Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N14267
Date:	2010-04-26
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Report
Document Title:	Meeting report of the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 meeting, 7-16 April 2010 in Geneva, Switzerland
Document Source:	SC 6/WG 9 Convenor
Project Number:	
Document Status:	For your information.
Action ID:	FYI
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	3
ISO/IEC JTC1/SC6 Secretariat Ms. Jooran Lee, KSA (on behalf of KATS) Korea Technology Center #701-7 Yeoksam-dong, Gangnam-gu, Seoul, 135-513, Republic of Korea ; Telephone: +82 2 6009 4808 ; Facsimile: +82 2 6009 4819 ; Email : jooran@kisi.or.kr	

Meeting Report for WG9 April 2010 meeting in Geneva (6N14267)

1 Overview

1.1 This was a difficult meeting, with a variety of options for handling the ORS-res material, and apparent agreements falling apart on the next day, and not being finally resolved until the Wednesday evening before the Thursday WP 3 plenary and the Friday WG 17 plenary.

1.2 But the Wednesday evening agreements held, and there was no opposition in the Friday plenary. (See clause 2).

1.3 We tried to progress the Internet Draft, but there was just not enough time. We ended up with only skeleton text for changes to be implemented in the -05 draft. (See clause 3).

1.4 We also tried to progress PER Encoding Instructions and other SG17 Web pages, again with only partial completion, but some real progress. (See clause 4).

1.5 The work on an Object Identifier Handbook was not progressed as much as was intended. (See clause 5).

1.6 A lot of time was spent on joint meetings, and on new work proposals from Russia that were certainly out of scope of Q.12. These were in the end fought off as potential additions to the ASN.1 work, but some hard words had to be used.

1.7 As usual, work on Defect Reports fell off the end of the agenda, but a 12D was produced recording issues in X.660 concerning case-folding and matching.

1.8 There were few people that were present for the whole meeting (which was part of the problem. The attendance list in the Agenda and Minutes (6N14268 and TD836r1) shows the attendees as China(1), Denmark(1), France(2), Germany(1), Ghana(1), Korea(2), Russia(1), UK(3), USA(7), Japan(2), and TSB(1). However, only about eleven of these (from five countries) contributed significantly to progressing the work. See the full document for more details.

1.9 The full agenda and minutes are in 6N14268.

1.10 The Calling Notice and draft Agenda for the London WG9 meeting has been issued as 6N14270.

1.11 Notification of the (electronic) BRM for 29168-1 (25-26 July) and 29168-2 (24-25 August) is present in 6N14271.

2 ORS progression

2.1 People will no doubt be aware of the history, and I shall not repeat it here, but National Bodies should be aware that in order to support ISO-only activity, the name of the "ORS Maintenance Agency" has been changed to the "ORS Operational Agency", as stated in 6N14266.

2.2 We came into this meeting with a proposal for a technical document X.672 (already under ISO/IEC FCD 29164 ballot), and an "ITU-T Supplement" for a Procedures document.

2.3 The UK wanted the procedures document to be an ISO only Standard for the appointment of a Registration Authority. Approval had been sought and obtained for the FCD 29164 under ballot to become an FCD for 29164-1, and for an FCD for 29164-2 (the procedures document to be issued out of Geneva, with no reference to ITU-T involvement, and not as Joint Work).

2.4 The text was revised to apply this decision, but then there was a pivotal decision in the middle of the week to make 29164-2 Joint Work **with no technical change to the contents of the then current draft.**

2.5 So the end result was agreement on text for AAP Approval on X.672 (which will be Joint Text with ISO/IEC 29164-1), but with many agreed technical changes to the text in ISO, particularly correcting serious

errors in the handling of DNS security. It is, however, expected that Korea and the UK will request changes on the FCD ballot to allign the two texts before ITU-T Last Call.

2.6   The other agreement was on text for TAP Determination on X.673 (which will be Joint Text with ISO/IEC 29164-2).

2.7   The final result on the technical document (X.672 | ISO/IEC 29164-1) was ITU-T Consent to text for Last Call under AAP procedures, with the expectation that the results of the BRM on 29164-1 will be technically aligned with this, posing no problems.

2.8   The final result on the procedures document (X.673 | ISO/IEC 29164-2) was ITU-T Determination to text for Consultation under TAP procedures, and an FCD ballot (now underway) on ISO/IEC 29164-2 with identical text, again posing no problems.

2.9   Provided there are no technical problems on the two FCD ballots, the ITU-T Last Call, and the ITU-T Consultation, this will be a good outcome, with final approvals late this year and publications early next year.

3   Internet Draft

3.1   The result on this was less satisfactory, due to lack of time. We had intended to produce final text for -05 and **post a new Internet Draft**.

3.2   In the event, we only managed to put change marks into "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects.doc" (12Dxxx6).

3.3   There was an offer to obtain further US input on this, but at the time of writing, nothing has appeared.

3.4   It is hoped that this can be progressed in electronic meetings and by e-mail.

4   PER Encoding Instructions and review of all SG17 ASN.1 Web pages

4.1   Again, significant work was done, but not enough to progress to a conclusion. 12D256r1 was the main output document that will be worked on in London. (See also 12D338r5, which is a bucket that needs reviewing.)

4.2   It is also believed that we have not completely handled all the PER EIs in the published ISO/IEC 19794-7, and Homework was given to JL to produce input into London on this problem.

5   OID allocations

5.1   OID allocations were made for the ORS that will require an SC 6 Resolution in London (see 12Dxxx2, TD1025).

5.2   The suggestion for an "Examples" arc is documented in 12Dxxx4. **Chinese, Arabic, and Russian speakers are very strongly urged to provide input to this before London.**

6   OID Handbook

Broad content was produced and posted as TD1026r1, but there was little discussion at this meeting - time constraints again.

JL

24 April 2010