DEFECT REPORT FORM

1. <u>Defect Report Number</u>: **266**

Title: Invalid updates of conformance clause

2. <u>Source</u>: CEN/ISSS/WS-DIR

3. Addressed to: ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 and ITU-T SG 7

Editor Group on the Directory

4. (a) WG Secretariat: UK (BSI)

(b) ITU-T WP: WP 4

- 5. <u>Date Circulated by WG Secretariat</u>:
- 6. <u>Deadline for Response from Editor</u>:
- 7. <u>Defect Report Concerning</u>: ITU-T Rec. X.519 (1997) | ISO/IEC 9594-5 : 1998
- 8. Qualifier: (e.g.: error, omission, clarification required)

Error

9. <u>References in Document</u>: (e.g.: page, clause/section, figure, and/or table numbers)

Clause 9

10. <u>Nature of Defect</u>: (complete, concise explanation of the perceived problem)

The following items was present in 9.1.1 of edition 2

c) the extensions listed in the table of 7.3.1 of ITU-T Rec. X.511 | ISO/IEC 9594-3, that the DUA is capable of initiating for which conformance is claimed.

However, it was by the operational security extension overlaid by:

c) Whether conformance is claimed to Rule-based Access Control.

This seems like a mistake

Technical Corrigendum 1 to ITU-T Rec. $X.519 (1997) \mid ISO/IEC 9594-5 : 1998$ adds text to 9.1.1 b) and to 9.2.1 e). However, these items have been changed to Technical corrigendum 1 to ITU-T Rec. $X.519 (1993) \mid ISO/IEC 9594-5 : 1995$. The suggested changes do not make sense as they are.

11. <u>Solution Proposed by the Source</u>: (optional)

Reinstate the 9.1.1, item c) from edition 2 and changed the current item to d).

12. <u>Editor's Response</u>:

(any material proposed for processing as an erratum to, an amendment to, or a commentary on the IS or DIS final text/ITU Recommendation or Draft Recommendation is attached separately to this completed report).