

MEETING MINUTES

for December 7, 2010, Hyatt Madeleine, Paris

MEMBERS PRESENT

NAME	COMPANY
Dietrich Wecker	Administrator
Damien Cochet	Xiring
Franz Trierweiler	Xiring
Klaus Erichsen	Sagem Monotel (now Ingenico)
Jeff Durix	SCM Microsystems
Joris Jourdain	SCM Microsystems
Harm Brams	Vasco Data Security
Mike McEwen	Oracle
Jean Lusetti	Gemalto
Abu Ismail	NXP
Uwe Schnabel	HID Global

MINUTES

The meeting began at 7:00. Members signed the sign-in sheet, and wrote their names on a folded piece of paper which they placed on the table in front of them, to help with identification.

1. Administrative

1.1. New members, changes

Mike McEwen was welcomed to his first meeting, representing Oracle. Oracle has joined the Workgroup as a core member.

Klaus Erichsen informed the group that his company, Sagem Monetel, is now Ingenico.

In terms of membership changes, it has been noted that many associate members join only for a year in order to get the test cards.

1.2. Financial report

Financial report for the first two quarters can be viewed on the PC/SC website. Current account balance at the end of September was \$6,546. Current account balance at the time of the meeting was \$12,693. Workgroup budget for 2010 remains similar to previous years, with income covering expenses.

1.3. Non-profit status

Open Domain's lawyer has suggested that there is no need for the Workgroup to change to non-profit status. Since PC/SC does not make a profit, the PC/SC income and expenses have little impact on the books of Open Domain. Changing to non-profit status can be done at any time in the future, for example if PC/SC starts to make a profit.

2. Adding new tag to FEATURE_GET_TVL_PROPERTIES

Discussion about whether to add this feature to Part 3 or Part 10. Feature request was submitted by Ludovic Rousseau. Refer also to PC/SC email distributed on this topic September 26, 2010.

As stated in the email, "Extended APDUs were always a problem, unfortunately some readers do not support them at all, but this is the "good case", many readers claim to support them but do not do this well, as a result, the application will not work well."

Jean Lusetti said application needs to know if reader driver supports extended APDUs. Harm Brams said CCID specs already take care of the chopping, so the problem appears to be only for readers that are not CCID. Franz Trierweiler said that the application should check if driver supports extended APDUs, to avoid a possible crash.

The group agreed to ask Ludovic again to clearly state what the specific problem is.

Action items:

What: Ask Ludovic again to clearly state what the specific problem is.

Who: PC/SC Administration

When: Now.

3. Part 3. Supplemental Document

Proposal submitted by HID. Uwe Schnabel provided a summary of the proposal, which includes adding functionality for a purse, especially for Mifare cards. Goal is a standard way to send increment and decrement commands. Topic of multiple purses was briefly discussed. Abu Ismail commented that Mifare might not be able to handle purse backup schemes. Harm Brams added that the solution may be to code the address of the purse in TLV. Uwe Schnabel agreed, and suggested that the mode can be encoded in the data block of the APDU. HID will resubmit the proposal, based on the meeting's comments.

Action items:

What: Proposal to be updated and resubmitted.

Who: HID

When: Before next meeting.

4. Part 9: Modify to list INS to be rejected by smart card reader

Proposed by Xiring. Damien Cochet said ISO7816 Part 4 and 8 are filtered to accept only four instruction bytes. Uwe Schnabel commented that protection profile is application and use case dependent and should be sufficient. PC/SC should not take ownership of implementation dependent profiles, since this would require too much work. Relating to this, in Part 9, Section 4.1.8.1, there is a security warning at the bottom which uses the word "should", which in ISO terminology should be understood as a "must". PC/SC generally does not specify security measures.

It was decided to make no modification to the PC/SC specification.

5. Extension to Part 10 (GET_FEATURE_REQUEST)

Proposed by Kobil, although they were not present at the meeting, regarding the PACE authentication of reader and contactless card for the German ID card. Harm Brams said that since this request is country-specific, it should not be part of an international standards definition. Discussion should be if there should be country specific codes. Uwe said that he sees it in the context of Part 10.

Harm Bram asked if tags should be reserved for specific solutions, and if extra reader features should be addressed by PC/SC. The tag is a one byte value. 18 values have been used so far. Number 20 was requested for use by the PACE protocol.

A note should be added to Part 10 that tags are reserved as follows:

tag value (hex):	Description:
0 - 7F	allocated, PC/SC defined usage
20	PACE
80 - FE	non-allocated tags
FF	future use

Those interested in a tag should contact PC/SC and provide the following information:

1. Requested tag number.
2. Short description of the application.

The decision on whether to grant the tag will be agreed upon by the members, with one of the key criteria being whether it's an open or proprietary standard.

Action items:

What: Add above update to Part 10.

Who: Uwe Schnabel

When: Before next meeting.

6. IFDtest2 Update

Question has been proposed to Steve Olsson of Microsoft and the Microsoft Smartcard Core Team. PC/SC could develop their own test suite, which could be used with multiple operating systems, not only Microsoft. Everyone agreed that this would be beneficial, since PC/SC is currently dependent on Microsoft for compatibility testing.

Franz Trierweiler said that the current Microsoft test application doesn't cover all PC/SC features and basically ensures that the PC is not negatively impacted. It cannot be used as a certification tool. Uwe Schnabel said that if PC/SC would develop their own test tool, the first step would be to add a compliancy statement at the end of each chapter of the PC/SC specification. Abu Ismail said that it could be considered that a third party company could be contracted to develop the test application.

Uwe Schnabel suggested that we could put an RFP on the PC/SC website, asking for quotes to add the compliancy statements to the specification. The compliancy statement would also specify which function needs to be supported in order to be compliant.

Action item 1:

What:

- Email Microsoft with a deadline, asking them if they plan to update the IFDtest2 application.
- If Microsoft does not respond, or says no, then we could contact Ludovic Rousseau and ask if he would be interested in writing the compliancy statements and creating a test program for a mutually agreed upon fee.
- If Ludovic is not interested in the above, we could put an RFP on the PC/SC website.

Who: PC/SC Administration

When: Now.

7. Workgroup email communication

7.1 Operation of mailing lists

Open Domain had a problem in the last year with an ISP provider, which caused occasional mail disturbances. Open Domain plans to move the email services to a new provider, which should improve reliability.

The group discussed that there is confusion with the PC/SC email traffic. When members respond to emails sent by PC/SC Administration to all of the members, only PC/SC Administration receives the email. PC/SC Administration must then forward the email to all the members, causing a time delay. Better would be if whenever PC/SC Administration sends an email to all members, that they could simply reply to that email to reach all of the members.

Action items:

What: Take a look at improving the email traffic.

Who: PC/SC Administration

When: Now

7.2 Public review of Specifications prior to publishing

Not covered in this meeting, due to the late hour.

Action items:

What: Add to next meeting's agenda.

Who: PC/SC Administration

When: For next meeting.

8. Other Business

8.1 Part 3, Supplement 1, Chapter 2.1.22

HID proposed extending table. They will submit a proposal.

8.2 Part 3, Supplement 2

Abu Ismail will provide a draft proposal at the next meeting, regarding NFC devices.

Members: Please review the Meeting Minutes, and inform the Workgroup Administration of any inaccuracies within 10 days of receiving them. When no inaccuracies are found, the Minutes will be viewed as having been accepted by the membership.

PC/SC Workgroup Administration



admin@pcscworkgroup.com