

**Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6**

<b>Document Number:</b>	N13951
<b>Date:</b>	2009-05-18
<b>Replaces:</b>	
<b>Document Type:</b>	National Body Contribution
<b>Document Title:</b>	NB of UK's contribution on the progression of ISO/IEC 16512-2/DCor 1, PDAM 2 and FPDAM 1
<b>Document Source:</b>	National Body of UK
<b>Project Number:</b>	
<b>Document Status:</b>	For consideration at the SC 6/wG 7 Tokyo meeting.
<b>Action ID:</b>	FYI
<b>Due Date:</b>	
<b>No. of Pages:</b>	2
ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 Secretariat Ms. Jooran Lee, KSA (on behalf of KATS) Korea Technology Center #701-7 Yeoksam-dong, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, 135-513, Republic of Korea ; Telephone: +82 2 6009 4808 ; Facsimile: +82 2 6009 4819 ; Email : <a href="mailto:jooran@kisi.or.kr">jooran@kisi.or.kr</a>	

## **UK view on progression of ISO/IEC 16512-2/DCor 1, PDAM 2 and FPDAM 1**

Our aim is to progress these documents to publication as soon as is possible within the procedures for ITU-T/JTC 1 collaboration. Amendment 2 contains material that was missing from the original standard but which is essential for the operation of the protocol. Amendment 1 contains extensions to the base standard to provide the secure RMCP-2 protocol.

Amendment 2 requires a 4-month FPDAM ballot before the approved text can be forwarded to SG 11 for ITU-T approval. The earliest opportunity to do this is at the SC 6 plenary meeting in London January 2010.

Amendment 1 is dependent on ISO/IEC 16512-2 and on Amendment 2. It should be processed as an amendment to ISO/IEC 16512-2 together with Amendment 2.

We consider that Amendment 1 and Amendment 2 should proceed together with a view to simultaneous publication. The actions for this are as follows:

1. The DCor.1 text should be incorporated into Amendment 2 at the SC 6 meeting in Tokyo, June 2009.
2. The revised PDAM 2 should be submitted to the SC 6 Secretariat for FPDAM ballot at the start of August 2009 with completion of ballot in December 2009. This will give time for National Bodies to review the ballot comments before the meeting of SC 6 in January.
3. We note that this timetable will mean that, according to the Guide for ITU-T/JTC 1 Collaboration, there will be no possibility of discussing this formally at the SG11 meeting in September which occurs during the ballot period. We do not wish to discourage ITU-T comments on the FPDAM ballot, however.
4. The editing of PDAM 2 needs to be completed before finalization of the editing of FPDAM 1 in order to ensure that any references to PDAM 2 are correct and also to enable sequential numbering of figures and tables to carry on from those in PDAM 2 without overlap or a break.
5. We are not yet aware of the extent of changes to FPDAM 1, but if they include any significant new technical material that has not been raised in the ballot comments an additional FPDAM 1 ballot will be required. If so, this ballot should run simultaneously with that for FPDAM 2.
6. Following resolution of ballot comments on these FPDAM ballots at the SC 6 meeting in London, the revised FPDAM texts should be sent to SG 11 for final approval under ITU-T procedures.
7. Given the above considerations, the SC 6 meeting in June should send a liaison statement to SG 11 stating that SC 6 expects to approve FPDAM 1 and FPDAM 2 in early 2010 following its plenary meeting in January 2010.
8. SC 6, at its meeting in January 2010, should examine the possibility of producing a new edition of ISO/IEC 16512-2 incorporating FPDAM 2, rather than issuing Amendment 2 as a separate publication. The extent of the changes, particularly with respect to figure and table numbers, may cause confusion if the current standard and Amendment 2 exist at the same time. This is a matter of advising ITU-T and ITTF about the advisability of this action.
9. SC 6, at its meeting in January 2010, should also consider whether or not to incorporate secure RMCP-2 in the new edition. Secure RMCP-2 has developed the use of DMAs as trust parties in its security transactions, but still relies on MAs (without distinguishing between RMAs and DMAs) in its use of basic RMCP-2. We consider that it may be preferable to await feedback from the practical implementation of secure RMCP-2 before incorporating Amendment 1 into the new edition. There is a long term possibility that secure RMCP-2 could be published as a separate standard based throughout on a clear distinction between the roles of RMAs and DMAs.