have no relevance in item management. This functionality could occur on the tag or sensor; either way it has no impact to this standard.	Delete this definition	
BSI 25	4.1.9		Ge	The definition of timestamp is too broad to be useful	Suggest replacing “The unambiguous representation of some instant in time” with “unambiguous representation of the instant in time when some measurement or event occurred”	
BSI 26	4.1.10		Ed	A device that converts energy from one domain into another. The device may either be a sensor or an actuator.	device that converts energy from one domain into another Note The device may either be a sensor or an actuator.	
BSI 27	4.1.11		Ed	An electronic data sheet describing a TIM or a TransducerChannel. The structures of multiple TEDS are described in this standard	electronic data sheet describing a TIM or a TransducerChannel, as well as structures of multiple TEDS	
BSI 28	4.1.12		Ed	A signal or command that is used to start an action.	signal or command that is used to start an action	

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.

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
BSI 29	4.2	All	Te	ISO 10241 defines the structures of abbreviated terms. ISO has been lax on enforcing the requirements, however, the format of abbreviated terms is the same as for terms and definitions — Each abbreviated term will include an entry number, style “TermNum” — The abbreviated term can precede or following the full form, depending on which one is the preferred term. — Both will be on a separate line in a vertical arrangement.	Structure the abbreviated terms according to ISO rules.	
BSI 30	4.2		Ed	Reference to abbreviated term “TIM” is not defined	Add to list of defined abbreviations	
BSI 31	4.2	UTC	Ed	Current literature permits UTC to be an abbreviated term for either Universal Co-ordinated Time, or Universal Time Coordinated The preferred spelling, according to the Concise Oxford Dictionary is “coordinated” . It is recommended that the full form term follow the order of the abbreviation, namely, Universal Time Coordinated (UTC)	Change full form term to Universal Time Coordinated	

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.

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
BSI 32	5		Ge	Paragraph 5 seems very general (it is supposed to be) but it does not relate well to the Fgure 1 or to the rest of the documents – The impression is that Para 5 was written first and then the rest of the document. It describes rather well the thought process that was used to develop the standard. What it should do is address the outline of the remaining parts and how they fit together. While in hindsight it was and is a good starting point, the document would benefit greatly from a description of how the rest of the parts as described in 6-10 fit together as a model. If Figure 1 is the model then that should be talked to. An over view is still useful.	Requires rewrite	
BSI 33	5	Figures 1 and 2	Te	The original form of these figures were SmartDraw and the pasted object was a Portable Network Graphic (.png). While PNG is patent and license free where GIF is not, the object size is considerably larger. Ultimately, the form of the graphic that will need to be submitted to ISO will be either .dxf or .dwg.	Use the correct graphics format.	
BSI 34	5.1.1	Title	ED	Section 5.1 is explaining the basic application model; therefore each subsection of 5.1 should have the same name (title) as the corresponding box in Figure 1.	Change the title of 5.1.1 to: “ISO/IEC 15961 Commands & Responses”,	
BSI 35	5.1.1	1st Para	ED	The current sentence is a little wordy an leaves out the a primary function and that is the configuration.	Change the sentence to read: “ISO/IEC 15961-4 specifies a set of commands that enable an application to discover sensor capabilities, configure sensors, and retrieve sensor information, including battery status.	

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.

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
BSI 36	5.1.2	Fig 1	Ed	The introductory text in clause 5 indicates that each subclause will define a component of Figure 1, but 5.1.2 has no corresponding box in Figure 1	Change text of current box "Standard Sensor Records" to "Sensor Identifiers & Parameters" to align with title of 5.1.2 Modify some of the text of 5.1.2 to align with this and move other text to a new 3rd level sub-clause to align with BSI 36 Reposition to link to "Sensor Process" box, with dotted lines to other boxes	
BSI 37	5.1.2	Text	Te	Since we are drawing a parallel to 15962 we should use complementary terms. This seems to be a lot of good thoughts but in the wrong place. This paragraph should be telling the reader what happens in the big box that contains three smaller boxes. Some of the current text may be more appropriate as the text for section 5; it would serve as a mini intro. However it still needs work if we are to move it to section 5.	Change Figure 1 text "24753 Processes" to read Sensor Protocol Processor" and create a new 3rd level sub-clause taking into account the following text: "The Sensor Protocol Processor provides all the processing, which is as specified in ISO/IEC 24753 and is required for handling sensor application data. It consists of the following components, all of which are described more fully below: Battery Status, Sensor Configuration, and Sensor Processes. The Sensor Protocol Processor can physically reside anywhere between the application software and the tag driver but shall contain all the components." Make the current 5.1.3 to 5.1.5 as 4th level sub-clauses Note: The clause references in the following comments refer to the present sub-clause numbers.	
BSI 38	5.1.2	Para 1, last sentence	Ed	This text needs clarifying as to what "both sensors" means? On one chip? On separate chips? Or does it mean both types?		

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.

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
BSI 39	5.1.3	Text	TE	The current wording does not describe what this box does; it hints at it but it needs to be more concise. What is happening here is the retrieving of the Characteristic Records for each sensor associated with the RF tag and the recorded sensor event data.	Suggest the following wording: The primary function of the Sensor Processes is to retrieve the Characteristic Records for each sensor associated with the RF tag. These Characteristic Records describe the type of sensor, e.g. temperature, light, shock, etc, the tolerances, the type of configuration commands. In addition the Sensor Processes retrieve sensor event data, e.g. excessive temperature, excessive moisture and length of time.	
BSI 40	5.1.4		Ed	The word “is” in the first sentence is extraneous	Remove “is”	
BSI 41	5.1.4	Title	ED	The “reset function” is just another configuration. The term reset implies returning something to their initial state or configuration. Really all we have is initial configuration and reconfiguration.	Change the title of section 5.1.4 to read: “Sensor Configuration”, and change the corresponding box in figure 1 to the same text.	
BSI 42	5.1.4	Text	Ed	We need to be sure to explain the function of configuration and reconfiguring the sensor functions. In addition we need to explain that different parts of the functionality may reside in the sensor module and the RF tag.	Suggest the following wording: “The function of the Sensor Configuration is to send the appropriate configurations to the sensor function; both initially and ongoing (as needed). Please note that a sensor may be just a simple device that detects a change in the environment, such as a change in temperature; however to put the actual reading into context there needs to be some additional functionality to set threshold values, sampling intervals, recording criteria, etc. This “extra” functionality may be part of the processors on the tag or in the sensor module or both. Regardless of where the functionality physically resides the configuration commands of ISO/IEC 15961-4 and processing by ISO/IEC 24753 will be the same.”	

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.

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
BSI 43	5.1.5		TE	Although batteries are treated as sensors, we have two separate issues: • Whether the sensor readings are valid due to a loss of power • For battery assist without sensors	Clarify the position	
BSI 44	5.1.5	Title	TE	Since the low battery status may be sent automatically or in response to a specific command, the word “reporting" in the title in not needed.	Change the title of section 5.1.5 to read: “Battery Status”, to correspond to box in figure 1 to the same text.	
BSI 45	5.1.5	2ND Para	ED	This could be said for any sensor data being reported. we don’t think this paragraph adds anything.	Delete this second paragraph of section 5.1.5	
BSI 46	5.1.6	First paragraph 1st bullet	ed	“it provides the rules for ~”	Change “it ~” to ‘**It**~”	
BSI 47	5.1.6	1st Para 1st Bullet	TE	We disagree with the premise that the method of connection of the sensor to the RF tag is relevant to the air interface. It must be agnostic to the air interface and the application commands must be agnostic to the air interface.	Delete this bulleted paragraph.	
BSI 48	5.1.6	1st Para 2nd Bullet 1st Sent	ED	The application commands from 15961-4 the Sensor Processes and into the Sensor driver. The statement of “through this International Standard into a common format”” is misleading.	Suggest the following wording: “The Sensor Driver provides facilities that accept the application commands of ISO/IEC 15961-4 via the Sensor Processes, and converts them to a format that results in calls to command codes supported by the particular RFID tag air interface.” Delete the first paragraph in section 5.6 and replace it with this modified text (non bulleted).	
BSI 49	5.1.8	1st Para	ED	This paragraph belongs up in the beginning of clause 5.		
BSI 50	5.1.8	2nd Para	ED	This paragragh adds nothing to the standard.	Delete this paragraph.	

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.

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
BSI 51	5.2	All of it		We disagree with the premise that the way in which the sensor is connected to the RF tag is relevant. There are "normal" functions of a RF tag like ID and user data. When sensors are brought into play, additional functionality is needed to support the sensor(s). This additional functionality can reside physically on the tag or physically in the sensor module or parts in both the tag and sensor module. Regardless of how the sensor functionality is divided between the RF tag and the sensor module the commands and data to and from the tag will be the same for a given air interface. Replace the three bulleted points	Suggest changing the wording to: "The sensor Information Model (Figure 2) shows the relationship between the component processes and structures described later in this section. Within Item management the typical functions of a RFID tag are to provide a unique item identifier and other item-related data. When sensors are added, additional functionality is needed to support the sensor(s). This additional functionality can reside physically on the tag or physically in the sensor module or parts in both the tag and sensor module. Regardless of how the sensor functionality is divided between the RF tag and the sensor module the commands and data to and from the tag will be the same for a given air interface."	
BSI 52	5.2	Figure 2	Te	The relevant parts of this figure are the four boxes on the horizontal line Sensor Id to Data Record. The model applies to 15961-4, 24753, the sensor driver, and 18000-n. The flows lines and boxes representing these named standards should be removed. So too should the Sensor Address Map as this is specific to one sensor driver. It should be replaced by a box that indicates the signalling of the presence of a sensor. This way, figure 2 complements figure 1 and avoids duplicating it Change "Sensor ID" to "Sensor Identification" Ensure that 18000 air interface is understood. Consider mention of 15962.	Revise the figure	
BSI 53	5.2	Fig 2	ed	Incorrect graphic format	Replace	
BSI 54	5.2.4	Title		Sampling as defined here is just a part of configuration.	Change title to read: "Configuration	

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.

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
BSI 55	5.2.4	1st Sent		We seem to be fixated on sampling interval. There are more variables to configuration.	Replace the 1st sentence with the following: "The Sensor Configuration Record allows the appropriate configurations to be; both initially and ongoing (as needed)."	
BSI 56	Clause 6	Most	Te	Much of Clause 6 is specific to one particular sensor driver – currently 18000-6C. The following detailed comments on Clause 6 and its sub-clauses are relevant	As a lot of the material is now in 18000-6 Amd 2, this clause needs to be completely reviewed, with three objectives: • Transfer what is essential to a specific sensor driver annex • Omit anything that only belongs in 18000-6 Amd 2 Retain the minimum generic content for the subject matter of Clause 6	
BSI 57	6	First sentence	ed	Should read "~ whether an RFID tag supports a sensor and/or **a battery**."		
BSI 58	6.1		Ed	Since the subclauses to this clause provide two options for signalling the sensor (either a DSFID or a "hook"), this title should not itself use "hook"	Change title to "the initial signal", clearly indicating that there are different methods such as DSFID extension and XPC	
BSI 59	Clause 7	All	Te	18000-6 Amd 2 now supports simple sensors, which are not addressed in this clause.	There is a need to reflect this by significant additions to Clause 7	
BSI 60	7.1		Te	The last sentence indicates that the choice of an implementation detail (whether or not sensors are integrated into the RFID CPU) can change how sensors are logically identified and addressed. Moreover, the alternate identifier approach is not defined.	Modify text, with the following clarifications: • The sensor Id 5.2.2 needs to be re-written to describe different methods (e.g. SAM, port, true unique id • 7.1 needs to indicate compliance with IEEE 1451.4 • 7.1 needs to state that the 1451.4 rule is an options Consider examples for clarity	

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.

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
BSI 61	7.1	Table 4		Manufacture ID – Listed as 14 bits –(17-16381).. Why is it not listed as 14 bits – (0 – 16383). Its inconsistent with the rest of the table	Clarify by adding a note that this is to be compliant with IEEE 1451.4. If we are to use their structures we must follow their rules.	
BSI 62	7.2	Table 5	Te	The text indicates that the fields shown as 5 and 6 in this table have since been combined into a single 8-bit field "tolerance" defined in 7.2.5 The next field in the table apparently should reference the new clause 7.2.6, defining a field called "sensor data type code"	Make corresponding changes to the table	
BSI 63	7.2	Table 5	ed	In Field 6, the size of Sensor data precision should be "**3 bits**" not "3 bit"		
BSI 64	7.2		Ge	The draft does not appear to explicitly provide support the situation where a single physical sensor performs two different sensor functions (e.g., time and temperature). In this case, would that sensor be supported by two SAM entries (but both containing the same Sensor Identifier), or was another method anticipated	Please elaborate on this scenario	
BSI 65	7.2.1	Table 6	Te	Ensure that Table 6 is as comprehensive as possible	Review with IEEE sensor experts to establish a complete first list	
BSI 66	7.2.1	Table 6	ed	The first character of Base or Derive Values of Code value 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37 should be Capital.		
BSI 67	7.2.1	Table 6	Te	Avoid the list being restricted to 255 entries	Establish extension rules for the list being longer than 255 entries	
BSI 68	7.2.1	Table 7	Te	Ensure that Table 7 is as comprehensive as possible	Review with IEEE sensor experts to establish a complete first list, especially whether it could be possible to reduce the encoding for the upper and lower alarm values	
BSI 69	7.2.1	Table 7	Te	Avoid the list being restricted to 255 entries	Establish extension rules for the list being longer than 255 entries	

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.

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
BSI 70	Table 7, Code Value 1	Sensor attributes and code values	Te	The definition says “Present (point-of-time) value” – where is the “present time” value recorded / presented? It is possible to pull and record numerous values for this code set; what differentiates them?	Change "present" to "current" and indicate that it is the value as the tag is being read	
BSI 71	Table 7, all codes sets denoting “since reset”	Sensor attributes and code values	Te	Where is the “reset” time / condition stored; how is the “reset” state indicated? How does the system know that a particular value for code 2 is different from another value received for code 2 from the same tag?	Resolve with a view as to whether the configuration should be time-stamped and whether this is on the sensor or on the system. The system approach could be linked to the unique sensor id	
BSI 72	7.2.1	Table 8	Te	Ensure that Table 8 is as comprehensive as possible	Review with IEEE sensor experts to establish a complete first list	
BSI 73	7.2.1	Table 8	Te	Avoid the list being restricted to 255 entries	Establish extension rules for the list being longer than 255 entries	
BSI 74	7.2.6		Ed	“that may used” should be “that may be used”, and the reference to Table 4 should really be to Table 5	Make substitutions in text as noted	
BSI 75	7.2.7		Ed	This section gives some characteristics of “offset,” but doesn’t define “offset.”	Add definition	
BSI 76	7.3, and 9.1	Title, other sentences	ed	According to Fig. 2, the title should be “Sample and configure record.” This applies to other sentences or caption in 7.3, Table 12, and 9.1.	Align text and figure 2	
BSI 77	7.3.4 to 7.3.6		Te	Review and identify all the options for sampling (time and event based) together with the options for recording / not recording the observed values. Also take into account the following more specific comments.	Rewrite these clauses for greater clarification	

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.

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
BSI 78	7.3.4	Whole clause	Te	The field **Sample repetition time interval** is the only possibility to set the sampling of the sensor. The value is given in seconds so the shortest possible sampling interval is 1 second; the longest interval is 18 hours (without external trigger). The monitoring of products during the whole shipment process (e.g. reefer cargo tracking) requires to measure parameters over several weeks and to have a certain flexibility of the sampling interval. For example, a tag including a temperature sensor in a reefer cargo container, which records the temperature of the products to ensure that, they are always well frozen. The shipment takes as an example 2 weeks and after one week half of the products are removed from the container. A short sampling and recording interval is needed at the time when the container is opened (e.g. each 10 minutes) but this short sampling interval is not required (and even not possible due to memory restrictions) for the whole shipment process. Generally speaking, the sensor data is recorded only upon receiving of a trigger - external source or if an alarm threshold is reached. This limits the flexibility and the possibilities of using RFID sensors in a significant aspect.	Extend sampling possibilities by adding records described at clause 7.1.3 (Sensor scheduling time data storage records) Table 36 (**Scheduling time data storage record**) and Table 39 (**Specific time scheduling record(s)**) of the CISC/ETRI proposal for ISO24753. Benefits: Sensor values may be stored at certain times independent from the sensor value itself. So not only alarm tracking (requires short sampling time) but also monitoring of the sensor value over a longer time period is possible. Add sampling intervals < 1s as they may be required for special applications and the monitoring of fast changing physical parameters.	
BSI 79	7.3.6		Ge	It is unclear whether the sampling operations described for these different modes are filtered or otherwise affected by the low limit and high limit parameters described in 7.2	Please identify the interaction between the limits and the sampling operation in each mode, or state that there is none, as appropriate.	
BSI 80	7.3.6.4		Ed	It appears that the phrase “repetition time interval” at the end of this clause should be replaced by “maximum data repetitions.	Please make the text substitution, if this interpretation is correct.	

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.

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
BSI 81	7.4	Table 14	Te	This table lists five sample formats, but the text in section 7.4.1 calls for four, not five.	Add text to 7.4 to explain that this table can be used to determine the memory requirement for given number of records. Change text of 7.4.1 to clarify how multiple data records are divided into a set of individual records using the sensor data type code (Table 11)	
BSI 82	7.4	Table 14	ed		Change “32 bit” to “**32 bits**” in Time Stamp column	
BSI 83	7.4.1	Interpreting the data	Te	The first paragraph does not provide a complete description of the meanings of the 32-bit values.	The second sentence should state that “The 16 bit value results when no time stamp is applied, and the 32-bit values mean **either** data and no time stamp is applied, or a time stamp and no data is applied.”	
BSI 84	7.4.2.	Timestamp	Ed	2nd sentence first paragraph is grammatically incorrect	Should be; “Each timestamp is **to** be encloded….”.	
BSI 85	7.4.2		Te	Probably not the right place, but the encoding of timestamp raises the technical issue about synchronising time both on the system and to correct errors due to the inherent inaccuracy of time mechanisms on the sensor or RFID tag.	Add text here and in more detail in clause 9 about synchronisation of time stamp to address the inherent inaccuracy of clocks on sensor which can vary depending on the simplicity / complexity of the sensor	
BSI 86	8		Te	Significantly more text is required for processing sensor commands. Use as sources: 18000-6 Amd 2, sensor WG4 SG3 Ad Hoc, and IEEE commands	Revise the clause	
BSI 87	9		Te	Significantly more text is required for processing sensor data, both in terms of configuration (Reader to sensor) and in reading any of the records. Use as sources: 18000-6 Amd 2, sensor WG4 SG3 Ad Hoc, and IEEE processes	Revise the clause	
BSI 88	9		Te	The role of NCAP needs to be clarified, because it could be interpreted as requiring different communication across the air interface.	Clarify so that it clear that NCAP is an alternative way to communicate with the application	
BSI 89	9	First paragraph	ed	In the first paragraph, Mode A and Mode 2 are used. Should be “ **Mode A and Mode B**“ or “**Mode 1 and Mode 2**”	Label these choices consistently with either letters or numbers	

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.

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
BSI 90	9.1	title	ed	Should read "**Creating and modifying the sample and configure record**"		
BSI 91	9.1	Creating the sampling and configuration record – Drafting Note.	Te	Overwriting the configuration of settings values is stated as the complete erasure of the previous record, or of complete overwriting. What would the process replace the previous value with in either instance? Especially overwriting.	Recommend that the standard clearly denotes what value (if any) is to be used when overwriting, and a clearer statement of just what the results of an erasure are. The concern is that – unless the configuration settings must be done completely each and every time they are programmed - one part of the value may be changed, but the rest of the configuration values are left as previously; what happens in this instance?	
BSI 92	Table in 9.2	No name nor Table heading	Te	There is no Table heading for this table. Also, explain why are the Field codes so out of order throughout the table?	Put a Table heading and name on this table. Explain that the field are in sequential order as defined in IEEE 1451.0 and that the field codes refer to particular components of that structure.	
BSI 93	10		Te	Now that 18000-6 Amd 2 has been circulated, it is possible to develop a sensor driver for the 6C tag. It is also necessary to consider the 18000-7 tag, BUT WITHOUT LEAVING THIS OPEN-ENDED AND CAUSING DELAYS IN THE NEXT STAGE OF APPROVAL OF 24753. With two sensor drivers it should be possible to include a pro forma version.	Revise this Clause	
BSI 94	10	Second paragraph	ed	"ISO/IEC 15961 presents ~"	Change "ISO/IEC 15961" to "**ISO/IEC 15961-4**" ?	
BSI 95	Document		Ge	The name of this standard is: Application protocol: encoding and processing rules for sensors and batteries It appears that mostly this document deals with sensors. Is there a need for more extensive *encoding and processing rules for batteries?*	Review to determine whether there needs to be greater content for batteries.	

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.

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
BSI 96	Document		Ge	Much effort has been put forth for the coordination between IEEE and SC 31 for the development of IEEE 1451.7. There is no mention of this document but extensive mention of 15951-4, both of which are at the same status. Should there be more and better use of IEEE 1451.7?	Review to determine whether there needs to be more and better use of IEEE 1451.7. Take into account that 15961-4 is a known requirement within the scope of WG4 SG1. IEEE 1451.7 is likely to determine interfaces between the tag and the sensor – not part of 24753. However, if 1451.7 also defines structures and code values that replace the (some) tables in 24753 then it is highly relevant.	

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.