|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S1 | Scope of the proposed project | All | Ge | There have been significant developments in the DASH7 community over the last year. The DASH7 alliance is a non-profit organization that includes over 40 members. Its main objective is the promotion of the ISO/IEC 18000-7, standard.  ISO/IEC 18000-7 is the supporting air interface protocol for ISO 17363. It is essential that any revision of ISO 17363 take into account the underlying technology developments.  In 2010, DASH7 will be publishing an extended set of specifications for input into ISO. They include:   * New Security features * New requirements on sensors   These new requirements will support future updates to ISO 17363. The scope of ISO 17363 clearly defines the air interface for cargo shipment tags.  Excerpts from the scope of ISO 17363: “Identified within this International Standard are the air interface and communication parameters for active  radio-frequency identification communications using the International Standards from ISO/IEC 18000-7,  *Information technology automatic identification and data capture techniques — Radio frequency identification*  *for item management air interface — Part 7: Parameters for an active RFID air interface communications at*  *433 MHz*.” | The scope of the NP needs to be consistent with the scope of the published ISO 17363: 2007 standard.  Replace:   1. Makes recommendations about a second generation supply chain tag intended to monitor the condition and security of the freight resident within a freight container.   By:   1. Updates previous recommendations about a containerized cargo supply chain RFID system, based on shipment tags.   Strike out the following:   1. ~~Specifies the implementation of sensors for freight resident in a freight container.~~   The sensor interface is defined in the air interface protocol: ISO/IEC 18000-7. A reference to the sensor clauses of the air interface protocol standard may be made in the updates to the ISO 17363 document. |  |
| S2 | Scope of the proposed project |  | Ge | Mandatory and Optional information on the shipment tag:  In order not to create confusion in the market, it is essential for the 17363 standard to align with the current ISO 18186 standard currently in development in TC104. We must avoid creating a duplicate set of Data elements and cargo shipment tag information.  Mandatory and optional data elements on the cargo shipment tags should be agreed to by both the shipper/consignee community and the carriers.  Loading times, Container serial #, embarkation/de-embarkation locations are key elements that can not be decided by one single party. They require consultations with all players in the business process. | Updates in red:   1. Makes specific recommendations about mandatory non-reprogrammable information on the shipment tag **based on a series of new data elements defined in ISO 18186 currently under development in ISO TC104.** 2. Makes specific recommendations about optional, re-programmable information on the shipment tag **based on a series of new data elements defined in ISO 18186 currently under development in ISO TC104.** |  |
| S3 | Scope of the proposed project |  | Ge | The GPS interface should be handled the same way as the sensor interface 🡪 by the air interface protocol.  The format of the GPS data and the control commands (configuration, enabling) should be referenced but not defined in ISO 17363.  The communication methods from the GPS interface are part of the air interface protocol. | Strike out the following:   1. Makes specific recommends about the data link interface for GPS or GLS services. |  |
| S4 | Scope of the proposed project |  | Ge | The entire section describing the potential benefits of the shipment tag to the shipper and consignee is argumentative. There is no reason for the NP to describe a shipper’s (or a consignee’s) business scenario. This text suggests that the current standard does not support the described business scenarios.  Who from shipper or importer community has come forward and explicitly asked for updates to be made to the business processes listed in clause 6.3 of the standard?  This information s not provided as part of this NP.  Also, one can not develop a set of shipment tag requirements without involving the carrier community. Suggesting otherwise is simply not practical. | Strike out the following:  This tag is specifically intended to benefit the shipper and consignee of containerized freight. This tag and the data resident in the tag shall be the responsibility of the shipper and the consignee. The containerized freight carrier shall bear no responsibility for this tag, except as agreed upon between the shipper or consignee and the carrier. The shipper or, per the shipper’s instructions, the party physically loading (“stuffing”) the container will affix the tag. Notwithstanding the absence of carrier responsibility for the tag, data capabilities are flexible and may, at the shipper’s discretion, include destination, routing, conveyance or other transportation information, cargo information (including hazardous material information, where applicable) or other trip-specific information. The tag shall perform reliably from the point of stuffing of the container to delivery destination, and shall be removed by the consignee upon final delivery. The tag may be reusable. |  |
| S5 | Purpose and justification |  | Ge | ISO 18000-7’s next revision will include details about the sensor interface:  In section 6.3.12.5 of the current published standard, there is a footnote indicating the following:  *The target standard for future implementations of sensor technology for RFID is IEEE 1451.7. It is anticipated that*  *future revisions of this standard may require adherence to 1451.7 as the physical interface. Recognizing that the current*  *version of 1451.7 does not adequately address active tag technologies, active tag vendors are encouraged to actively participate in the revision of current 1451.7.*  The DASH7 community has now addressed this issue and will be coming forward with proposals that are aligned with this footnote. | Remove Sensors as a justification for this NP. |  |
| S6 | Purpose and justification |  | Ge | The fact that the information contained on the tag is not the carrier’s responsibility should not be relevant to the adoption of 17363. The published standard, as written, allows for this tag to be deployed with these known requirements from the shippers and consignees and at no additional cost to the carrier. | Strike out the following sentence:  *It also provides a clarification of focus, whereby the responsibility for the tag and the benefit of the tag inures to the benefit of the shipper and consignee of the content and is not the responsibility of the carrier* |  |
| S7 | Purpose and justification |  | Ge | While encoding may be discussed as part of this new work item, the decision to develop a new encoding scheme is not obvious and should therefore not be stated as an objective for the work item. | Replace:  “there is a need to declare an encoding scheme”  By:  “there is a need to discuss encoding scheme options. Backwards compatibility with existing infrastructure shall also be taken into account.” |  |
| S8 |  |  |  | TC104 has approved the development of ISO 18186 (cargo shipment tag) following a proposal from China to standardize what has been accomplished through the e-tag pilots led by SIPG.  To date, the TC104 committee is still debating the scope of the ISO 18186 standard. A meeting is scheduled onMarch 3rd in Washington DC to further clarify the requirements for this standard.  Claiming that TC104 has embarked in a separate direction is simply not true. Minutes of the last TC104 meeting in Shanghai state the following (sc4wg2n289):  (item 19)  *The focus of ISO 18186 was deliberated. After significant discussion, it emerged that the primary intent apparently was to specify application requirements. In this context, the Workgroup strongly emphasized the need to examine the draft to ensure that the contents are consistent with the intended purpose. It was felt that the standard should now be drafted in a device-independent, non-prescriptive manner. Specific mention was made of the need to refer to ISO 17363 for the treatment of content. Importantly, the Workgroup would have to consider changing the title of the standard to better reflect its intent.* | Remove the comment regarding TC104’s decision “to embark on its own standard”. |  |
| S9 | Relevant documents to be considered. |  | Ge | Add 18000-7 as a relevant document to be considered |  |  |