Public Review: Resolution of Comments on Draft ETSI EN 319 162-2 v0.0.4 – 31 May 2014

ASiC Baseline profile

> **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.**

ID	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph Figure/ Table	Type of comment (General/ Technical/Editorial)	COMMENTS	Proposed change	Resolution on each comment submitted
1	2.2 [i.8] [EN 319 162-2]		General	TS 102 176-1 could be replaced with TS 119 312		Accepted with changes: a note will be added that TS 102 176-1 will be replaced by TS 119 312
2			Technical	If the Comments/Changes to Draft ETSI EN 319 162-1 V0.0.3 on ERS are accepted, according changes are needed in Draft ETSI EN 319 162-2 V0.0.4 (ASiC Baseline Profile)		Rejected: proposal for ERS is specific for archiving applications. ESI TC will discuss use of ERS as part of Trust Application Service Providers related to long term preservation

| 3 | All ESI drafts | | | tech | The writing of all drafts needs improvements to enhance the quality | Apply the following rules:

- the standard should specify all the requirements necessary to achieve its objective and ONLY include essential supporting information

- use only appropriate verbal forms to express provisions, as defined in ETSI Drafting rules clause 14a (**http://portal.etsi.org/edithelp/HowToStart/home.htm?page=DraftingRules**)

  - shall/should/may are used only when writing provisions defined by the document itself.

  - do NOT use alternative forms such as is required to

  - "will/will not" shall be used to indicate behaviour of equipment or sub-systems outside the scope of the deliverable in which they appear

  - "can/cannot" shall be used for statements of possibility and capability. When document on signature policy says 'the signature policy may support X", a document on AdES format will say "the signature policy can support X" (a permissible actions defined in document D becomes a possibility in other documents)

  - never use present tense to express a provision. Present tense is only a description of facts

- Clearly separate provisions (shall/should/may) from complementary informative text (e.g. using notes, examples, or moving it to informative annex) so that implementers clearly know what they have to implement.- never duplicate text. Only say things once. | No change required |

3b	All ESI drafts			tech	The writing of all drafts needs improvements to enhance the quality	- do not copy provisions from other standards. If they are applicable, then write text like "RFC 5256 shall apply", "the attribute shall be as defined in \<clause c\> of XXX" - fully review scopes: scope defines without ambiguity the subject of the ETSI deliverable and the aspect(s) covered, thereby indicating the limits of applicability of the ETSI deliverable or particular parts of it. It shall not contain requirements. The scope shall be succinct so that it can be used as a summary for bibliographic purposes. Do not describe all clauses. - introduction: do not duplicate text with the scope. Introduction is not the scope. Introduction gives specific information or commentary about the technical content of the ETSI deliverable, and about the reasons prompting its preparation. It shall not contain requirements - keep it impersonal: do not use I, you, we - do not use colloquial language - tables: use ETSI drafting rules	No change required
4					Some software developers working for XXX have reported the difficulty for them as implementers to ensure their compliance with the ASiC baseline profile, especially for level E as there are still too many possibilities left open / too many options		This will be considered as part of the results of the ASiC Plugtests
5					it be possible to refer to open source instead of ZIP		Rejected: ZIP is recognized also by ISO as a PAS. It is however recognized the need to avoid proprietary algorithms, so compression will be restricted to "no compression" or "deflate" ISO SC34 is working on containers and ZIP is in process to be recognized as Referenced Specification in ISO/IEC CD 21320-1 with some restrictions in line with ASiC core and BP. Restriction on compression is aligned with current work on ISO 32000-2 (actual draft)

6				TE	In Lithuania a national standard on containers is published ("ADOC") that require additional metadata to be specified	Allow additional metadata in META-INF in case of ASiC E with XAdES	change 8.3.2 a) as follows: In META-INF folder data object in addition to what specified in this clause and in clause 8.3.1 may be present provided that all the following condition are met: 1) the name of the additional data object shall not contain the word "signature" or "timestamp" "manifest", case insensitive; 2) the additional data object may be signed or unsigned and the information contained shall not be necessary for any relying party for the the validation of the container signatures.
					Section 7.3.2 requires the signature entry name for ASiC-S CAdES: META-INF/signature.p7m	Change to signature.p7s	Accepted