|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Savi1 | 5.3.3.2 |  | Te | The Sensor interface for the air interface protocol supporting 17363 is currently not specified.  ISO 18000-7 states the following:  *The physical interface between the sensor and the RF tag should be as described in IEEE 1451.72*  With the following footnote:  *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.*  It is anticipated that the future revision of ISO 18000-7 shall specify ISO/IEC/IEEE 21451.7 as the sensor interface (wired and wireless) for data structures and commands.  IEEE 1451.7 was intended to be physical interface agnostic.  Requiring 802.15.4 as the wireless interface AND requiring sensors to communicate directly to the infrastructure using 802.15.4:  Would imply that 2 separate infrastructures would need to be deployed.  This would add unjustified cost to end users and SI’s. | Replace:  Sensor equipped RFID tags **shall** conform to ISO/IEC/IEEE 21451-7  By  Sensor equipped RFID tags **should** conform to ISO/IEC/IEEE 21451-7  Strike out reference to 802.15.4 as the wireless interface between an RFID tag and a sensor.  Strike out :  *Sensors communicating directly to an external communications infrastructure shall conform to ISO/IEC/IEEE 8802-15-4.* |  |
| Savi3 | 6.2.2 |  | TE | Read/write distances: where are the operational requirements for 35 m?  Tags today can write up to a distance of 100m.  Where does the requirement of having 3m distance between tags come from? Current 17363 tags can be discriminated w/o this requirement. | Replace 35m by 100m.  Strike out:  *Sufficiently separated from other ISO 17363 tags by more than 3 m to allow discrimination* |  |
|  | 7.3.3 |  | Ge | Missing end of sentence. Where are all the optional CSS data elements?  How are they compatible with those described in 18186? | Reference ISO 18186 optional CSS data elements |  |
|  | 7.3.7 |  | Te | Minimization of memory size is not relevant for active data rich tags such as ISO 18000-7 tags.  ISO 18000-7 is a byte oriented protocol. Any savings by using 6-bits would require padding to ensure a full byte.  ISO 18000-7 can allow for 6bit encoding but there would be large implications to existing infrastructure: software to encode and de-code from 6-bit to 8-bit.  Backwards compatibility with existing infrastructure is not taken into account. | Strike out 6-bit encoding as a requirement for 17363 devices. |  |
|  | 8.4 |  | Te | Requirements for authentication should be an option | Replace “shall” by “should” |  |
|  | 8.5 |  | Te | Providing incorrect or misleading data to an unauthorized party is a security option | Strike out first sentence of 8.5. |  |
|  | 10.2 |  | Ge | Shall be in accordance with all parts of 18046.  802.15.4 is not represented in the ISO/IEC 18046 standard, nor does it have a conformance standard. |  |  |
|  | 10.4 |  | Ge | Introduction of a new 802.15.4 infrastructure: 802.15.4 is not a globally accepted standard for global logistics.  802.15.4 specifies multiple PHY’s that are not globally accepted. |  |  |
|  | 10.8.1 |  | Ge | ISO/IEC/IEEE 8802.15.4 is not yet published.  802.15.4 does not specify communications with sensor devices.  See comment #1. |  |  |
|  | 10.8.2 |  | Ge | Where do the requirements to communicate with the On Board Unit using solely 802.15.4 come from? |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |