

COMMENTS about the PROPOSAL for a THIRD SIZE UICC

Source : CEGETEL/SFR

CEGETEL has studied with a lot of interest the proposal for a third size UICC, presented by Nokia, in Tdoc SMG9_UMTS 98u057.

⇒ CEGETEL would like to point out the constraints to be taken into account.

◆ **COMMON CONSTRAINTS**

1. It shall be feasible to print both the name of the operator and the ICCID, on the new card.
2. The new size shall provide a feature for orientation. (the dimensions are not indicated in the figures).
3. Due to the reduced size, each new card shall be provided upon a plastic carrier by the manufacturer, in order to avoid serious damage by handling it, and to limit the risks of losing it.

◆ **CONSTRAINTS ABOUT ALTERNATIVES 1 and 2**

The main interest of alternatives 1 and 2 is backwards compatibility.

1. To ensure that these sizes are backwards compatible, an ID-1 plastic carrier shall be provided in order to insert this new size into an existing ISO reader (of a mobile or a SIM card manufacturer tool for testing purposes), and a Plug-in plastic carrier shall be provided too, in order to insert this new size into an existing Plug-in reader, that means that the plastic carrier shall be the ID-1 size with 2 pre-cuts out, one for the plug-in card, and the other one for the new size card.

◆ **CONSTRAINTS ABOUT ALTERNATIVE 3**

This size is a completely new one, with no backwards compatibility.

1. Both the format for a plastic carrier and the pre-cut out for the new size shall be standardized, in order to be able to insert the new card into the new card readers provided by any card manufacturer.
2. Due to the reduced size very close to the semiconductor, in order to limit returns by clients, because of damage, a large-scale distribution should involve new concepts, - for example, to provide the mobile with the card already inserted, - that means an increase of both distribution and management costs.
3. The feature 'Removable', as defined for the UICC in UMTS 21.11, is very important, but seems impossible **in practice** with this card, that means 'no more card mobility'.

⇒ In order to fulfill some of these constraints, CEGETEL would like that the following questions are studied and solved :

Q1 : About the alternative 1, what is the feasibility of the coexistence of the Plug-in pre-cut and the new size pre-cut on the same plastic ID-1 carrier, since the minimum distance between 2 sides is 1,25 mm ?

Q2 : If it's mechanically feasible, by inserting the card in a plug-in reader, what are the risks of damaging this reader and bad contacts, because of the new size pre-cut ?

Q3 : About the alternative 2, what is the feasibility for 2 pre-cuts in the plastic ID-1 carrier, since 2 sides are common between the plug-in format and the new size format ?

Q4 : Idem Q2 for the alternative 2.

Q5 : About the alternative 3, as the package is provided by the semiconductor industry, does it mean that the graphical personalisation (printing of the operator film, sequential printing of the ICCID) should be in charge of the semiconductor manufacturer, and no more in charge of the card manufacturer ?

Q6 : About the alternative 3, as the package is provided by the semiconductor, what are the other impacts upon the existing card manufacturer's production process ?

In conclusion, CEGETEL asks the different involved parties to examine the constraints and questions above, before making an acceptable choice for the new size.