



SLOVENSKI STANDARD
oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023
01-december-2023

Elektronski podpisi in infrastruktura (ESI) - Storitve priporočene elektronske pošte (REM) - 4. del: Profili medobratovalnosti

Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI) - Registered Electronic Mail (REM) Services - Part 4: Interoperability profiles

iTeh Standards
(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)

Ta slovenski standard je istoveten z: ETSI EN 319 532-4 V1.3.0 (2023-10)

[oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023)

ICS:

35.040.01 Kodiranje informacij na splošno Information coding in general

oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023 en

Draft **ETSI EN 319 532-4** V1.3.0 (2023-10)



Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Registered Electronic Mail (REM) Services; Part 4: Interoperability profiles

(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)

Document Preview

[oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023>



Reference

REN/ESI-0019532-4v131

Keywordse-delivery services, registered e-delivery services,
registered electronic mail**ETSI**650 Route des Lucioles
F-06921 Sophia Antipolis Cedex - FRANCE

Tel.: +33 4 92 94 42 00 Fax: +33 4 93 65 47 16

Siret N° 348 623 562 00017 - APE 7112B
Association à but non lucratif enregistrée à la
Sous-Préfecture de Grasse (06) N° w061004871

Important notice

The present document can be downloaded from:

<https://www.etsi.org/standards-search>

The present document may be made available in electronic versions and/or in print. The content of any electronic and/or print versions of the present document shall not be modified without the prior written authorization of ETSI. In case of any existing or perceived difference in contents between such versions and/or in print, the prevailing version of an ETSI deliverable is the one made publicly available in PDF format at www.etsi.org/deliver.

Users of the present document should be aware that the document may be subject to revision or change of status.

Information on the current status of this and other ETSI documents is available at

<https://portal.etsi.org/TB/ETSIDeliverableStatus.aspx>

If you find errors in the present document, please send your comment to one of the following services:

<https://portal.etsi.org/People/CommitteeSupportStaff.aspx>

If you find a security vulnerability in the present document, please report it through our
Coordinated Vulnerability Disclosure Program:

<https://www.etsi.org/standards/coordinated-vulnerability-disclosure>

Notice of disclaimer & limitation of liability

The information provided in the present deliverable is directed solely to professionals who have the appropriate degree of experience to understand and interpret its content in accordance with generally accepted engineering or other professional standard and applicable regulations.

No recommendation as to products and services or vendors is made or should be implied.

In no event shall ETSI be held liable for loss of profits or any other incidental or consequential damages.

Any software contained in this deliverable is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, express or implied, including but not limited to, the warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and non-infringement of intellectual property rights and ETSI shall not be held liable in any event for any damages whatsoever (including, without limitation, damages for loss of profits, business interruption, loss of information, or any other pecuniary loss) arising out of or related to the use of or inability to use the software.

Copyright Notification

No part may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and microfilm except as authorized by written permission of ETSI.

The content of the PDF version shall not be modified without the written authorization of ETSI.

The copyright and the foregoing restriction extend to reproduction in all media.

© ETSI 2023.
All rights reserved.

Contents

Intellectual Property Rights	6
Foreword.....	6
Modal verbs terminology.....	6
Introduction	7
1 Scope	8
2 References	8
2.1 Normative references	8
2.2 Informative references.....	9
3 Definition of terms, symbols, abbreviations and terminology	10
3.1 Terms.....	10
3.2 Symbols.....	10
3.3 Abbreviations	10
3.4 Terminology	11
4 General requirements	11
4.1 Introduction	11
4.2 Compliance requirements.....	11
5 SMTP interoperability profile	12
5.1 General requirements	12
5.2 Style of operation	12
5.3 REMS - interfaces constraints	12
5.3.1 Introduction.....	12
5.3.2 REM MSI: Message Submission Interface.....	13
5.3.3 REM MRI-ERI: Message and Evidence Retrieval Interface	13
5.3.4 REM RI: Relay Interface	13
5.3.5 CSI: Common Service Interface	14
5.4 REM message constraints	14
5.4.1 REMS relay metadata MIME Header Fields constraints	14
5.4.2 signed data MIME Header Fields constraints	15
5.4.3 REMS introduction MIME Header Fields-Body constraints	15
5.4.3.1 General Requirements.....	15
5.4.3.2 multipart/alternative: free text subsection Header Fields constraints.....	15
5.4.3.3 multipart/alternative: HTML subsection Header Fields constraints.....	15
5.4.4 original message MIME Header Fields constraints	15
5.4.5 REMS extensions MIME Header Fields constraints	16
5.4.6 ERDS evidence MIME Header Fields constraints.....	16
5.4.7 REMS signature MIME Header Fields-Body constraints.....	16
5.5 REMS - evidence set constraints	17
5.5.1 ERDS evidence types constraints	17
5.5.1.1 Mandatory evidence - all styles of operation	17
5.5.1.2 Mandatory evidence - S&N style of operation.....	17
5.5.1.3 Conditional evidence - all styles of operation	18
5.5.2 ERDS evidence components constraints.....	19
5.5.2.1 General requirements	19
5.5.2.2 SubmissionAcceptance - SubmissionRejection	19
5.5.2.3 ContentConsignment - ContentConsignmentFailure	20
5.5.2.4 ContentHandover - ContentHandoverFailure.....	20
5.5.2.5 RelayAcceptance - RelayRejection.....	21
5.5.2.6 RelayFailure	21
Annex A (informative): REM best practices.....	22
Annex B (informative): REM baseline rationales	23
B.1 Introduction	23

B.2	Common Service Interface (CSI)	23
B.2.1	Overview	23
B.2.2	Derived rationales	25
B.2.2.1	General	25
B.2.2.2	Message Routing	25
B.2.2.3	Trust establishment	25
B.2.2.4	Capability discovery and management	35
B.2.2.5	Governance support	38
B.3	Digital signatures and time-stamp	39
B.3.1	Overview	39
B.3.2	Submission event	41
B.3.3	Relay event	42
B.3.4	Consignment event	44
Annex C (normative): REM baseline requirements		45
C.1	General requirements	45
C.2	Common Service Interface (CSI)	45
C.2.1	Overview	45
C.2.2	General provisions	45
C.2.3	Basic handshake	46
C.2.3.1	Introduction	46
C.2.3.2	Message Routing	46
C.2.3.3	Trust establishment	46
C.2.3.3.1	Trust - Trusted List general requirements	46
C.2.3.3.2	Trust - Trusted List service element restrictions	47
C.2.3.3.3	Trust - Validation steps	49
C.2.3.4	Capability discovery and management	50
C.2.3.4.1	Capabilities - Trusted List general requirements	50
C.2.3.4.2	Capability metadata - Trusted List referencing of REMS metadata	54
C.2.3.4.3	Capability metadata - Consistency and validation steps	57
C.2.3.4.4	Capability-based security - Trusted List referencing of security tokens	58
C.2.3.4.5	Capability-based security - Consistency and validation steps	59
C.2.3.4.6	Capability - Discovery interface	60
C.2.3.5	Governance support	60
C.3	ERDS evidence - composition	65
C.3.1	General requirements	65
C.3.2	New ERDS evidence extensions	66
C.3.2.1	GeneralEvidenceInfo extension	66
C.3.2.2	RelayEvidenceInfo extension	67
C.3.3	Composition requirements	68
C.3.4	Detail requirements	70
C.4	Digital signatures and time-stamp	76
C.4.1	Overview	76
C.4.2	REM messages - digital signature provisions	77
C.4.3	ERDS evidence - digital signature provisions	77
C.4.4	ERDS evidence - time-stamp provisions	78
C.4.5	Specific applications	78
C.4.5.1	Submission event	78
C.4.5.2	Relay event	80
C.4.5.3	ContentConsignment event	84
C.4.5.4	Summary tables	87
Annex D (informative): REM baseline best practices		92
D.1	Global governance practices	92
D.1.1	General	92
D.1.2	Links with national laws	92
D.1.3	REMid policy elements	92

D.2	Registration and setup practices	93
D.2.1	General	93
D.2.2	Certificate and signature properties.....	93
D.2.2.1	Certificate significant elements.....	93
D.2.2.2	Certificate issuing path	93
D.2.2.3	Digital signature - signature-policy-identifier.....	94
D.2.3	TL fulfilment.....	95
D.2.4	Flow elements	95
D.3	Periodical practices.....	95
D.4	Run-time practices.....	95
D.4.1	General	95
D.4.2	Basic handshake	95
D.4.3	Content checks	96
D.4.4	Events checks	96
D.4.5	Complete set of examples.....	97
Annex E (normative):	XML schema files.....	98
E.1	XML Schema file location for namespace http://uri.etsi.org/19532/v1#	98
Annex F (informative):	Change History	99
History		101

iTeh Standards
(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)
Document Preview

[oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023>

Intellectual Property Rights

Essential patents

IPRs essential or potentially essential to normative deliverables may have been declared to ETSI. The declarations pertaining to these essential IPRs, if any, are publicly available for **ETSI members and non-members**, and can be found in ETSI SR 000 314: "*Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs); Essential, or potentially Essential, IPRs notified to ETSI in respect of ETSI standards*", which is available from the ETSI Secretariat. Latest updates are available on the ETSI Web server (<https://ipr.etsi.org/>).

Pursuant to the ETSI Directives including the ETSI IPR Policy, no investigation regarding the essentiality of IPRs, including IPR searches, has been carried out by ETSI. No guarantee can be given as to the existence of other IPRs not referenced in ETSI SR 000 314 (or the updates on the ETSI Web server) which are, or may be, or may become, essential to the present document.

Trademarks

The present document may include trademarks and/or tradenames which are asserted and/or registered by their owners. ETSI claims no ownership of these except for any which are indicated as being the property of ETSI, and conveys no right to use or reproduce any trademark and/or tradename. Mention of those trademarks in the present document does not constitute an endorsement by ETSI of products, services or organizations associated with those trademarks.

DECT™, **PLUGTESTS™**, **UMTS™** and the ETSI logo are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members. **3GPP™** and **LTE™** are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the 3GPP Organizational Partners. **oneM2M™** logo is a trademark of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the oneM2M Partners. **GSM®** and the GSM logo are trademarks registered and owned by the GSM Association.

Foreword

This draft European Standard (EN) has been produced by ETSI Technical Committee Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI), and is now submitted for the combined Public Enquiry and Vote phase of the ETSI standards EN Approval Procedure.

The present document is part 4 of a multi-part deliverable. Full details of the entire series can be found in part 1 [4].

Proposed national transposition dates	
Date of latest announcement of this EN (doa):	3 months after ETSI publication
Date of latest publication of new National Standard or endorsement of this EN (dop/e):	6 months after doa
Date of withdrawal of any conflicting National Standard (dow):	6 months after doa

Modal verbs terminology

In the present document "**shall**", "**shall not**", "**should**", "**should not**", "**may**", "**need not**", "**will**", "**will not**", "**can**" and "**cannot**" are to be interpreted as described in clause 3.2 of the [ETSI Drafting Rules](#) (Verbal forms for the expression of provisions).

"**must**" and "**must not**" are **NOT** allowed in ETSI deliverables except when used in direct citation.

Introduction

Registered Electronic Mail (REM) is a particular instance of an Electronic Registered Delivery Service (ERDS). Standard email, used as a backbone, makes interoperability smooth and increases usability. At the same time, the application of additional security mechanisms ensures integrity, confidentiality and non-repudiation (of submission, consignment, handover, etc.). It protects against the risk of loss, theft, damage and any illegitimate modification. The present document covers the common and worldwide-recognized requirements to address electronic registered delivery securely and reliably. Particular attention is paid to the Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 [i.1]. However, the legal effects are outside the scope of the present document.

iTeh Standards
(<https://standards.iteh.ai>)
Document Preview

[oSIST prEN 319 532-4 V1.3.0:2023](https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023)

<https://standards.iteh.ai/catalog/standards/sist/3ff889bf-f8bc-4a30-853b-5b4c51528d71/osist-pren-319-532-4-v1-3-0-2023>

1 Scope

The present document specifies the interoperability profiles of the Registered Electronic Mail (REM) messages according to the formats defined in ETSI EN 319 532-3 [6] and the concepts and semantics defined in ETSI EN 319 532-1 [4] and ETSI EN 319 532-2 [5]. It deals with issues relating to authentication, authenticity and integrity of the information, with the purpose to address the achievement of interoperability across REM service providers, implemented according to the aforementioned specifications.

The present document covers all the options to profile REM services for both styles of operation: S&N and S&F.

More specifically, the present document:

- a) Defines generalities on profiling.
- b) Defines constraints for SMTP profile.

The present document also specifies a REM baseline supporting the technical interoperability amongst service providers in different regulatory frameworks.

NOTE: Specifically but not exclusively, REM baseline specified in the present document aims at supporting implementations of interoperable REM services by use of Trusted List Frameworks to constitute Trusted domains and qualified REM services (instances of electronic registered delivery services) by use of EU Trusted List system as per Regulation (EU) No 910/2014 [i.1].

2 References

2.1 Normative references

References are either specific (identified by date of publication and/or edition number or version number) or non-specific. For specific references, only the cited version applies. For non-specific references, the latest version of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

Referenced documents which are not found to be publicly available in the expected location might be found at <https://docbox.etsi.org/Reference/>.

NOTE: While any hyperlinks included in this clause were valid at the time of publication, ETSI cannot guarantee their long term validity.

The following referenced documents are necessary for the application of the present document.

- [1] [ETSI EN 319 522-1](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Electronic Registered Delivery Services; Part 1: Framework and Architecture".
- [2] [ETSI EN 319 522-2](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Electronic Registered Delivery Services; Part 2: Semantic Contents".
- [3] [ETSI EN 319 522-3](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Electronic Registered Delivery Services; Part 3: Formats".
- [4] [ETSI EN 319 532-1](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Registered Electronic Mail (REM) Services; Part 1: Framework and Architecture".
- [5] [ETSI EN 319 532-2](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Registered Electronic Mail (REM) Services; Part 2: Semantic Contents".
- [6] [ETSI EN 319 532-3](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Registered Electronic Mail (REM) Services; Part 3: Formats".
- [7] [IETF RFC 5321](#): "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol".
- [8] [IETF RFC 5322](#): "Internet Message Format".

- [9] [IETF RFC 2045](#): "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message Bodies".
- [10] [IETF RFC 3207](#) (2002): "SMTP Service Extension for Secure SMTP over Transport Layer Security".
- [11] [ETSI EN 319 522-4-3](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Electronic Registered Delivery Services; Part 4: Bindings; Sub-part 3: Capability/requirements bindings".
- [12] [ETSI TS 119 612 \(V2.2.1\)](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Trusted Lists".
- [13] [ETSI EN 319 122-1](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); CAAdES digital signatures; Part 1: Building blocks and CAAdES baseline signatures".
- [14] [ETSI EN 319 132-1](#): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); XAdES digital signatures; Part 1: Building blocks and XAdES baseline signatures".
- [15] [eIDAS Technical Specifications](#): "SAML Attribute Profile" - Version 1.2", 31 August 2019.

2.2 Informative references

References are either specific (identified by date of publication and/or edition number or version number) or non-specific. For specific references, only the cited version applies. For non-specific references, the latest version of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

NOTE: While any hyperlinks included in this clause were valid at the time of publication, ETSI cannot guarantee their long term validity.

The following referenced documents are not necessary for the application of the present document but they assist the user with regard to a particular subject area.

- [i.1] [Regulation \(EU\) No 910/2014](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market and repealing Directive 1999/93/EC.
- [i.2] ISO/IEC TR 10000:1998: "Information technology - Framework and taxonomy of International Standardized Profiles".
- [i.3] IETF RFC 6698: "The DNS-Based Authentication of Named Entities (DANE), Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol: TLSA". <https://standards.ietf.org/rfc/rfc6698/>
- [i.4] IETF RFC 7208: "Sender Policy Framework (SPF) for Authorizing Use of Domains in Email, Version 1".
- [i.5] IETF RFC 6376: "DomainKeys Identified Mail (DKIM) Signatures".
- [i.6] NIST Special Publication 800-177: "Trustworthy Email".
- [i.7] NIST Special Publication 800-45: "Guidelines on Electronic Mail Security, Version 2".
- [i.8] IPJ - The Internet Protocol Journal - November 2016, Volume 19, Number 3: "Comprehensive Internet E-Mail Security: Review of email vulnerabilities and security threats".
- [i.9] IETF RFC 4035: "Protocol Modifications for the DNS Security Extensions".
- [i.10] IETF RFC 7489: "Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting, and Conformance (DMARC)".
- [i.11] IETF RFC 8551: "Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME) Version 4.0 Message Specification".
- [i.12] ETSI EN 319 521: "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); Policy and security requirements for Electronic Registered Delivery Service Providers".

- [i.13] IETF RFC 7817: "Updated Transport Layer Security (TLS) Server Identity Check Procedure for Email-Related Protocols".
- [i.14] IETF RFC 2046: "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Two: Media Types".
- [i.15] ETSI TR 119 001 (V1.2.1): "Electronic Signatures and Infrastructures (ESI); The framework for standardization of signatures; Definitions and abbreviations".
- [i.16] IETF RFC 8550: "Secure/Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (S/MIME) Version 4.0 Certificate Handling".

3 Definition of terms, symbols, abbreviations and terminology

3.1 Terms

For the purposes of the present document, the terms given in ETSI EN 319 532-1 [4] and the following apply:

REMIC authority: entity entitled to govern the REMIC

NOTE: A REMIC authority governs the REMIC by the management of the REMIC policy and through processes of supervision and monitoring, ensuring the adherence to the REMIC policy and the requirements specified in the present document.

REMIC policy: set of organizational, security and technical requirements that each adherent REMSP is obliged to fulfil to achieve interoperability

3.2 Symbols

Void.

3.3 Abbreviations

For the purposes of the present document, the abbreviations given in ETSI EN 319 532-1 [4], ETSI TR 119 001 [i.15] and the following apply:

CC Country Code

NOTE: As defined in ETSI TS 119 612 [12], clause 3.2.

DNS Domain Name System
EML Electronic Mail Format

NOTE: As per Internet Message Format syntax defined in IETF RFC 5322 [8].

MS Member State

NOTE: As defined in ETSI TS 119 612 [12], clause 3.2.

QERDS Qualified Electronic Registered Delivery Service

NOTE: As per the definition in ETSI EN 319 522-4-3 [11], clause 7.2.

QREMS Qualified Registered Electronic Mail Service
SAN Subject Alternative Name (or SubjectAltName) X509v3 digital certificate extension

NOTE: As per extension defined in IETF RFC 8550 [i.16], clause 4.4.3.

TSL Trust Status List

NOTE: As per the definition in ETSI EN 319 522-2 [2], clause 9.3.

3.4 Terminology

Since Registered Electronic Email Services are specific types of Electronic Registered Delivery Services, the present document uses the terms and definitions from ETSI EN 319 521 [i.12] and ETSI EN 319 522 (Parts 1 to 3) [1], [2] and [3].

ETSI EN 319 532-2 [5], clause 4.1 specifies the usage of prefixes ERD versus REM or ERDS versus REMS for naming concepts and structures.

The naming convention used in the present document is that constructs whose content is completely generated by the REMS are prefixed with "ERDS" or "REMS". In contrast, constructs whose content includes user-generated data is prefixed with "ERD" or "REM".

4 General requirements

4.1 Introduction

The present document provides one profile as intended in ISO/IEC TR 10000 [i.2]: *"the identification of chosen classes, conforming subsets, options and parameters of base standards, or International Standardized Profiles necessary to accomplish a particular function"*. In the present document the concept of profile embraces references like architectural, protocol detail, semantic and implementation aspects, and technical standard and service interoperability aspects.

More specifically, the present document specifies a REM service profile that uses the same formats (S/MIME based) and the same transport protocols (SMTP). Annex B and Annex C specify the baseline set of requirements for the implementation and configuration of interoperable REM services.

The mandatory requirements defined in the aforementioned referenced REM services specifications are not normally repeated here, but, when necessary, the present document contains some references to them.

4.2 Compliance requirements

Requirements are grouped in three different categories, each with its corresponding identifier. Table 1 defines these categories and their identifiers.

Table 1: Requirements categories

Identifier	Requirement to implement
M	System shall implement the element
R	System should implement the element
O	System may implement the element

All the requirements shall be defined in tabular form.

Table 2: Requirements template

Nº	Service/Protocol element	EN reference	Requirement	Implementation guidance	Notes

Column Nº shall identify a unique number for the requirements. This number shall start from 1 in each clause. The eventual references to it would also include the clause number to avoid any ambiguity.

Column **Service/Protocol element** shall identify the service element or protocol element the requirement applies to.

Column **EN Reference** shall reference the relevant clause of the standard where the element is defined. The reference is to ETSI EN 319 522-1 [1], ETSI EN 319 522-2 [2], ETSI EN 319 532-1 [4] or ETSI EN 319 532-3 [6] except where explicitly indicated otherwise.

Column **Requirement** shall contain an identifier, as defined in table 1.

Column **Implementation guidance** shall contain numbers referencing notes and letters referencing additional requirements. It is intended either to explain how the requirement is implemented or to include any other information not mandatory.

Column **Notes** shall contain additional notes to the requirement.

NOTE: Within a REMID, a provision different from the ones specified in the present document is viable if and only if such REMID does not envisage to interoperate with other REMIDs.

5 SMTP interoperability profile

5.1 General requirements

This clause defines a profile for interoperability among REMSPs based on SMTP relay protocol and the same formats. Under this basis, although many aspects described here are valid and reusable in other contexts, formats and protocols, all the sentences of the present part of the document mainly refer to interactions among REM services providers using - as a transfer protocol for REM messages - SMTP and its related updates, extensions and improvements (e.g. ESMTP or SMTP-AUTH, etc.).

In particular, the concepts defined in IETF RFC 5321 [7], clause 2.3.1 regarding envelope and content of the Mail Objects, and the concepts defined in IETF RFC 5322 [8], clause 2.2 and IETF RFC 2045 [9] regarding the collection of header fields, structure, formats and message representation shall apply.

5.2 Style of operation

From an interoperability standpoint, no impact is expected to occur because of the adopted style of operation by REMS (Store-And-Forward vs Store-And-Notify). Therefore, the present document shall deal with both on the same profile.

The reason for that is that any REM message exchanged between two REMSPs (even REM messages that contain a reference to the REM Object in a Store-And-Notify context) is conveyed using the Relay Interface that, within the present interoperability profile, is based on the SMTP protocol. Henceforth protocols, message formats and evidence formats are the same in the two cases.

Then, all the REMS operating under the Store-And-Notify style of operation also need a REMS operating under Store-And-Forward style of operation that represents a common layer between the two styles of operation.

Differences only arise in the set of mandatory evidence, which is specified within the two styles of operations, as described in clause 5.5.

5.3 REMS - interfaces constraints

5.3.1 Introduction

The next clauses profile the interfaces specified in ETSI EN 319 522-1 [1] and ETSI EN 319 532-1 [4], clause 5.