

Public Review: Resolution of comments on Draft ETSI TR 119 600 v0.0.3 – 31 May 2014

Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Business Guidance for Trust Service Status Lists Providers

Foreword: Please note that the following disposition of comments is provided to the light of the current context of the m460 mandate, in particular with regards to Directive 1999/93/EC. It should be noted that such disposition should be reviewed to the light of the eIDAS Regulation.

Organization name: Entity 1	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	Resolution on each comment submitted
Entity 1 - 1.	General		E	Please number all Notes		Document cleaned by Edit Help. Notes are numbered according to Edit Help rules.
Entity 1 - 2.	General		E	Please make all bullet items list as numbered ones, for an easier future reference		Done
Entity 1 - 3.	Introduction		E/T	Wherever “standards” is mentioned, please add “and specifications”		Document cleaned by Edit Help.
Entity 1 - 4.	1	1 ST line	E/T	Same as above		Document cleaned by Edit Help.
Entity 1 - 5.	3.1	Definition of “trusted list”	T	It wouldn't hurt adding a Note explaining that a "trusted list" is a "trusted service status list" issued in compliance with the applicable legislation.		Might be confusing but actually an example can be given wrt EU MS trusted list being to CD 2009/767/EC. Actually Note 2 should be a note associated to “trusted list”. An additional note could be added to state that a TL is a special case of TSL.
Entity 1 - 6.	3.1	Definition of “trusted list provider” 2 nd Note	T/E	“supervision/accreditation “ <u>body issuing one or more</u> ” status list” The definition is “TL provider”		Actually Note 2 should be a note associated to “trusted list”.

Entity 1 - 7.	3.1	Definition of "trusted list provider" 2 nd Note 2 nd para	E/T	"it refers to a " <i>body issuing one or more</i> " list meeting" The definition is "TL provider"		Actually Note 2 should be a note associated to "trusted list".
Entity 1 - 8.	3.3	Clause number	E	The correct clause number is "2"		Agreed
Entity 1 - 9.	4.1	TSPs providing signature validation services:	T		"Such TSPs provide trusted services that can be used to confirm the validity of an electronic signature <i>for remote users.</i> "	Does not bring much added value.
Entity 1 - 10.	4.1	TSPs providing registered electronic mail services.	T	Please provide a description, such as: "Electronic mail dispatching services that, where necessary jointly with other providers of similar services, provides trusted information on what data objects were sent from what e-mail address, when such shipment occurred and when these data objects have been delivered to what e-mail address. Optionally sender's and recipient's identity can be assured too, being they either legal or natural persons."		To be added
Entity 1 - 11.	4.1	TSPs providing trust services consisting in the long term preservation of electronic signatures or secure archiving services	T	Please provide a description too, such as: "Archiving services that, by applying security measures that address ICT, infrastructures, human resources, etc., ensure the preserved data objects' authenticity, integrity, legibility for the entire preservation time."		To be added
Entity 1 - 12.	4.1	1 st para After the bullet items list	E		"Trust service providers may also provide ⁵ "	Done

Entity 1 - 13.	4.1	2 nd para After the bullet items list	E		“trust service provider <u>are</u> to be met by qualified trust services and qualified trust service provider <u>s</u> to be	Done
Entity 1 - 14.	4.2.1	1 st para	E		“TSLs are based upon the reasoning that it <u>they</u> will enhance	Done
Entity 1 - 15.	4.2.1	1 st para	E		“related trust services if they <u>these parties</u> This prevents confusion.	ok
Entity 1 - 16.	4.2.2	7 th paragraph	T	“refers to ETSI TS 119 612 standard” This is not a “standard”, rather, a “technical specification”		Document cleaned by Edit Help.
Entity 1 - 17.	4.2.2	Note 2	T		“signature validation services, <u>Electronic delivery services</u> , long term preservation of signatures”	ok
Entity 1 - 18.	4.2.2	Paragraph before the first bullet item	E/T	“to issue their own list that ...” To prevent misunderstandings, it is better to say: " to issue lists applicable to these domains, that depending on mutual agreements with the EU can be recognised in EU too, that provide ..."		The possibility for them to issue TLs does not presuppose their wish to be (mutually) recognised. This may be an additional benefit if they so wish as explained after.
Entity 1 - 19.	4.2.2	Paragraph before the first bullet item	E/T	“in compliance with their <u>those domains</u> approval scheme.		Concept of domain added
Entity 1 - 20.	4.3	After 1 st para	T	A Note would be useful here, saying: "NOTE: as an example of solution to this problem, it is mentioned that in some cases such public keys are published in the relevant Official Journals."		Ok, rephrased.
Entity 1 - 21.	4.5	1 st para	T		“several TSL/TL providers <u>types</u> “	Text updated since comment

Entity 1 - 22.	Page 12	1 st para	T	<p>“These standards are laid out in a way which can be related ...”</p> <p>Maybe it is better to say, also taking into account that a future possibility is addressed here:</p> <p>“will be laid out in such a way that they can be referred to by TSL/TL providers ...”</p>		Ok, rephrased.
Entity 1 - 23.	5.1	Last bullet	T	<p>“trust service providers established in EU Member States.”</p> <p>Previously it has been hinted to the possibility for TSL/TL to be used outside the EU</p>	So it would be better to say: " <i><u>in the applicable domain, for example in</u></i> EU Member states"	Ok, rephrased.
Entity 1 - 24.	5.3	1 st line	E		“depend <u>s</u> on”	ok
Entity 1 - 25.	5.4	1 st line	T		"standards <i><u>and or specifications</u></i> ": TS 119 000 lists no EN for this service	Document cleaned by Edit Help.
Entity 1 - 26.	5.4	Table 1 title	T		“Table 1: Summary of guidance on selection of standards <i><u>and/or specifications</u></i> ”	Document cleaned by Edit Help.
Entity 1 - 27.	5,4	Table 1	E/T	<p>Line “List content specifications”</p> <p>CD 2009/767/EC is not a "specification"</p>	“List content <i><u>specifications</u></i> provisions”	ok
Entity 1 - 28.						