Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N14097
Date:	2009-10-05
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Agenda
Document Title:	The 3rd Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q.12/17 collaborative meeting on ASN.1, 16-25 September 2009 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:	36

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

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR

STUDY PERIOD 2009-2012

STUDY GROUP 17

TD 0407 Rev 3

English only

Original: English

Question(s): 12/17 Geneva, 16-25 September 2009

TEMPORARY DOCUMENT

Source: Rapporteur

Title: Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q.12/17 collaborative meeting on ASN.1 in Geneva, 16-25 September 2009

This is also ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N14097

Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q12/SG17 collaborative meeting on ASN.1 in Geneva 16-25 September 2009

NOTE – We met on Sunday 20th Sept (but not the Saturday)Contents

1 Documents for consideration DONE 3

2 Timetable 4

3 Preparatory work (½ hour Wed1 PM1) - DONE 5

4 Attendees and IPR (¼ hour Wed1 PM1) DONE 5

4.1 Attendees at Q.12 meetings 5

4.2 Ad hoc meeting attendees (in addition to the above) 5

4.3 IPR - DONE 6

5 Standardization Status and free public availability of texts, and new Unicode version (¼ hour initially Wed1 PM1, ½ hour for review of HW on Tues AM1) DONE 6

6 OID top-level domain discussion (1 hour Thurs1 13.30-14.30, H2) DONE 8

6.1 Informative annex 9

6.2 Appointment of an outside agency for the high-level OID domain zone files 9

6.3 Obtaining a .oid.xxx 9

6.4 Interim payments for .oid-xxx.org 10

6.5 Use of TAP or AAP 10

7 Ballot resolution on CD 29168 (X.oid-res) (Wed1 PM2, Thur1 AM, Thur1 PM1) DONE.....10

8 Conformance testing of the ORS (½ hour Fri1 AM1) DONE. 11

9 Relation of SG17 ORS to EPCglobal (½ hour Fri1 AM1) DONE.....11

10 Case sensitivity in ORS, punycode, and new version of Unicode (Fri1 AM1 ¾ hours, and Fri1 AM2) DONE. 12

11 Implementation issues for ORS (using CNAME and DNAME etc) (Fri PM2, Mon AM2 and Mon PM1) DONE.....13

12 ORS security/trust and performance issues (Thurs1 PM2 ½ hour) DONE for GENEVA.....14

12.1 Trust Anchor repository 15

12.2 Support for DNSSEC 15

13 Review of proposed text for Sec Generals pages (Tues AM1 ½ hour) DONE.....16

14 Request from Q.4 for an OID arc for Cyber Security (Thurs1 PM2, ½ hour) DONE. 17

15 SG16 liaison on use of XML, XML Schema, FastInfoset, and ASN.1 in H.325 (Sun AM2 ¼ hour) DONE 17

16 OID arcs for WMO CAP (Thurs1 PM2 ¼ hour) DONE.....18

17 Review Languages and description techniques used in ITU-T (Zero time) DONE.....19

18 TC215 New Work Items on OID repository interworking (Sun AM2 ¼ hour) DONE FOR GENEVA 19

19 Mutual education/tutorials related to SC 31/WG 6 (mobile and sensors), TC 122/WG 10 (supply chain applications of RFID), and the auto industry (Europe, Asia, and U.S.) (Mon PM2, 16.00 to 18.00) DONE.....21

20 PER Encoding Instructions for 3GPP (Sun AM 1) DONE FOR GENEVA. 24

21 Other PER Encoding Instructions (Sun AM2 ¾ hour) DONE FOR GENEVA.....24

22 IRI oid scheme (Sun PM) REFERRED TO ELECTRONIC MEETINGS AND JL HW and Barcelona if necessary.....25

23 OID arc and Unicode label allocations (Tuesday AM2 ¾ hour) Carried Forward to Electronic Meeting and Barcelona.....26

24 Revision of A.23 Joint Work Rules (Zero time) DONE. 28

25 Web services study group (Tues AM2 ½ hour) DONE. 28

26 Review of SG17 Web pages (Tues AM1 ¾ hour) Deferred to Electronic Meeting or Barcelona. 28

27 Defect Reports (Tues PM1) Referred to Electronic meeting or Barcelona. 29

28 Review of Future Work proposals (Tues PM1) Deferred to Electronic Meeting or Barclona, using new 12D389.....29

29 Items needed for WP3/SG17 Plenary (Wed2) Mainly done – Item A was carried forward to the electronic meeting and Barcelona.....30

30 Items needed for SC6 posting from the Geneva meeting (Wed2) DONE.....31

31 Final admin (Thurs2 PM2) CARRIED FORWARD TO BARCELONA.....31

32 Review of Tokyo HW and electronic meeting minutes and related actions (Wed1 PM1 ¼ hour) DONE.....32

33 Future meetings (Wed2) CARRIED FORWARD TO BARCELONA.....32

34 Table of output documents (Wed2) DONE.....33

35 HW during Geneva Sept 2009 DONE 34
36 HW immediately post Geneva Sept 2009 – REVIEW IN ELECTRONIC MEETINGS 34
37 HW post Geneva Sept 2009 REVIEW IN ELECTRONIC MEETINGS 35
38 Items for electronic meetings 35
39 Items for SC6 January 2010 meeting – Jl to check for agenda items and files carried forward. .. 35

1 Documents for consideration DONE

Documents for consideration at the meeting are in the meeting input folder. They are hyperlinked from the agenda items.

Documents carried forward in Document Register that are not TDs listed below: 12D097 (clause 31), 12D116 (clause 28), 12D136 (clause 28), 12D147r3 (clause 27), 12D168 (clause 28), 12D195 (clause 28), 12D251 (clause 28), 12D276 (clause 28), 12D323 (clause 28), 12D338r4 (clause 21), 12D360r1 (clause), 12D368 (clause 23), 12D374r3 (clause 27), 12D375 (clause 6), 12D377 (clause 22), 12D378 (clause 11), 12D385 (clause 10), 12D387 (no action needed).

Contributions: C 85, 86, 90, 93, 167 (clause 6), C 145 (clause 14) Done: C 184 is the last

TDs needing attention: 3006=12D124 (clause28), 3343=12D356 (clause 21), 191=12D319r4 (clause 29), 222 (clause 16), 239 (Clause 8), 242r1 (clause 6), 252=12D380 (clause 29), 264=12D306r7 (clause 29), 287 (no action needed), 283 (clause 12), 290 (clause 17), 292, 294, 295 296, 297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 304, 305, 307, 317 (no action needed), 325=6N13994=12D383 (clause 7), 327 (no action needed), 328 (clause 8), 329=12D382 (clause 32), 330 (clause 32 and 29), 331=12D384 (clause 11), 332=12D386 (clause 6), 333 (clause 29), 334 (clause 18), 335=12D364r2 (clause 32), 338 (clause 16), 348, 350, 352 (no action needed), 357 (clause 15), 369 (clause 14), http://www.itu.int/md/T09-SG17/en (clause 29), 398 (clause 33), 404 (no action needed), 407 (This document), 413 (no action needed); 414 .(for information no action needed), 416 (for information, no action needed), 419 (clause 5), 420 (for information, no action needed), 424 (clauses 6, 7 and 11), 425 (for information, no action needed), 426 (for information, no action needed) 351 and 435 (clause 31), 431 (clause 6), 434, TD 481, TD 488, TD 489, 500, 514, 530 (for information, no action needed), 499 (clause 16).

(Done: TD 551-PLEN is the last for consideration at this meeting)

Other documents: T09-SG17-R-0001 Attachment 1 (clause 6), 6N13997 (clause 9), Document Register (clause 31), Agenda and Minutes (this document clause 31), Tony Rutkowski comments on TD283 (clause 12), Discussions on case sensitivity in Unicode labels (clause 10), Positioning of .oid and related issues (clause 6), Liaison to Q.12 concerning OID allocations (clause 29), 3GPP Relaying problem PER EI (clause 20), PER Encoding Instructions (clause 21), Proposed revision of A.23 Joint Work rules (clause 24), Explanation of A.23 changes (clause 24), arpa, root and int zone files (clause 11), Presentation to CAP workshop (clause 16), E-mail correspondence re IRIs (clause 22), An alternative approach to zone files from Steven Legg (clause 11), Use of DIG (clause 11), Technical Corrigenda awaiting approval (clause 27), Some e-mail discussion on case-insensitivity of Unicode labels (clause 10), First IRI-review (clause 22), Second IRI submission (clause 22), rfc3172 - arpa guidelines (clause 6), rfc1035 - domain implementation and specification (clause 11), rfc2181 - clarifications to the DNS specification (clause 11), rfc2535 - DNS security extensions (DNSSEC) (clause 12), Domain Name System Security Extensions (Wikipedia) (clause 12), TC 215 NPs and associated docs on OIDs, (clause 18), TC 215 liaison statement for the OID documents (clause 18), 6N14061 PoW and copy of Portal (clause 5), Portal Explanatory Notes (clause 5), Introduction to OIDs by OD (clause 16), Proposed revision of page leading to Handle System (clause 13), Proposed new page for OIDs and ORS (clause 13), Guidelines on the use of colour in IEC Documents (clause 7), Early papers on hierarchical RAs schoch (clause 13), Early papers on hierarchical RAs IFIP 1981 (clause 13), SC 31 ODS CD29177 (clause 19), OID allocations in Meeting Reports (clause 23), the embedded PDF in http://www.itu.int/md/T09-TSAG-100208-TD-GEN-0061/en (clause 5), Possible IETF revision of RFC 3490 (clause 10), UK CD ballot comments (clause 7), Calling Notice for Barcelona meeting 6N14062 (clause 33), SG 17 Work plan (clause 2), Comments by OD on the contents of the submission (clause 22), Comments by OD on the associated e-mail (clause 22). Other CD ballot comments and Editor's proposed Disposition of Comments (clause 7); SC31 presentation (clause 19)

2 Timetable

SG 17 Work plan (Schedule of meetings) HISTORICAL
TD 0434 Tutorials and Presentations HISTORICAL
Timetable for WP meetings.doc HISTORICAL

NOTE 1 – We use AM1 and AM2 and PM1 and PM2 for the quarter days when necessary, otherwise we just use AM and PM, or just the whole day designation. The first day will start PM1 Wednesday. Unless otherwise agreed, we will start at 09.00 (AM1), break for coffee 10.45 to 11.15, then we have 11.15 (AM2) to 12.30, lunch 12.30 to 14.30, then 14.30 (PM1), break for tea 15.45 to 16.15, then 16.15 to 17.30 (PM2). The Rapporteur will try to adhere to that, as break discussions are often as important as main meeting discussions so please complain if sessions are over-running. The schedule is approximate.

Wed 16 AM1: SG 17 Plenary DONE

Wed 16 AM2: WP 3 Plenary DONE

Wed 16 PM1: Preparatory work (Items 3, 32, 4 and 5) DONE

Wed 16 PM2: Item 7 start - BRM DONE

Thu 17 AM: 7 continue - BRM DONE

Thu 17 13.30 to 14.30: As Hoc meeting on position of .oid and other non-technical issues (Item 6) DONE

Thu 17 PM1: Continue item 7 - BRM DONE

Thu 17 PM2 Joint meeting with Q4 (Items16 – WMO CAP, 14 – Cyber Security arc) DONE

Fri 18 AM0: (M2) Discussion of A.23 Rev 8:30 – 9:30 DONE

Fri 18 AM1: Complete clause 6 minutes. 8 – Conformance testing, 9 - EPCglobal DONE

Fri 18 PM: Start 10 – Case sensitivity, punycode, etc. DONE

Sunday 20 AM1 (9.30 start): 20 – 3GPP EIs DONE

Sunday 20 AM2: 21 – Other PER EIs DONE, 15 – SG 16 Liaison, 18 – TC 215 DONE

Sunday 20 PM: 22 – IRI progression DONE

Mon 21 AM1: Security Coordination DONE

Mon 21 AM2: 11 – ORS implementation, continue 10 – Case sensitivity, punycode, etc DONE

Mon 21 PM1: Complete 7 - BRM DONE

Mon 21 PM2: Electronic meeting with SC 31 re clause 19, 4pm to 6pm DONE.

Review of progress: It was agreed that agenda items 10, 11, 12, and 7 have to be done (on Tuesday), but that review of clause 5 HW, 26, 23, 27, and 28 could (if necessary) be deferred. Agenda items 29, 30, 33 and 34 are also essential and will form the main business on Wednesday. It is also important to start to identify the semantics of the XML page. We will try to do this on Thursday.

Tue 22 AM1: Clause 5 – ½ hour HW review DONE, 12 – DNSSEC DONE, 13 – Sec Gen pages DONE, 26 – Web pages DONE

Tue 22 AM2: 25 – Web services DONE, 23 – OID arc and Unicode label allocations DONE

Tue 22 PM1: 27 – Defect Reports, 28 – Futures DONE

Tue 22 PM2 (16.00 to 18.30) Kept free for JCA-IdM meeting DONE

Review of progress: The following items are outstanding (apart from ones which can be deferred): 15, 18, 22, 29, 30, 34, 35. It is confirmed that we are deferring to the electronic and/or SC6 meeting: 23, 26, 27, 36, 37. It is intended that the following be addressed on Thursday: Clause 5 HW, 28, 31

Wed 23 AM Start to prepare for Plenary and other items – 35 Geneva HW DONE, 29, 30, 33, 34, 18, DONE, 15

Wed 23 PM Review and finalize all output documents DONE

Thu 24 AM Progress any remaining work, 22 I-D (determine and document IANA registration procedures), 28, plan for Barcelona, 31 DONE

Thu 24 PM WP 3 meets DONE

Fri 25 SG 17 Plenary DONE

3 Preparatory work (½ hour Wed1 PM1) - DONE

3.1 Distribute initial ZIP on a stick as necessary

3.2 Update clause 1 and add to ZIP and agenda if necessary

3.3 Agree Agenda and time allocations

3.4 Review all outstanding Homework assignments from last meeting and determine actions (add to Agenda or carry forward as necessary)

4 Attendees and IPR (¼ hour Wed1 PM1) DONE

4.1 Attendees at Q.12 meetings

John Larmouth (Rapporteur & Convener, BSI, UK), j.larmouth@salford.ac.uk

Paul Thorpe (ASN.1 Editor, OSS Nokalva, USA), thorpe@oss.com

Jean-Paul Lemaire (AFNOR), lemaire@univ-parisdiderot.fr

Jun Seob Lee 이준섭 (ETRI), juns@etri.re.kr

Olivier Dubuisson (France Telecom, France), olivier.dubuisson@orange-ftgroup.com

Dongmei Xu (CESI, China), lxudm@126.com, xudm@cesi.ac.cn

Seung Jai Yi 이승재 (KISA, Korea), sjlee@nida.or.kr

Hui Zhang 张晖 (CESI, China), zhanghui@cesi.ac.cn

In-Hye Kim (KISA, Korea), ihkim@kisa.or.kr

Herb Bertine (Invited Participant), hbertine@optonline.net

Tony Rutkowski (Yaana Technologies), tony@yaanatech.com

Elaine Newton (NIST, USA), enewton@nist.gov

Arkadiy Kremer (SG17 Chairman), kremer@rans.ru

Helmut Wolf (Germany), helmut.wolf@ties.itu.int

Reiner Gusenburger (Germany), reiner.gusenburger@ties.itu.int

Jianyong Chen (WP3 Chairman, ZTE, China), chen.jianyong@zte.com.cn

Dave Chadwick (UK ITU-T delegation), d.w.chadwick@kent.ac.uk

Georges Sebek (SG17 Counselor), sebek@itu.int

4.2 Ad hoc meeting attendees (in addition to the above)

Mike Hird (UK ITU-T delegation), Michael.hird@ties.itu.int

Paul Redwin (Dept for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, UK Gov

and HoD UK ITU-T delegation), Paul.Redwin@bis.gsi.gov.uk

Yuki Kadobayashi (NICT Japan), youki-k@is.naist.jp

Craig Schultz (Little eArth Corporation, Japan), craig@cass-hacks.com

Miho Naganuma (LAC, Japan), miho.naganuma@lac.co.jp

Hiroshi Takechi (LAC, Japan), hiro@takechi.org

Yutaka Miyake (KDDI, Japan), yu-miyake@kddi.com

Ryu Watanabe (KDDI, Japan), ry-watanabe@kddi.com

Kaoru Banno, Kaoru.banno@itu.int

Francis Muguet, francis.muguet@ties.itu.int

Yoshiaki Isobe (Japan), yoshiaki.isobe.en@hitachi.com

Tetsushi Oki (Japan), ohki@kom.comm.waseda.ac.jp

Hongwei Luo (China), luohongwei@chinattl.com

Wataru Senga (KDDI), wa-senga@kddi.com

Dick Brackney (USA, DoD), rcbrack@verizon.net

James G. Ennis (US Dept of State), james.ennis@ties.itu.int

Elaine Newton (USA, NIST), enewton@nist.gov

4.3 IPR - DONE

The Rapporteur asked all attendees whether they were aware of any IPR on new material that any contributor wished to retain. All attendees said they were not aware of any such requirement. HW was given to the Rapporteur to inform the SG17 Counselor of this minute if any such requirement applied.

5 Standardization Status and free public availability of texts, and new Unicode version (¼ hour initially Wed1 PM1, ½ hour for review of HW on Tues AM1) DONE

6N14061 PoW and copy of Portal HISTORICAL
Portal Explanatory Notes HISTORICAL
(Doc 2) the embedded PDF in http://www.itu.int/md/T09-TSAG-100208-TD-GEN-0061/en HISTORICAL
Distribution of identical recommendations HISTORICAL

Summary: The new Editions of X.660 | ISO/IEC 9834 (some parts only), X.680 | ISO/IEC 8824 and X.690 | ISO/IEC 8825 have all passed their FDIS ballots without comment, and publication is awaited. Expected publication dates are not yet known for X.690 (see below). The rest are 2008. X.oid-res | ISO/IEC 29168 is work in progress and is covered (mainly) by clause 7. There are a number of known defects on the new editions that need progression, but there are no ballots in progress on defects or amendments.

The latest message was from Maho Takahashi takahashi@iso.org dated 24 August 2009: "I checked and the ITU-T published 9834 Parts 1, 3, 7 and 8. We received the final texts and are in the process of publishing them with 2008 as the publication year. Regarding 8824 Parts 1-4 and 8825 Parts 1-6, we are checking the status with the ITU-T. The X.68x series is on the way. It is a special work and I hope that it will be finished next week. We will provide a reply to your Q.1 after we hear from them. As it concerns your Q.2, the attachments (Amds and Cors) will be withdrawn as soon as the new edition is published. We are still waiting a reply from the ITU-T on the X. 690 series."

NOTE that there was an agreement dating to earlier than 2000 that where the ITU-T publication date differed from the ISO publication date, we would use the ITU-T publication date in all references. As the 2008 Versions are likely (?) to have 2009 ISO publication dates, we should remember that decision and ensure it is followed for the2008 Versions.

On the embedded .pdf document: Please note clause 6 of the General agreement, and the table in Annex A. This means that the new Editions of the X.680series, the X.690 series, and the X.660 series will be freely available to the public. We would have to rely on 6.c) for the X.890 series, and for X.oid-res.

Actions needed:

Assign HW during Geneva to agree a number for X.oid-res. Action by Tues AM1.

Assign HW during Geneva to complete or check the table below (PET). Action by Tues AM1

Also assign HW to check the limit dates for ISO/IEC 29168 on the ISO Portal (do we need any action to extend the limits? See Portal Explanatory Notes. **Current limit for starting FCD is 5 June 2010**) (JSL). Action by Tues AM1

Also assign HW to produce a 12D listing all the URLs for free availability of *all* ASN.1-related texts (in ISO and in ITU-T), checking whether all those listed in Doc 2 are already freely available (and obtain and record in the 12D) the URLs, or whether free availability is still pending (PET). Action by Tues AM1

Record in 12D97 the full text of the agreements on free availability (see above documents). Action PET.

The current table of standards is:

Designation	Edition number	Publication Date
X.680 | ISO/IEC 8824-1	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.681 | ISO/IEC 8824-2	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.682 | ISO/IEC 8824-3	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.683 | ISO/IEC 8824-4	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.690 | ISO/IEC 8825-1	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.691 | ISO/IEC 8825-2	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.692 | ISO/IEC 8825-3	2	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.693 | ISO/IEC 8825-4	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.694 | ISO/IEC 8825-5	2	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.695 | ISO/IEC 8825-6	3	ITU-T 2008 | ISO?
X.891 | ISO/IEC 24824-1	1?	ITU-T 2005? | ISO 2007?
X.892 | ISO/IEC 24824-2	1?	ITU-T 2006? | ISO 2006?
X.893 | ISO/IEC 24824-3	1?	ITU-T 2008? | ISO 2008?
X.660 | ISO/IEC 9834-1	3	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
ISO/IEC 9834-2	?	ISO 1993?
X.662 | ISO/IEC 9834-3	4	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
ISO/IEC 9834-4	?	ISO 1991?
ISO/IEC 9834-5	?	ISO 1991?
X.665 | ISO/IEC 9834-6	?	ITU-T 2005? | ISO?
X.666 | ISO/IEC 9834-7	3	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.667 | ISO/IEC 9834-8	2	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008
X.668 | ISO/IEC 9834-9	?	ITU-T 2008 | ISO 2008

X.669	?	ITU-T 2008?
X.670	?	ITU-T 2004
X.671	1?	ITU-T 2004
X.oid-res | ISO/IEC 29168	1	ITU-T? | ISO?

6 OID top-level domain discussion (1 hour Thurs1 13.30-14.30, H2) DONE.

C 85 UK letter, HISTORICAL
C 86 Germany letter, HISTORICAL
T09-SG17-R-0001 Attachment 1, HISTORICAL
TD 242r1 (Proposed ICANN letter), HISTORICAL
TD 332 Recommendations on root positioning, HISTORICAL
12D375 Establishing OID as a gTLD, HISTORICAL
Positioning of .oid and related issues (old), HISTORICAL
A very early expressed requirement from IETF for DNS support of OID (very old), HISTORICAL
rfc3172 - arpa guidelines.txt HISTORICAL
C 90 US contribution proposing TAP and not AAP HISTORICAL
C 93 UK contribution and comments on first CD HISTORICAL
C167 France Télécom Orange proposals for the ORS HISTORICAL
TD 424 Contribution from KISA and CNNIC – Attachment 2 HISTORICAL
TD 431 Ad hoc meeting Thursday 17 Sept purpose and agenda Rev 1 HISTORICAL

Summary:

("A very early requirement …" comes from URL:

http://www.ops.ietf.org/lists/namedroppers/namedroppers.2000/msg00574.html)

C 85 and C 86 are the letters of objection to the ICANN letter, from the UK and Germany. R-0001 Attachment 1 contains these plus the France Telecom input. TD 332 was produced at the interim meeting in Tokyo giving Q.12s recommendations on the progression of the positioning of the OID root in the DNS system. This is for discussion at an "open" meeting to be held in Geneva September 2009 to attempt to resolve this issue and to determine further progression. It is expected that a further contribution jointly from NIDA and CNNIC will be made to the September meeting identifying the cost and availability of ".oid" (or a look-alike with various parents). TD 332 gives more details.

It has been agreed (Tokyo 2009) that we should plan on, and recommend the positioning of ".OID." as high as we can, but that we should try to ensure a number of mirrors in different states/countries if we were not either a gTLD or had ".oid.arpa.".

It has been agreed (Tokyo) that there is no requirement for a WHOIS service in the initial Recommendation | International Standard or implementation.

It has long been agreed that we want to use DNS as the base for an ORS solution, and the Tokyo meeting reaffirmed this.

On "Positioning of .oid and related issues (old)", the Tokyo agreed that clauses 1 and 2 are factual, but still useful. Clause 3 is a further reason not to send the ICANN letter at this time. The other questions in clause 4 still need discussion, but clauses 6 and 7 provide some answers.

It is noted that whilst ICANN approves allocations under .int, the UK Joint Academic Network (JANET) manages the zone files, I understand, but I have not yet made contact with the responsible person. JL

Tony Rutkowski made some comments on attachment 2 which are recorded under clause 11 but will not be discussed in the ad hoc meeting due to lack of time for this session.

Actions needed: Determine the best location for the root of the OID tree in the DNS structure, resolve any obstacles to progress with an allocation, determine who will proceed with an allocation and when.

Determine whether to use TAP or AAP, noting the following:

The electronic meeting has discussed C90 and Figure 5a of ITU-T A.23 on the arrangements for Collaborative Work with ISO under the TAP procedures.

Q.12 is intending an interim Rapporteur F2F meeting of Q.12 with SC6 WG 9 in Jan 2010 in Barcelona. It is hoped that Administrations with concern about the ORS will be able to send a representative to Barcelona. This meeting is intended to produce text for ISO FCD ballot immediately after Barcelona.

It is our understanding that we can (assuming text is ready) initiate an FCD (4 month) ballot out of SC6 on 25 Jan 2010, then go for Determination on 16 Apr 2010 (with 6 weeks left to run on the FCD ballot, hopefully ending 25 May 2010), then as soon as the FCD ballot completes and comments are resolved (assume 1 Jun 2010), the ITU-T Directors letter goes out saying that the consultation period has started (with the text resulting from the FCD ballot resolution).

There is then a 3-month consultation period, which should terminate 1 Sep 2010, comfortably before the 5 Nov 2010 plenary of SG17 at which Approval (and then Last Call) can occur.

By contrast, with AAP there would be an FCD out of Barcelona, Consent in April 2010, Last Call starting about 1 Jun. Effectively, there is a delay of about 18 weeks with TAP rather than AAP. A decision is needed on whether this delay would or would not prejudice the use of the ORS by other Recommendations and/or by SC 31.

The assumption in both cases is that major problems are resolve in Geneva Sept 2009, and that FCD-quality text is available for April 2010. It would be good to achieve that, but it is, of course, not certain.

Discussion:

6.1 Informative annex

6.1.1 There is agreement that an informative annex will be added to X.oid-res that will address the questions raised by C-167.

6.1.2 Q.12/17 | SC6/WG9 agreed that the editor should produce an informative annex essentially copying the questions in C-167, and that the SC6 resolution and ITU-T Q.12/17 meeting report will request comments on the informative annex text (as ballot comments or SG17 contributions respectively).

6.2 Appointment of an outside agency for the high-level OID domain zone files

6.2.1 There is agreement that an open process will be used for the appointment of an outside agency. The final decision will be taken by a joint SG17 plenary resolution and SC6 plenary Resolution. (This could occur in SG17 first ratified by SC6, or vice versa.)

6.2.2 On present plans it is expected that the Barcelona meeting of SC6 will appoint an initial group of experts to consider offers for operation as the outside agency, and will issue a call for National Body nominations. The closing date for nominations will be approximately 3 months after April SG17 meeting. The April SG17 meeting will review the nominated experts and may add additional experts. It will also issue a call for ITU-T Member nominations for the outside agency by the same closing date. The panel of experts will (hopefully) agree an appointment for ratification at the next available SG17 and SC6 meetings (in either order).

6.2.3 There was a proposal that the IS department of ITU might take on this role provided further analysis revealed that the load for lookup access would be light. However, there was some Member State opposition to this, and the ITU-T Counsellor said that further consultation in TSB would be needed to determine whether they would be prepared to undertake this activity.

6.3 Obtaining a .oid.xxx

6.3.1 The discussion homed in on two options: .oid.arpa and .oid-xxx.org. .oid-xxx.com was discussed but rejected because of some Member State opposition. It would appear to offer no advantages over .oid-xxx.org.

6.3.2 The decision was taken to progress .oid-xxx.org initially. However, a formal application will not be submitted until one month after the closing plenary. It is hoped that any Member State objecting

to applying for .oid-xxx.org will offer resources for progression of an .oid.arpa application. In the latter case, work on both .oid-xxx.org and .oid.arpa will be progressed in parallel up to the point where an irrevocable application is made.

6.3.3 Subsequent discussion in Q.12/17 showed that no attendee was willing to put in the effort to obtain .oid.arpa.

6.4 Interim payments for .oid-xxx.org

6.4.1 Discussion in Q.12/17 determined that .oid-res.org was available, and that this should be used if we operate under .org. It would be important to register .oid-res.org as soon as possible (even if it is not eventually used) in order to prevent its assignment to someone else.

6.4.2 It is clear that we need an offer to take homework to do the application for .oid-res.org (subject to no objections within the month). Korean Internet and Security Agency (KISA) offered to perform and fund this activity (without prejudice to whether they eventually became the outside agency for administering the zone files) until a permanent outside agency is appointed. Q.12/17 thanks KISA for this offer, and will report this in the Q.12/17 meeting report.

6.5 Use of TAP or AAP

It was noted that C90 (US) requested TAP for the ORS Recommendation. Although this had not yet been seconded, the Rapporteur allowed limited discussion on this topic.

The meeting noted that it was not essential to decide on a change of approval track at this SG 17 meeting, and the Rapporteur was requested to include in his Q.12 meeting report a footnote to the table of "Recommendations for Consent or Determination at the next meeting" a statement that "It has not yet been decided whether AAP should be changed to TAP for this Recommendation. This may depend on the content of the text after the next round of processing."

7 Ballot resolution on CD 29168 (X.oid-res) (Wed1 PM2, Thur1 AM, Thur1 PM1) DONE.

TD 325 CD ballot text, HISTORICAL
UK CD ballot comments HISTORICAL
ISO NB comments on the 1st CD HISTORICAL
6N14072 and TD 446 Proposed DoC on CD of ISO IEC 29168 HISTORICAL
Guidelines on the use of colour in IEC Documents HISTORICAL
TD 424 Contribution from KISA and CNNIC – Attachment 3 HISTORICAL

Summary:

The closing date for the ORS (first) CD is 11 Sept 2009

Recent e-mails have established that our approach to putting .oid into the DNS (anywhere) does not allow Web access on port 80 to resource records, only application access on port 53 can retrieve these. This (if correct) needs to be made clear in the document. (I have copied this remark to clause 11 also).

The KISA and CNNIC Attachment 3 proposes text for the next CD, but it is suggested that, after an initial scan, this be deferred until consideration of clause 11.

Actions needed:

Review Editor's proposed DoC. DONE.

The Editor is to send the Approved DoC to Jooran. ASAP

Determine CD2 or FCD ballot. CD2 was agreed.

The Editor is to send new text to Jooran by 18 Oct 2009 for immediate ballot.

Discussion:

The ballot resolution was completed, with both CN and GB DISAPPROVAL comments changed to approval.

It was unanimously agreed that CD2 was appropriate due to the immaturity of text on DNSSEC, the new class(es) of NAPTR records, and the informative annex.

8 Conformance testing of the ORS (½ hour Fri1 AM1) DONE.

TD0328 ORS conformance testing HISTORICAL
TD0239 Conformance testing HISTORICAL
TD 0478 Conformance Liaison from SG11 HISTORICAL

Summary: This is a relatively new area.

Actions needed:

Review the documents, and determine if we want to proceed, and if so whether we need an NP or a project split. (The Convener currently believes that an NP may be needed, and that this should be a separate Standard – making conformance testing a separate standard is quite normal in other work, and avoids delay to the base standard).

If we proceed with an NP, who writes and submits it?

Discussion:

It was agreed that OD would draft a further reply to SG11 in reply to TD 0478. DONE

9 Relation of SG17 ORS to EPCglobal (½ hour Fri1 AM1) DONE.

6N 13997 Research on the OID (Object Identifier) Resolution System HISTORICAL
ONS 1.0.1 standard 20080529 HISTORICAL
ONS design issues HISTORICAL

Summary: CNNIC (China Internet Network Information Center) are developing software in this area, and are working closely with NIDA (Korea) in some aspects of this work. The ORS for EPCglobal has a narrower scope than the SG17 ORS.

EPCglobal is a Consortium that has defined EPC (Electric Product Code), and EPC IS (Information Services), EPC ONS (Object Name Service). It is in the process of defining EPC DS (Discovery Service). (The documents are available from the EPCglobal web-site.)

EPC ONS is a fully standardized and implemented EPCglobal protocol which uses DNS for the resolution process. It uses identifier numbers that are not OIDs, but rather EPCs, and the output is different from what we are planning for ORS.

There is an expired internet-draft authored by Ning Kong with the title "Object Naming Service (ONS) Extension for the Extensible Supply-chain Discovery Service (ESDS)" dated October 2008.

The EPC is a set of hierarchical naming schemes using numbers and ASCII text.

H.IRP is an SG16 Draft Recommendation which is capable of resolving xCode and ucode. It is expected that, if the SG17 ORS matures fast enough, H.IRP will be modified to use that, and therefore to become more general.

It is noted that there is work in ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31/WG 6 (the 29170 series) which is capable of resolving mCode.

Actions needed: Send a Liaison Statement to SG16 to remind them to base their specification on X.oid-res?

Discussion:

We received a verbal report of an interim meeting of SG16 Q.22 reaffirming willingness to use ORS in one of their protocols, but noting that they needed a 4th type of output from the ORS lookup. This was discussed in the BRM (Agenda Item 6), and the project editor was instructed to provide text in the ORS to support their requirement.

HW was given to JSL to draft a liaison to SG16 saying roughly that "SG17 Q.12 has noted the requirement from SG16 Q.22 to provide a return from an ORS lookup which contains details of the identifier structure. It has been agreed to add this to the next version of the ORS using the substructure for this information which is currently recorded in H.IRP."

10 Case sensitivity in ORS, punycode, and new version of Unicode (Fri1 AM1 ¾ hours, and Fri1 AM2) DONE.

12D385 Draft for Implementation guidance for the ORS, HISTORICAL
Discussions on case sensitivity in Unicode labels, HISTORICAL
Some e-mail discussions on case-insensitivity of Unicode labels HISTORICAL
Possible IETF revision of RFC 3490 HISTORICAL

Summary: It is hard to summarize this. We have issues on whether Unicode labels should be always case-sensitive, or only some-times, and how we handle case-folding in the ORS DNS interface, and on use of punycode or % encodings.

The document "Possible IETF revision of RFC 3490" is old, but raises three issues: Has RFC 3490 been revised? Does this have any impact on the ORS? Does the new Edition of Unicode affect any other ASN.1 texts?

The latest version of Unicode is 5.1.0:
http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.1.0/

Actions needed: Needs discussion, or an output document.

The issue of Unicode 5.1.0 and other issues addressed in the inputs above were briefly reviewed Friday PM Tokyo, but it was agreed that this is a difficult area, and all the documents (except the last) were carried forward as an unnumbered output for the Geneva September 2009 meeting (they are listed above).

Homework was given for evaluation of any ORS impact JSL) or impact on other ASN.1 texts (PET)

Discussion:

Concern has been expressed that the ability to transfer Unicode labels (which can include almost all Unicode characters) in ORS lookups and responses means that we are not using ASCII for ORS protocol. It has been agreed to add a note to the next balloted version of ORS to emphasize that the NAPTR records and the DNS inquiry are all entirely ASCII, but can support all Unicode characters by use of % or punycode encoding.

A decision has been taken to use case folding, NFKC, and punycode.

Concern has also been expressed that the ability to have all Unicode characters in Unicode labels which form DNS names, gives rise to potential phishing problems. There is nothing in the X.660 which recommends the avoidance of characters in Unicode labels which are prone to phishing attacks, for example numeric 1 and alphabetic l, and capital letter O and numeric 0.

However, text has been provided for the second proposed internet draft on security issues concerning phishing attacks.

There was further discussion on whether a defect report on X.660 to add a government health warning related to phishing (probably based on the second proposed internet draft text) should be balloted in ISO out of this meeting, and then approved in the April meeting of SG17. It was agreed that the defect editor should record a defect on X.660 saying that it should contain a government health warning about phishing in the use of Unicode labels (particularly noting the use of those labels in DNS lookups using the ORS). The government health warning will use the text (modified as necessary) from the second proposed internet draft as a note (somewhere in X.660). The precise requirement should be that after replacing any character which is subject to phishing with a wildcard, no two Unicode labels from the same node shall be the same after case folding and NFKC mapping.

It was also agreed that we need to modify X.660 (with a defect report) to require that all Unicode labels from a given node (A) shall be distinct after case folding and NFKC mapping. HW was given to the defect editor to record that X.660 has a defect. It should require that all Unicode labels from a given

node (A) shall be distinct after case folding and NFKC mapping. This defect report is for progression during an electronic meeting and then at the next SC6 meeting.

It was agreed that a clause on Security Considerations should be included in the ORS draft. This probably covers any text that we might be including related to DNSSEC and/or NSEC3, but would include reference to phishing (using the text referred to about as the basis), but saying this issue was the responsibility of X.660. It would also say "There are no other phishing issues introduced by X.oid-res other than those covered by X.660."

There was some further discussion of DNSSEC, and it was agreed to add to the BRM that there should be a note concerning problems related to privacy.

11 Implementation issues for ORS (using CNAME and DNAME etc) (Fri PM2, Mon AM2 and Mon PM1) DONE.

TD0331 Draft Implementation Guidelines for DNS, HISTORICAL
12D378 Discussion on use of a crawler to synchronize OID repository with DNS, HISTORICAL
arpa, root and int zone files, HISTORICAL
An alternative approach to zone files, HISTORICAL
Use of DIG, HISTORICAL
rfc1035 - domain implementation and specification, HISTORICAL
rfc2181 - clarifications to the DNS specification HISTORICAL
TD 424 Contribution from KISA and CNNIC – Attachment 3 HISTORICAL
TD 424 Contribution from KISA and CNNIC – Attachment 1 HISTORICAL

Summary: There was a successful demonstration in Tokyo, but some elements still need to be checked. There was general agreement that we would not progress a tutorial annex on this subject unless a national body produced a draft for such an annex as comments on the Recommendation | International Standard, but it was hoped that such input would appear.

It was noted that the demonstration was only transforming to the canonical form in the last step. There was a suggestion that transforming to the canonical form of a Unicode label at the earliest step at which it was recognized would avoid the exponential explosion that occurs when multiple Unicode labels are added to a superior arc. If this was done, the architecture would change, because the input IRI would be modified at each odd numbered step to transform the Unicode label into the canonical form for that arc.

The present pilot implementations and presentations do not handle the return of child information, nor do they illustrate the use of % escapes or puny-code for non-ASCII characters or for case sensitivity.

It was agreed at the Tokyo meeting that we needed to have standards-level text describing the requirements of the ORS in terms of look-up requirements, and particularly the handling of child information. This should describe (and the need to eliminate) the various exponential explosions and administrative requirements for the addition of new Unicode labels at a high arc. The placement of any resulting text (within the current Recommendation | Standard, an Implementers Handbook, etc) is not yet determined, but it is agreed that such text (and how to satisfy it using DNS) is certainly needed in some form of international standardization.

The arpa root and int zone files may or may not be of use in further discussions.

Tony Rutkowski has offered to run with obtaining the DNS allocation if we can get political agreement in September.

Recent e-mails have established that our approach to putting .oid into the DNS (anywhere) does not allow Web access on port 80 to resource records, only application access on port 53 can retrieve these. This (if correct) needs to be made clear in the document.

Steven Legg has commented "Punycode has value even for languages like Korean, Japanese and Chinese. RFC 3492 has an example with a simplified Chinese string with this sequence of code points:

u+4ED6 u+4EEC u+4E3A u+4EC0 u+4E48 u+4E0D u+8BF4 u+4E2D u+6587

Each of these code points will require 3 octets when encoded in UTF-8. Each of those octets would require 3 octets when %encoded. Thus each Chinese character takes nine octets to encode, or 72 octets

for the whole string, which exceeds the DNS limit of 63 octets. On the other hand, the punycode encoding is xn--ihqwcrb4cv8a8dqg056pqjye, which is 28 octets and well within the limit."

Steven Legg commented on attachment 1: "The email trail in attachment 1 captures all the important points. Table 7 as elaborated by Table 9 is still my recommended solution."

Tony Rutkowski commented on attachment 2: "In Sec. 2, Terms and definitions. The description of IANA and Jon Postel's role is not accurate. In any case, this historical description is very inappropriate and should not be propagated. I suggest the following. IANA is the "Internet Assigned Numbers Authority." The IANA activity was begun in the early 1970s as part of the DARPA network research activity as a means to assign/register values associated with the network protocols being developed. The activity was shared with the ARPA Network Information Center. It was formally named IANA in the late 1980s. Additional work should be done for the other terms. In Sec. 3, the actual root zone file can be found at ftp://ftp.internic.net/domain/. In the Annex to the Report, the last two rows in the spreadsheet should be separated out for treatment. Plainly, ITU.INT is not a TLD. Presumably you don't mean "acceptance," but "control." The use of ITU.INT is under ITU control, not ICANN's. There is also an error in the spreadsheet cell defined by INT and Purpose. The are several exceptions to the stated purpose. The most obvious one is the allocation of TPC.INT for the purpose of E.164 number resolutions for fax delivery. One of the most significant technical issues is whether NAPTR RRs are appropriate for an ORS or whether some other kind of RR specific to OID resolution may be a better choice. This issue doesn't seem to be addressed."

Actions needed: Basically, we need text for all the above in the next CD, where it is not already present. It is agreed that the PE will produce text.

Check remaining elements of the demo, and ensure there is text in the next CD (as an Annex or wherever) that documents the DNS zone files that are needed to support the OID structure within the DNS. It is agreed that the PE will produce text.

Determine whether this text should be an Implementer's Handbook or an informative Annex. It may be that this demonstration should form a major part of the text in the next round. The text needs to include error cases and the use of caching. It probably also needs to extend to the use of multiple Unicode Labels on each arc.

These can be handled in one of two ways. Either the zone table would have additional entries, and the steps illustrated in the presentation would be the same, or there could be use of CNAME records rather than multiple entries. The latter would be organizationally simpler, would require less space in the zone tables, but could be less efficient for lookup. This is simply an implementation matter, but we have yet to discuss where to place text giving advice on this.

A demo and text will ne needed on the return of child information, and on the use of %escapes or puny-code.

Discussion:

Attachment 1 of TD 424 was reviewed, and there was some discussion of the possible use of "FINAL" as in table 7 and table 9. KISA that they had now verified a CNAME/DNAME option that provided all the functionality we require, and that there did not seem to be any advantage in using the "FINAL" concept. The PE will include a full description of the agreed CNAME/DNAME approach in the body of CD2. It would be possible to have further discussion on additional improvements (including reopening the "FINAL" question) if necessary during the ballot period.

Attachment 3 of TD 424 was reviewed, and will be placed (with editorial changes) in the body of the CD2.

12 ORS security/trust and performance issues (Thurs1 PM2 ½ hour) DONE for GENEVA.

M34 - Trusted Provider Identity presentation, HISTORICAL
M10 Verisign contribution on TPI, HISTORICAL
TD 283 ATIS trust, HISTORICAL
Comments from TR on TD283, HISTORICAL
rfc2535 - DNS security extensions (DNSSEC) CARRY FORWARD

Domain Name System Security Extensions (Wikipedia) CARRY FORWARD
DNSSEC presentation from Korea CARRY FORWARD

Summary:

The following was minuted in Montreux in relation to trust issues. "There would be a requirement for the server beneath oid.itu.int to have a certificate for DNSSEC once we get beneath the level at which the oid root server operates. It was noted that the presentation in M34 with the supporting document M10 of the Montreux work provides major input into this area."

The following was minuted in Montreux in relation to performance issues. "These have not yet been addressed, but there may be interactions between the ability to cache, and the use/non-use of DNSSEC."

It has to be noted that the DNS root is not yet signed. ICANN has provided an interim trust anchor repository, but only for owners of top-level domains. Note that as of August 14, 2009, the .arpa domain has not placed a trust anchor in the ICANN Repository.

DNSSEC, even when working fully, will provide for integrity (and a few other options) on material returned, but will **not** provide encryption. Are there applications that would want the application data returned from an ORS look-up for a node to be encrypted? (Later: It was noted that DNS is intended to provide the same information to all inquirers without any form of access control. Thus lookup from a node cannot be encrypted.)

Actions needed:

Discuss the problems with DNSSEC, and determine how to handle the need for a trust anchor. Presumably the OID DNS zone file custodian would "own" the private key for encrypting the high-level DNS-OID-mirror zone files, but where would we publish the matching OID public key? Perhaps in the OID Repository, in the same format as the ICANN Repository? Or wait to see if we get a public key for the root and proceed from there? Do we have the same public-private key pair for all the high-level nodes, or a separate one for each?

Is there an encryption issue to be discussed on the return of application data from a DNS node?

What text do we need in CD2 in these areas?

Discussion:

12.1 Trust Anchor repository

The IANA Interim Trust Anchor Repository is at https://itar.iana.org/anchors/ and it contains the trust anchor for .org using RSA/SHAH-1 (NSEC3). Expires July 1, 2010.

12.2 Support for DNSSEC

Note – The RFCs relevant to this discussion are: rfc4033, rfc4034, rfc4035 CARRIED FORWARD

12.2.1 Actors:

1. We have .org (secured with a private key and a public key which is either signed by the node above .org or is a well publicized trust anchor).
2. We have the OID high level zone files (HLZF) maintained by the HLZF Manager.
3. We have zone files managed by some other organization that hang from an OID-DNS note maintained by the HLZF manager.

12.2.2 Options:

1. The HLZF is not secured. This is minimum work for the HLZF manager, but restricts the options for Actors 3.
2. The HLZF is secured. This requires that the HLZF manager generates public/private key pairs for each of the DNS names in the HLZF with the public key for the highest of these nodes signed by Actor 1. (We have not yet determined the precise administrative mechanism that will be provided by Actor 1 for this purpose).

3A. (Necessary only if the HLZF is not secured – Option 1). Any Actor 3 can choose their node to be unsecure. It they wish it to be secured, then they generate a private/public key pair and arrange for their public key to be publicized as a trust anchor for their branch of the tree.

3B. (Only available if the HLZF is secured – Option 2). Any Actor 3 can choose their node to be unsecure, or they can choose it to be secured. It they choose it to be secured, then they can either:

a. generate a private/public key pair, and arrange to have their public key signed by Actor 2. (We would expect the precise administrative mechanism that will be provided by Actor 2 to be the same as those provided by Actor 1 in Option 2); or they can

b. generate a private/public key pair and arrange for their public key to be publicized as a trust anchor for their branch of the tree.

12.2.3 Q.12/17 has to take a decision on whether it requires the HLZF Manager to operate with Option 1 or Option 2. The eventual text in X.oid-res will state which of options 1 and 2 have been decided, and the implications of this decision, essentially be copying the text of 3A or 3B suitably reworded or expanded.

12.2.4 If we decide to go for Option 2, then we should mandate the use of NSEC3 in order to avoid any privacy concerns, and note this in the X.oid-res.

12.2.5 The CD2 text will describe the Actors and Options above, but will state that a decision has not yet been taken on option 1 or option 2, but will include the text of 12.2.4. It is expected that there will be ballot comments on the accuracy of the above, and on the choice of option 1 or option 2.

13 Review of proposed text for Sec Generals pages (Tues AM1 ½ hour) DONE.

Proposed revision of page leading to Handle System HISTORICAL
Proposed new page for OIDs and ORS HISTORICAL
Early papers on hierarchical RAs schoch HISTORICAL
Early papers on hierarchical RAs IFIP 1981 HISTORICAL
TD 0395 Information on Digital Object Identifier System with Addendum 1 HISTORICAL

Summary:

The TSB has requested text for inclusion in the Sec Generals pages to balance the text on the handle system. The current pages are at:

http://www.itu.int/osg/csd/emerging_trends/

http://www.itu.int/osg/csd/emerging_trends/handle_system/index.html

The contents have been agreed as:

a) The Object Identifier concept (very brief history, other uses of the words, the – important – concept of a distributed hierarchical set of RAs).

b) Practical deployment (the OID Repository – introduction, some important uses? eg WMO CAP, e-health, Directory, RSA, RFID tags, Cyber security (?) others – preferably some US ones - NASA????)

c) The basic OID tree 1986 vintage (numerical arcs, secondary identifiers – techy stuff)

d) The introduction of Unicode labels in 2007, and a summary of the new provisions, with mention of IRI

e) A reference to the OID Repository for details of the tree.

f) The emerging ORS (motivation, and its links to the DNS system).

Actions needed: Review text from JL. Consider adding links to "early papers", and to the free X.660 series texts (what is the best URL for these free texts from ITU-T? are the 2008 versions available free yet), and to the "downloads" of the JL and Olivier books on the OSS site for the right-

hand column of the main paper. (This is probably better than having no right-hand column.) Are there any other links that could usefully be added?

Determine who will progress this further (Georges Sebek?)

Discussion:

The proposed pages were briefly reviewed, and homework was given for OD to finalize the pages, and post as a TD. This will be referenced in the Q.12/17 and WP3 meeting reports.

14 Request from Q.4 for an OID arc for Cyber Security (Thurs1 PM2, ½ hour) DONE.

TD0369 Request for OID arc for cyber security HISTORICAL
C 145 Creation of a discovery framework for CYBIEF HISTORICAL

Summary:

They request a joint meeting to discuss TD 369. We can certainly do more or less any of their options; we just need discussion on which to do.

There is a broader issue of what OID support is needed for C 145, and whether it can be accommodated under the solution of TD369. (Additional time has been allocated from the previous rev to accommodate this discussion.)

Actions needed: Allocate an arc and send liaison to SC6 to allocate in January 2010, and then update the OID Repository and main register (once we have one!).

Determine what, if anything to do about C 145.

Discussion:

14.1 It was agreed to allocate arc {joint-iso-itu-t(2) cybersecurity(48)} for use by a new ITU-T Recommendation X.cybief.1 ("Procedures for registration of arcs under the Cybersecurity object identifier arc"), when the approval process commences for X.cybief.1. The Editors should include a note in early drafts as a reminder that this needs to be done.

14.2 At the same time, we will allocate a long arc from the root to 2.48 allowing "oid:/Cybersecurity/etc…."

14.3 It was agreed that Q.4/17 and Q.12/17 will work jointly on OID aspects of X.cybief.1.

14.4 HW was given to OD to reserve the arc 2.48 will in the OID repository following this meeting. DONE.

15 SG16 liaison on use of XML, XML Schema, FastInfoset, and ASN.1 in H.325 (Sun AM2 ¼ hour) DONE

TD0357 Liaison from SG16 on use of ASN.1 in H.325 HISTORICAL

Summary:

H.325 will use XML encoding, and will use XSD to specify it. Use of FastInfoset is still up for grabs as a binary encoding, but they appear to have ruled out X.694. Is this curious?

They have many questions related to extensibility that need extensive answers. I hope we can find time to do that (or allocate Homework).

Actions needed:

This requires a detailed response. We need to find someone to take homework to draft the detailed response, to review it, and to send it.

Do we want to ask for a mapping from the XSD to ASN.1 using X.694, and possible provision of an additional binary encoding, or not?

Are we happy with their approach to extensibility?

Discussion:

OSS experts were asked to draft a response to this which will need review Wed2. DONE

A liaison was issued to SG16 (and a similar one to ISO/IEC JTCC 1/SC 37.

16 OID arcs for WMO CAP (Thurs1 PM2 ¼ hour) DONE.

TD0222 OIDs for CAP, HISTORICAL
TD0338 WMO CAP, HISTORICAL
Presentation to CAP Workshop WIS-CAP-2009, HISTORICAL
Introduction OIDs by OD HISTORICAL
TD 0499 Liaison statement on proposed OID for alerting HISTORICAL

Summary: **(**Referred to electronic meeting to tidy up, but not done, but CAP workshop has provided new input).

Scheduled for joint meeting with Q4.

Eliot Christian wrote "Together with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and OASIS (the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) hosted a small, single-issue workshop at WMO in Geneva, 22-23 June 2009. This focused identifiers associated with the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP, ITU Recommendation X.1303). The Workshop produced a "Draft Implementers' Note on Harmonizing Certain Identifiers in CAP Implementations", available at

http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/www/ISS/Meetings/WIS-CAP_Geneva2009/DraftNote.doc

The Workshop Document Plan, including written contributions that were considered during the drafting, is available at

http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/www/ISS/Meetings/WIS-CAP_Geneva2009/DocPlan.html"

We also have from OD: "The proposal is to allocate an OID under top-level arc 2 for "alerting" purposes (probably, 2.43, considering that 2.42 is pre-allocated to telebiometrics, but we'll discuss in September if a better encoding is necessary, in which case we'll use 2.28).

From JL: It was proposed that the ITU/TSB could be the Registration Authority for that OID. (One subsequent OID would be allocated to WMO for the alerts they deal with according to their treaty. Other subsequent OIDs will be allocated for other kinds of alerts when the need arises.)

I believe ITU-T Q.12/7 (working in collaboration with Q.4/17) and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 will have to produce a joint Recommendation | International Standard (in the ITU-T X.670 | ISO/IEC 9834 series) to define the rules of operation of the RA for that new arc. I don't expect this to be a lot of work but we need to tell the RA what it should do."

JL: Drafting the new Recommendation | International Standard may be (fairly) trivial, but someone needs to take ownership and write the first draft. Also, I think we would need an NWI (or at least a project split) in SC 6. Suggestions?

As a last remark, I think this new Recommendation | International Standard could become standard text for many arcs under arc 2, by a simple Corrigendum to add a new arc. I am thinking particularly of the possible e-health arc.

Actually, following that thread, could we do the whole thing by a Corrigendum (or amendment) on X.668 to add details of handling this new arc (and any future additions)? It probably needs to be an amendment, but as the body of the text will be the same.

I am just trying to reduce the effort of producing text for the new RA.

From Tony: "There seem like two answers. Register WMO in 1.1.3 and they can set a registration authority or outsource it. Alternative have TSB establish an arc for X.1303 and it could manage or outsource it. The advantage of this option is global coherency among all CAP objects. We could also easily move forward because it's under Q4/17's TOR. Use the new OID resolver to implement."

JL: "I think I would envisage allocation of 2.43 using the normal procedures, a country arc beneath that in the normal way, and then an RA to agree and allocate other arcs under 2.43 for Microsoft or ITU-T or WMO or whatever. But there are many variations on this theme.

I think there is merit in having a single top-level arc for all CAP activity, rather than people allocating CAP stuff under a miscellany of other arcs.

PS I believe that there is a VERY strong synergy between the needs of HL7 and of CAP in this area (both have country-specific formats and protocols and management identification, and both have the need to also include international standardised definitions). Note that TC 215 seem to be asking (in an NWIP) for a mechanism to access (via an ORS look-alike) all health-related OIDs which have already been more or less randomly allocated lower down the tree. Having all CAP-related stuff hang from a high-level long arc "/Cap" would be good and simpler."

Actions needed:

Allocate the arc and discuss the problems of producing an RA Recommendation.

Make the OID presentation by OD a 12D? (to be posted as a TD by OD) DONE as TD 488.

Discussion:

16.1 It was agreed to allocate arc {joint-iso-itu-t(2) alerting(49)} for use by a new ITU-T Recommendation X.alerting ("Procedures for registration of arcs under the Alerting object identifier arc"). It was referred to Q.12/17 discussion to identify a person who would produce the first draft of X.alerting for the January Q.12/17 meeting. The title should be reviewed by Q.12/17. There was no volunteer to draft this recommendation, but until the requirements are confirmed by WMO (see LS TD 499), there is no urgency for a draft. It is referred to the next meeting to identify an initial editor to draft the text for the new ITU-T Recommendation X.alerting ("Procedures for registration of arcs under the Alerting object identifier arc"). Q.12/17 agreed the title.

16.2 At the same time, we will allocate a long arc from the root to 2.49 allowing "oid:/Alerting/etc…."

16.3 SG17 will be asked to resolve these allocations at this meeting, and SC6 to confirm them at its Jan 2010 meeting.

16.4 OD agreed to draft a Liaison statement to WMO explaining that we intend to allocate (in the new Recommendation X.alerting) the OID {joint-iso-itu-t(2) alerting(49) wmo(0)} and a Unicode label allowing WMO to perform further allocations under oid:/Alerting/WMO/etc…. The liaison statement will ask WMO to confirm that this meets their requirements. DONE TD 499.

16.5 OD has HW to reserve the arc 2.49 in the OID repository following this meeting. DONE.

17 Review Languages and description techniques used in ITU-T (Zero time) DONE.

TD0290 ITU-T languages and description techniques HISTORICAL

Summary: SG2 are using ASN.1 for information type definitions in a new amendment in Rec. M.3020, the methodology for specification of management interfaces. The contact is Mr Knut Johannessen knut.johannessen@telenor.com

Actions needed: None. For info only unless raised by an attendee.

Discussion:

18 TC215 New Work Items on OID repository interworking (Sun AM2 ¼ hour) DONE FOR GENEVA

TC 215 NPs and associated docs on OIDs, CARRIED FORWARD
TC 215 liaison statement for the OID documents, CARRIED FORWARD
TD 334 Liaison to TC215 re OID Repository interchange CARRIED FORWARD

Summary: These NPs were discussed in Tokyo, and a liaison was output (TD 334).

The OID Project Leader and the Rapporteur/Convener were invited to the BRM for these (approved) NPs between 18-21 Oct in Durham, North Carolina, USA (others could also attend)

Contact is Audrey Dickerson, TC215 Secretary adickerson@himss.org

JL wrote: " The general tone of our Liaison Statement is to say that what you do with the NWIP on the management of OIDs is of no concern to SC 6 or Q.12/17 (but of course we will be interested to be kept informed.), but that the exchange format you are proposing **is** of considerable interest, and we believe it should be global, and not restricted to e-health. We also believe that an additional binary format carrying the same semantics would be highly desirable. Thus we are proposing the strongest possible liaison between ITU-T SG 17 Q12 - a collaborative team producing common text for an ISO Standard and an ITU-T Recommendation under procedures and rules equivalent to those of Annex K of the JTC 1 Directives. It will be for the Durham meeting to agree or refuse that (I am certain that ITU-T SG 17 would readily accept it). This would probably be the major topic of our involvement in Durham, but I am sure that TC215 Experts (after reading the Liaison Statement) are likely to have questions about the procedures for a collaborative team producing common text, and I would be very happy to answer those by e-mail well in advance of Durham."

The latest e-mail was from JL: I think there is no way that either Olivier or myself can be F2F present in Durham (funding), and if you cannot provide even a sound linkage, then I fear we must leave it to you to resolve your NP comments *** and address our Liaison statement from ISO SC 6 (which I guess you now officially have?) ***. There is nothing more I wish to send, but it would be good to get an early response (before Sept 16) from someone (Heather heather@lginformatics.com I guess?) that will be driving the formal response to our liaison. It was my intention at the September meeting of SG 17 to warn of a possible positive response to our liaison regarding joint work, and to get approval in principle to the joint work that is proposed in that liaison. Unless I get something back from you or Heather before Sept 16, I will not be able to do that. Is it possible to get at least an informal response to our liaison by 16 Sept (preferably a week earlier!)? *** Please confirm that you have formally received the liaison statement from SC6 (a copy is attached), and that you will respond formally to it as part of your NP ballot resolution. ***

Unfortunately the reply was very negative: "I will ask WG 3 on Semantic Content to address your concerns. Hope to have an answer for you after the Durham meetings."

I replied further: "I suppose that means we will get nothing for our September meeting, and no advance intimation of your likely response to our Liaison Statement before Durham? I guess we find this disappointing, but let us see what comes out of Durham. You did not confirm that you had received an official copy of the SC6 liaison, and I have not found it posted yet on the UK TC 215 mirror. Has it got lost? If so, we need to chase it up. It was my expectation that it would be considered as part of the NP Ballot Resolution meeting in Durham. Is that not the case?

Much is now (Early Sept 2009) happening in the UK to try to get some sort of response to our liaison, but it is not yet clear what that response will be. Something may be available for Geneva. It would be good if other ASN.1 participants could make contact with their TC 215 mirrors to involve themselves in this issue.

JL hopes to provide a short update on the UK position on this, but this is not yet approved.

An e-mail from the TC215 WG3 Convenor on 12 Sept said "It is unlikely that this work will be completed in Durham and all documents are shared with the NMB as part of the circulation and voting system. I haven't yet seen that draft. Audrey is it appropriate to include John on the communication list for this project? That is the way I would prefer to handle it so that SC6 can share the document and provide input." JL says "I don't think this is addressing the main issues in our liaison. There is either a blockage or something. I do not know what "I haven't yet seen that draft" is referring to."

Actions needed: Discuss the TC215 NPs, our response, and the current situation. (It now seems unlikely that we will get a positive response to our liaison – what next to do?)

It is possible that this cooperation is dead, and that TC215 will go their own way on an OID Repository XML-based Exchange Standard.

Should we consider initiating work in SG17 and SC6 to produce a counter and more general OID Repository (binary and XML-based) Exchange Standard, specified with ASN.1?

Appoint JL and OD as SG17 Liaison Officers to TC215?

Discussion:

JL reported that he had understood that there was agreement at the UK mirror of TC215/WG3 that the UK Chair of the TC215 mirror would inform the Chair of TC215, and the Convenor of TC215/WG3 that the UK would have a position at the Durham, NC, that TC 215 should accept the invitation to produce common text with SG17 on the OID repository export format.

Unfortunately, the UK delegate in Q.12/17 has not yet received confirmation that this was sent.

If the confirmation had been received, it was intended to produce a liaison with SG17 approval for the joint work.

It was noted that common text would be extremely difficult to approve because of the common printing procedures. Instead, we would use twin text, and this would have been made clear in any liaison that we produced.

It was agreed to produce a liaison from SG17 to TC215:

Noting that SC6 had proposed collaborative work between ISO TC 215 WG3 and SG17 on the production of Twin Text for an ISO TC 215 Standard and an ITU-T Recommendation on an export format for OID repositories, SG17 would welcome the establishment of this project as collaborative work.

The Q.12/17 meeting report will reference this liaison, drawing attention to the last sentence above, and to the addition to our action plan (which will say "Subject to agreement by TC 215"), and the inclusion of X.oid-exp ("Object Identifier Repository Export Format") in our list of recommendations for later in the study period.

We also need to produce (and reference in our meeting report) a revised summary TD.

19 Mutual education/tutorials related to SC 31/WG 6 (mobile and sensors), TC 122/WG 10 (supply chain applications of RFID), and the auto industry (Europe, Asia, and U.S.) (Mon PM2, 16.00 to 18.00) DONE.

SC 31 ODS CD 29177 HISTORICAL
SC 31 presentation Harmon HISTORICAL

Summary:

There have been e-mail interactions (mainly between OD and Craig K Harmon craig.harmon@qed.org related to ISO/IEC 15459 and to possible overlap of provision between ONS and ORS for accessing supply chain RFID information. It is expected that OD will expand on this summary.

Craig: "It is my understanding that one would need to add two bytes of information to provide "connectivity" to the ITU recommendations (X.668) regarding a master "resolver", i.e., an OID. I have actually built this feature into my revision of 1736x, Supply chain applications of RFID, but at the end and not the beginning of the message (the beginning of the message is already committed). Presently, we do not have URLs or URNs built into anything other than EPC. The OIDs that would be developed would be for application standards, e.g., 1 0 17367 x, however, that information is not carried anywhere except by the registration of the meanings of established Application Family Identifiers (AFIs), e.g. AFIs 0xA1 through 0xAA.

I would also like to let you know that many applications will not be using all of 15962, so your OID precursor might not be there. One would need to infer the OID from an AFI that appeared in memory bank 01 of an 18000-6c or 18000-3m3 tag.

It would probably be best if your folks were fully aware of what we are doing in SC 31/WG 6 (mobile and sensors), TC 122/WG 10 (supply chain applications of RFID), and the auto industry (Europe, Asia, and U.S.) . . . and I well understood what you are proposing, because while I think I understand there is a lot of fuzziness with my understanding of the work of SG 16 and SG 17.

We have requested a tutorial from Craig to introduce to us what is happening in SC 31/WG 6 (mobile and sensors), TC 122/WG 10 (supply chain applications of RFID), and the auto industry (Europe, Asia,

and U.S.). This is scheduled for 21 September 2009 at 1400 UTC (4pm Geneva time) using an analogue Voice Bridge and GotoMeeting – see below.

Details for the Voice Bridge are:

Monday 21 16:00-18:00 Geneva time (UTC 14:00-16:00).

+41 22 730 6282

Pin code: 4742

Details for GotoMeeting are:

https://www1.gotomeeting.com/join/414557520
Meeting Password: rfidors
Meeting ID: 414-557-520

Later e-mail discussions indicated that whilst Craig might e-mail us a tutorial on the above subjects, he was primarily interested in our input on what we were doing in relation to RFIDs.

Craig also said: "I have copied the three SC 31/WG 6 Liaison Officers to ITU-T/SG 16 and ITU-T/SG 17 and the WG 6 Secretary:

- You Sung Kang - Liaison Officer from SC 31/WG 6 to ITU-T SG17 youskang@etri.re.kr
- Yong-Woon Kim - Liaison Officer from SC 31/WG 6 to ITU-T SG17 qkim@etri.re.kr
- Sang-Keun Yoo - Liaison Officer from SC 31/WG 6 to ITU-T SG16 lobbi@etri.re.kr
- Se Won Oh - SC 31/WG 6 Secretary sewonoh@etri.re.kr

This dialogue began with Olivier's concerns about my presentation to SC 31 on the work of ITU-T and specifically SG 17. I have invited SG 17 to provide additional information about what you have done or are doing that would be of interest to:

- Supply chain applications of RFID
- Mobile Item Identification & Management
- Real time locating systems
- Security
- Sensors and sensor networks

- - - break line - - -

If you have applications that require assignment of bits on a tag, in the interrogator, or in between, I have a particular interest. If there are data structures that are expected to move from the interrogator (mobile) to the network or from the network to the interrogator (mobile), we have a particular interest. If there are commands and responses that are envisioned to operate in this mobile environment, we have a particular interest.

- - - break line - - -

I would well like to understand the above text between the break lines."

JL replied to OD and Jun: "Can we determine our presentation (and who gives it) in Geneva, or do we need some earlier e-mail interaction? I guess the above bold text would provide the non-generic part of our presentation. Who would be best to drive that? Probably Jun?"

A later e-mail from JL (specifically related to the ods) said (parts snipped):

"The ballot on the CD for the ors terminates on 11 Sept. The CD for the ods is dated 27 July, so the ballot probably terminates around 27 October. The ods seems to be intended to support only mcode. By contrast, the ORS handles international OIDs of arbitrary depth with names as well as numbers, but the canonical form is numbers only. "mcode" is already in the OID tree as 2.27.1, or /tag-based/mcode. The return of the ods is a single URI; the return of the ors is arbitrarily many URLs (subject to length restrictions on DNS records, I think). On this basis, the ods provides a subset of ors functionality, with no attention to integrity and trust. From the SC 6 perspective, it would be better if the ods text simply described how to get the mcode values from the RFID tag and to map them into a canonical OID, and then use ORS for the look-up. That would avoid two different and similar mechanisms. However, by going direct with the top-level mcode value xxx, SC 31 would have xxx.ods.arpa (a three-level DNS look-up), whereas going via the ors they would have xxx.mcode.tag-based.oid.arpa (a five-level DNS

look-up). I do not know whether this matters, given that DNS look-up caching will occur anyway. I also do not know who SC31 intends to administer .ods.arpa, but it looks like KISA. If the ods were based on the ors, then the top-level arcs of the OID tree would be on one server (pointed to by the .arpa server), and that server would point to the ods server, so we would have three servers involved (the one with the .arpa zone files, the one with the .oid.arpa zone files, and the one with the .mcode.oid.arpa zone files). There is in principle no reason why the same organization could not provide the server for the .oid.arpa and the .mcode.oid.arpa zone files (without prejudging whether this would be KISA or NIDA (for example), in which case there are the same number of servers involved, and no real efficiency concerns."

I have been asked to emphasise that this is an informal meeting of Experts for the purpose of exploring the interactions and dependencies. The meeting is open to all Experts on both sides, and is not empowered to take any decisions on either side, although the Rapporteur will attempt to record the discussions (and any tentative agreements) below.

JL sent:

"The ballot on the CD for the ors terminates on 11 Sept. The CD for the ods is dated 27 July, so the ballot probably terminates around 27 October.

The ods seems to be intended to support only mcode, which is a two (perhaps three) level hierarchy (of numbers only, I think). By contrast, the ORS handles international OIDs of arbitrary depth with names as well as numbers, but the canonical form is numbers only.

"mcode" is already in the OID tree as 2.27.1, or /tag-based/mcode. The return of the ods is a single URI; the return of the ors is arbitrarily many URLs (subject to length restrictions on DNS records, I think).

On this basis, the ods provides a subset of ors functionality, with no attention to integrity and trust.

From the SC 6 perspective, it would be better if the ods text simply described how to get the mcode values from the RFID tag and to map them into a canonical OID, and then use ORS for the look-up.

That would work, I am 99% sure, and would avoid two different and similar mechanisms.

I suppose from the SC 31 perspective, by going direct with the top-level mcode value xxx, they would have xxx.ods.arpa (a three-level DNS look-up), whereas going via the ors they would have xxx.mcode.tag-based.oid.xxx (a five-level DNS look-up).

I do not know whether this matters, given that DNS look-up caching will occur anyway

I also do not know who SC31 intends to administer .ods.arpa, but it looks like KISA.

I suppose the ods is less politically sensitive than the ors simply because it is restricted to a single application and coding scheme and a limited size of tree.

If the ods were based on the ors, then the top-level arcs of the OID tree would be on one server (pointed to by the .arpa server), and that server would point to the ods server, so we would have three servers involved (the one with the .arpa zone files, the one with the .oid.arpa zone files, and the one with the .mcode.oid.arpa zone files).

There is in principle no reason why the same organization could not provide the server for the .oid.arpa and the .mcode.oid.arpa zone files (without prejudging whether this would be KISA or NIDA (for example), in which case there are the same number of servers involved, and no real efficiency concerns."

Craig wrote:

"One can find the SC 31/WG 6 documents at http://www.autoid.org/SC31/sc_31_wg6.htm

I would draw your specific attention to:
wg6n0148_SC31N2896_NP21451-7.zip
wg6n0137_Txt_CD29179_API_20090520.doc 259KB
wg6n0135_Txt_CD29178_SB_20090520.doc
wg6n0133_Txt_CD29177_ODS_20090520.doc
wg6n0131_Txt_CD29176_Privacy_20090520.doc
wg6n0129_Txt_CD29175_AD_20090520.doc

wg6n0127_Txt_CD29174_MII_20090520.doc
wg6n0125_Txt_CD29173_Device_P_20090520.doc
wg6n0123_Txt_PDTR29172_Ref_20090520.doc

Actions needed: Prepare for and attend telecom on date/time Mon 21 Sept 4pm Geneva time.

The proposed agenda is:

- Presentation about what SG 17 is doing.
- A short presentation by a Korean colleague about H.IRP in SG 16 (this would be useful, as H.IRP plans to rely on X.oid-res in much the same way as SC 31 might consider.
- Presentation about the work of SC 31/WG 6.
- Questions for clarification.
- Action items.

Following this meeting we need to discuss whether it is appropriate to send a liaison to SC31.

Discussion:

There was a lengthy GoToMeeting with analog voice which worked well. It was mainly concerned with a presentation by Craig of the .ppt file listed at the head of this agenda item.

It was agreed that OD would send Craig some more formal material about the work of Q.12/17. It was left to OD to either send it informally or to draft a liaison statement in time for submission as a TD on Wednesday evening.

20 PER Encoding Instructions for 3GPP (Sun AM 1) DONE FOR GENEVA.

3GPP relaying problem PER EI CARRIED FORWARD

Summary: This problem is broadly understood, and covered in the document. Colin has agreed that our outline solution is OK.

Actions needed:

Produce a revised output outlining the solution, after discussion.

If possible produce proper EI text to handle this, with an update of the Web pages.

Discussion:

JL presented his document above. Unfortunately, time did not permit much discussion, and there is disagreement between PET/JPL and JL whether the solution works without requiring the octet string to be at the end. It was referred to the electronic meeting to progress this further, following JL homework (see clause 36).

PET also raised another RAN2-related problem concerning whether a decoder is required to ignore material (which is length delimited) in a known extension if the length value exceeds the encoding of the *known* extension. JL stated that he was 100% certain that there would be no text to say that, and a lot of text that solidly implied the opposite. Attempts to produce "back-door" extension mechanisms in this way would be highly unlikely to work (JL's opinion only – no time for further discussion.) JL further commented that we badly needed to get F2F involvement of the ASN.1 group with RAN2 at this critical time to ensure that PER was not misused, and that mistakes were not made.

21 Other PER Encoding Instructions (Sun AM2 ¾ hour) DONE FOR GENEVA.

12D356 Web Page for PER EIs, CARRIED FORWARD
12D338r4 Proposals for PER encoding instructions as at 21 Dec CARRIED FORWARD

Summary: It was agreed (Tokyo 2009) that we go for left alignment of the unaligned PER encoding within the EI specified field, both to accommodate published and CD Standards, and because it is more consistent with ALIGNED PER.

19794-11 (under CD ballot closing June 2009), and discussed in Moscow uses a number of other PER EIs.

There appear to be two encoding instructions that were not allowed as prefixes, only in the Encoding Control Section – TEXT and NAMESPACE. This may need further consideration.

Actions needed:

Implement the change to left alignment in the Web pages.

Check EIs used by 19794-7 and 19794-11 and progress urgently.

Progress work on one or more of the PER Encoding Instructions identified for immediate work (see 12D338r4). To determine whether/how to proceed, and who/when will draft text.

Revise website text as appropriate (see 12D356). This is now increasingly urgent due to use of PER EIs in ISO/IEC 19794-11.

Review the TEXT and NAMSPACE EIs.

Discussion:

Unfortunately, time did not permit much discussion of this topic. It was referred to the electronic meeting to progress this further, following JL homework (see clause 36).

22 IRI oid scheme (Sun PM) REFERRED TO ELECTRONIC MEETINGS AND JL HW and Barcelona if necessary.

12D377 Internet draft for OID IRI registration HISTORICAL
E-mail correspondence re IRIs HISTORICAL
First IRI-review HISTORICAL
Second IRI submission HISTORICAL
Comments by OD on the contents of the submission HISTORICAL
Comments by OD on the associated e-mail HISTORICAL
Second version posted text draft-larmouth-oid-iri-01 CARRIED FORWARD
Second version posted XML draft-larmouth-oid-iri-01.xml CARRIED FORWARD
Confirmation of i-d posting CARRIED FORWARD
draft-larmouth-oid-iri-02.xml CARRIED FORWARD

Summary:

Note that the list of URI/IRI schemes is at:

http://www.iana.org/assignments/uri-schemes.html

See also See section 5 of http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4395.txt.

From Marshall Rose: "At http://xml.resource.org/experimental.html you will find a preliminary version of xml2rfc.tcl that implements the IETF Trust language of November, 2008. Briefly, the ipr attribute of the <rfc> element now accepts three additional values: trust200811, noModificationTrust200811, and noDerivativesTrust200811."

We had a comment on the first draft "(2.9) Security Considerations: The non-considerations presented here will be a show-stopper in the IESG, if not replaced by serious considerations. Please see the URI Scheme specifications published in the recent past (to locate these, please look up the IANA URI Scheme registry). See also Section 2.7 of RFC 4395."

Another e-mail comment (Steven Legg) was "On reading RFC 3987, I think that extending the urn:oid scheme does get you what you want. A scheme applies to both URIs and IRIs and an identifier has both a URI representation and an IRI representation. If the urn:oid scheme is extended to allow Unicode labels, then an Internationalized OID that uses non-ASCII labels would be represented with escapes when transferred as a URI, but would be represented naturally without escapes when transferred as an IRI. Whether a URI or an IRI is used in any particular case is determined by the context.

Another ultimate fall-back option is to a) Delete the X.660 Annex about IANA registration, with a Corrigendum (a pain, but do-able), and b) Keep everything else, and change the terminology in the repository to say "ASN.1 OID-IRI" in all places where a raw "IRI" occurs.

JL has now produced full proposed text for both the I-D and the accompany e-mail.

The comments by OD on both of these need to be addressed.

Actions needed:

Check that we have addressed the comment about 2.9, and all other comments

Review and agree all available documents, post I-D, and ask for e-mail uri-review.

(To change the XML document in a way that will allow reproduction of the TXT document, it is necessary to use an appropriate editor. The simplest solution is to change the .xml extension into a .xml.txt extension, then to use Notepad, and then do the editing, and then change the extension back to .xml for conversion to text.)

To convert the edited XML document to a .txt document, proceed as follows:

1. Go to http://xml.resource.org
2. Fill in the box for Convert your XML Source and click submit
3. The output will be ready for submission as an internet draft

Step 3: Submit as revised Internet Draft using https://datatracker.ietf.org/idst/upload.cgi .

Step 4: Email uri-review saying that the revised internet draft has been posted, and asking for a further review.

Step 5: Formally request allocation from IANA stating that it has been reviewed by uri-review

Step 6: Initiate corrigendum to X.892

Discussion:

It was noted that TSB do not like to allocate a number until the document has entered the approval process. We agreed to reference only the ISO number in the Internet Draft.

The second version (01) of the internet draft was posted, but errors were reported from SL.

The email to uri-review needs to be modified to insert some empty lines, and to include mention of the errors reported by SL. DONE.

JL has HW to post the 02 version, and to determine the IANA procedures in Step 5 above. 5 and 6 are refrerred to the electronic meeting.

23 OID arc and Unicode label allocations (Tuesday AM2 ¾ hour) Carried Forward to Electronic Meeting and Barcelona

12D368 Unicode labels allocated in ASN.1 specifications CARRIED FORWARD
OID allocations in Meeting Reports CARRIED FORWARD

Summary: **(**It was referred to the electronic meeting to make progress in this area, but nothing happened.)

There is a very poor record of activity by SG17 and SC6 (and by other committees before that) on allocations related to OID arcs. The above documents need serious tidying up to produce an authoritative record.

Actions needed:

Consider turning the second document above into a 12D, to be continuously updated at each meeting as necessary. Review the first document.

We should consider whether we want a Unicode label for a long arc from the root to {2 27}.

To produce a document listing all approved allocations of arcs and long arcs from the root, with primary identifiers (where applicable) and Unicode labels, to cover everything in the X.660 series and recent SG17 and SC 6 Resolutions. All available information needs to be consolidated, including information in the OID Repository and other known sources. It should include references to letters from countries, and any Unicode Labels allocated. Where obtainable, dates of allocations should be included. It should clearly identify the top-level arcs that would be in the top-level .OID DNS domain files. Initially, this should be a 12D.

Develop proposals for Unicode Labels for top arcs. The proforma specified in X.660 should be used, and resolutions drafted for future approval by SG17 and SC6 for all current allocations that require joint resolution. (It is believed that this only applies to top arc joint-iso-itu-t (2), as it is believed that all other arcs are covered by the amendments.) See M35 and the OID repository.

Develop registration text for Unicode Labels (including Chinese and Korean text if appropriate), and for current identifiers on top-level arcs.

Resolve to allocate Unicode label allocations, both for short arcs and for long arcs.
For example: "/ISO/Registration_Authority/19785.CBEFF
"/Joint-ISO-ITU-T/ASN.1/Specification/Character_Strings/Printable_String
"/ASN.1/Specification/Modules/ISO_10646"
"/Joint-ISO-ITU-T/ASN.1/Specification/Character_Strings/Numeric_String"
"/ITU-R/R-Recommendation/..."
"/Joint-ISO-ITU-T/Registration Procedures/Document-Types/Binary" (WRONG! CANNOT HAVE SPACE).
"/Joint-ISO-ITU-T/BIP"
To be completed

See 12D368.

We also need a table for recording the allocations of Unicode labels for top arcs and long arcs. (Lower-level arcs are not the responsibility of X.660.)

To produce a document listing all approved allocations of arcs and long arcs from the root, with primary identifiers (where applicable) and Unicode labels, to cover everything in the X.660 series and recent SG17 and SC 6 Resolutions.

The following was minuted in Montreux, and may need action:

>>>>>

It is proposed to have the registered joint arcs and the register of arcs under country formally maintained on a web page linked-to from the SG17 home page.

It is further proposed that we consider deleting the recommendation sentence in X.660, and adding normative text to say that the operation of RAs for arcs beneath a joint arc (if not covered by a Recommendation) will be specified in text following each joint arc registration. If this was done, then the recommendation sentence in X.660 for arc {2 16} would be part of this text.

It is generally agreed that this would be a good solution, and could clarify the situation for other arcs beneath the joint arc. However, no change was made before text was consented on X.660, and while deletion of the sentence in "(for information)" could be regarded as editorial, the addition of text to extend the information content of the register of joint arc allocations (which would have to appear in X.666) would be a technical change to X.666.

On balance, it seems best to progress this as an amendment to X.666 extending the information content of a register entry as above. This should be discussed further at the September SG17 meeting with a view to developing such an amendment at the same time as text is added to the existing register entries. It may be possible for the electronic meetings to do some initial work on this. (Note from JL – the electronic meetings did not progress this.)

Further discussion recognized that an amendment would require an ISO NP, which was considered overkill for a small addition. It was therefore agreed that we should progress this change as a technical corrigendum to X.666.

<<<<<

Discussion: **This fell off the end of the Agenda.**

24 Revision of A.23 Joint Work Rules (Zero time) DONE.

Proposed revision of A.23 Joint Work rules. HISTORICAL
Explanation of A.23 changes HISTORICAL

Summary: It is noted that a revision is under TSAG Determination. Herb Bertine and OD are active in this area. JL has already expressed comments that earlier text still referred to FCD ballots as a precursor to SG17 approval, but this has been corrected in the latest version that is under determination. The most significant change seems to be: "Alignment on the ISO project stages, with the replacement of the Final CD by the DIS at the enquiry stage. The duration of the DIS ballot is five months (instead of the four months that could be extended to six months with the FCD). The DIS ballot is conducted among JTC 1 and the members of ISO and IEC, not at SC level as with the FCD. Should the DIS ballot receive no negative comments, the subsequent two months FDIS ballot may be omitted."

Actions needed:

This is left to individuals to review, and time will not be allocated for it unless further issues are raised. If further discussion is needed, at least one of Olivier and Herb need to be present. These two documents are largely for information, but every delegation and Editor (and the Rapporteur!) should ensure that they become familiar with the final text before July 2010.

Discussion:

This was discussed in the joint meeting. No further action needed by Q.12/17.

25 Web services study group (Tues AM2 ½ hour) DONE.

Summary There is a possible replacement for the JTC1 WSSG (Web Services Study Group) with a JTC 1/WG or a JTC 1/SWG. This was expected to be determined at the June 3 WSSG meeting.

Actions needed:

Determine what happened at the June meeting.

Consider a possible liaison statement to JTC1 on this subject from this interim meeting or from the next SC6 meeting, London 2010.

Discussion:

It is agreed that there is no further action needed on this topic.

26 Review of SG17 Web pages (Tues AM1 ¾ hour) Deferred to Electronic Meeting or Barcelona.

Summary:

Note that http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/asn1/workprogram.html is outdated CARRIED FORWARD

Actions needed:

We also need to be sure that there is still a link to http://www.oid-info.com in the new Web pages being provided by Rick Reed. It was agreed to wait until Rick's stuff has been posted as a new SG 17 Web-site home page before taking any action.

Discussion: This fell of the end of the agenda.

27 Defect Reports (Tues PM1) Referred to Electronic meeting or Barcelona.

12D147r3 - JPL - defect reports on X660 series CARRIED FORWARD
12D374r3 - JPL - defect reports on Edition 2008 CARRIED FORWARD
Technical Corrigenda awaiting approval CARRIED FORWARD

Summary: There are still some Defects to be progressed, but most have been resolved to draft text for a Technical Corrigendum.

Actions needed: Review all Defect Reports. Progress them to the stage of an agreed Technical Corrigendum, where not yet done, and approve the Technical Corrigenda ready for ballot. Submit for ballot when all Editions to which they refer are published (check when this will be.)

Note that some of the Defects may be Editorial Corrigenda and not Technical Corrigenda. Also, some may be able to be handled by the Editor on final review of the texts.

We would aim to do ITU-T Corrigenda out of the SG17 April meeting.

Discussion: This fell off the bottom of the agenda.

28 Review of Future Work proposals (Tues PM1) Deferred to Electronic Meeting or Barclona, using new 12D389

All the 12Ds in clause 28 will be placed by PET into a single new Futures 12D389 which is output and carried forward.

12D124 - Discussion of Basic ASN.1
12D323 - Proposal on extensibility
12D276 - Ensuring the quality of ASN.1 modules in standards
12D251 - ASN.1 Envelope
12D195 - IEEE 754
12D168 Standardizing native DOM support
12D136 Examples of textual encodings
12D116 Material for discussion of Basic ASN1

Summary:

I am not going to attempt a summary. These are all very old proposals, and I believe no-one has an interest in them. Attendees are invited to look at them from the above links in advance of the meeting, and to declare an interest in one or more of them.

If there is no expression of interest in a particular one of the above, it will be marked in the Document Register as "DONE Sept 2009", and will not appear on the agenda again unless the subject is independently raised later.

However, the question has recently been raised of whether we should update X.694 to handle the latest XSD x.y features. First we need to determine what is x.y, and what its status is. It can be observed that there has not to-date been a lot of use of ASN.1 derived from XSD (although the mapping has appeared in a number of Standards).

It needs to be determined whether an amendment is needed to X.694 for this purpose (probably requires either an NP or a project split, as the original work-item was not explicit on the version of XSD that it supported). (It is possible that an upgrade to X.693 might also be needed if we decided to progress.)

Actions needed:

It is believed that there is no future agreed work at this point. However, the issue of conformance testing for the OID resolution system software (ORS software) is a live issue, and we may need to determine if we with to progress that – probably an SC6 NWI will be needed.

We need to review the Future Work 12Ds above, and finally mark them "DONE".

It is my hope that we can take each item in turn (without opening it in the meeting, ask if there is interest in progressing it, and if not, discard it.

In particular, a decision is needed on whether an upgrade to X.694 should be progressed, or should be left on the back-burner.

Discussion: This fell off the bottom of the agenda, but PET will produce a new single 12D of futures.

29 Items needed for WP3/SG17 Plenary (Wed2) Mainly done – Item A was carried forward to the electronic meeting and Barcelona.

12D380 Q12 Meeting Report Geneva Feb 2009 HISTORIC
12D306r7 Q12 Geneva February 2009 Action Plan HISTORIC
TD0333 Letter from Uruguay HISTORIC
12D360r1 Question 12 for Study Period 2009-2012 HISTORIC
Items for Q12 (update before use) HISTORIC
Draft Meeting Report DONE

To be done:

TD 0610 (Meeting Report) – Group DONE (SR)
TD 0407/Rev.2 (Agenda and Minutes) – Group DONE (SR)
TD 0544 (Barcelona meeting info) – SC6 DONE
TD 0612 (Liaison to SC6) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0499 (Liaison to WMO) – OD DONE
TD 0613 (Liaison to SG11) – OD DONE (S)
TD 0614 (Liaison to SG16) – JSL DONE (S)
TD 0576 (Sec Gen pages) – OD DONE
TD 0615 (OID Allocations) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0616 (Ad Hoc Minutes) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0617 (Liaison on H.325) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0618 (Liaison to TC215) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0619 (Summaries) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0620 (Liaison to GRIFS) – Group DONE (S)
TD 0622 (Publicity material) – Group DONE (S)

Items to be included in meeting report or Action Plan or Liaisons:

The meeting report will highlight items that need to be copied to the WP3 meeting report. These are highlighted below.

The Q.12/17 meeting report will reference this liaison, drawing attention to the last sentence above, and to the addition to our action plan (which will say "Subject to agreement by TC 215"), and the inclusion of X.oid-exp ("Object Identifier Repository Export Format") in our list of recommendations for later in the study period.

We also need to produce (and reference in our meeting report) a revised summary TD.

There are no changes to the Q.12/17 summaries.

Send a liaison to SC6/WG9 with a copy of TD 0615 (OID Tree allocations) asking for an SC6 resolution. DONE

The discussion in clause 6 needs to be examined, and appropriate points included in a new Treferenced by the meeting report. This TD should also summarize 12.2.5 and the clauses that it references.

There should be a sentence or two saying that a decision has been taken on use of DNSSEC (NSEC3), which is believed to pose no privacy concerns.

Reference should be made to TD 0576 – Sec Gen's pages.

The following text has been agreed for inclusion in the Q.12/17 meeting report: "Q.12/17 noted that there is the possibility of invited participants to the next SG17 meeting who could assist Q.12/17 on their ORS project and its use of DNSSEC and also on the establishment of an 'oid:' IRI scheme. Q.12/17 would welcome the invitation of people with expertise in these areas to the next meeting. Other delegations should note that Q.12/17 has a need for further expertise in these areas, and would welcome inclusion of further experts in their delegation."

Liaison statement form OD to WMO explaining that we intend to allocate (in the new Recommendation X.alerting) the OID {joint-iso-itu-t(2) alerting(49) wmo(0)} and a Unicode label allowing WMO to perform further allocations under oid:/Alerting/WMO/etc…. The liaison statement will ask WMO to confirm that this meets their requirements.

It was agreed to produce a TD allocating arc {joint-iso-itu-t(2) alerting(49)} for use by a new ITU-T Recommendation X.alerting ("Procedures for registration of arcs under the Alerting object identifier arc"). Also allocate a long arc from the root to 2.49 allowing "oid:/Alerting/etc…." This TD shall be referenced in the meeting report.

Perhaps (subject to a positive response from TC215) inform SG17 in the Q.12 Meeting Report that there is a possibility of Joint Work with ISO/TC215 (e-Health) on a Recommendation related to an exchange format for OID Repositories, and add to the Q.12 Action Plan. (But this is looking iffy.)

Appoint JL and OD as liaisons to TC 215.

Add text from TC215 agenda item.

JL is to draft a liaison to GRIFS repeating the email that was sent from SC6. DONE

Appoint JL and OD as SG17 Liaison Officers to TC215

Include reference to TD 333 – Letter from Uruguay (already reported in Tokyo interim report)

See Liaison to Q.12 concerning OID allocations)

**Item A ** Consider a liaison statement to be sent to many Study Groups, and to all contacts for nodes under OID arc 2 about the DNS-OID-mirror CARRIED FORWARD.

a) Meeting report (see TD 252 – Feb meeting report) also use DOC on TDs for Q.12 in http://www.itu.int/md/T09-SG17/en.

b) Action plan (see 264=12D306r7)

c) Question 12 (see 12D360r1)

c) Recommendations for approval at this Study Group 17 meeting – NONE

d) Recommendations for consent or determination at this Study Group 17 meeting NONE

e) Recommendations planned for consent or determination at the next Study Group 17 meeting ORS (Rec. X.oid-res | ISO/IEC 29168)?

f) Liaison statements

g) Summaries of ORS Recommendation 12D319r4 = TD191 (Summaries of pending Recs)

h) Planned Rapporteur group meetings

i) Highlights of achievements

30 Items needed for SC6 posting from the Geneva meeting (Wed2) DONE

a) Agenda and Minutes (this document, tidied up after the meeting – Action JL)

b) ISO Meeting report (JL to produce after the meeting.)

c) Approved Disposition of Comments on CD 29168 (Project Editor to produce and mail to Jooran with CD2 text by 12 Oct 2009 for immediate ballot to close 10 Jan 2010)

d) Recommendations from WG9 for circulation of Agenda and Minutes, meeting report, (liaison re OIDs), approved DoC and text for immediate CD ballot (closing date see HW) and a liaison to SG16 with the new CD2 text when available from Jun.

31 Final admin (Thurs2 PM2) CARRIED FORWARD TO BARCELONA

12D097 - Team - status of work CARRIED FORWARD
TD 0351 List of JCA-NID contacts HISTORICAL
TD 0435 Lead questions for handling ALL - see TD 351 HISTORICAL

To note the JCA-NID contact list
Document Register, Agenda and Minutes

32 Review of Tokyo HW and electronic meeting minutes and related actions (Wed1 PM1 ¼ hour) DONE.

Summary:

It should be noted that the letter we sent from the Tokyo meeting to the EU GRIFS project has been acknowledged by Henri Barthel henri.barthel@gs1.org with "We will make the requested update to the database. Our plan is to delegate in the future the responsibility for maintaining the database to the appropriate parties duly appointed by the relevant standard bodies. The kickoff meeting of the GRIFS forum to be held in Washington DC on 30 June/1 July will initiate the implementation of this process."

Actions needed: Check HW done. Should Henri be added to the contacts 12D? Yes

Homework was given to NIDA and CNNIC to jointly obtain a list of gTLDs (and whether ".oid. gTLD." or ".ors.gTLD." or ".oid-res.gTLD." – or some other look-alike – is taken) and the cost and conditions for getting a name below them. If it is possible full details of how to reply and who to contact would be helpful. The results of this will serve to illuminate the discussions in September. To be submitted as a Contribution in time for the September meeting. Done.

To produce a document listing all approved allocations of arcs and long arcs from the root, with primary identifiers (where applicable) and Unicode labels, to cover everything in the X.660 series and recent SG17 and SC 6 Resolutions. Done.

33 Future meetings (Wed2) CARRIED FORWARD TO BARCELONA.

TD 398 Letter of invitation to Barcelona CARRIED FORWARD
Calling Notice for Barcelona meeting 6N14062 CARRIED FORWARD

Face to face meetings will occur as follows (note the short gap between London 2010 and Geneva 2010):

– January 18-22, 2010 in Barcelona with SC6 (see TD 398)

NOTE – Meeting on the Sunday prior to the meeting was discussed but rejected due to travelling constraints.

– April 7-16, 2010 in Geneva with SG17. It is currently not planned to meet on the middle Sunday.

– September 27 - 1 October, 2010 in London with SC6 (Note that there is only a 25 day gap between the close of this meeting and the start of the SG17 meeting.

– This will now be 8 – 17 December 2010 preceded by a security workshop 6-7 Dec 2010. It is currently not planned to meet on the middle Sunday.

– June 2011 is likely to be in the US

Subsequent SC6 meetings and SG17 meetings need to be considered as the work progresses.

Electronic meetings will occur as follows:

Candidate times are Sunday (4pm UK), Tuesday or Thursday (6pm UK) weekly

Software is expected to be GotoMeeting provided by TSB, plus Skype for the audio. It is noted that we need ITU-T approval for GotoMeeting sessions from Sept 29 2009 every Tuesday 5pm UTC until the April 2010 SG 17 meeting (apart from the week of the SC 6 meeting in Jan 2010).

The format for circulation of the Barcelona Agenda needs to be determined. A complete ZIP for the Agenda and linked documents can be sent to asn1dev, but a simple Agenda with links not working would be OK for other postings. The Convener will not attempt to provide in addition an Agenda with links on how to obtain referenced documents. If there are many items carried forward, it may be possible to re-use this Agenda and Minutes.

34 Table of output documents (Wed2) DONE

12D#	Title	Going to SC6 (for xyz?)	Going to SG17 (for ?)	12D needs upload ?
NO	Q.12/17 Meeting Report C/F	NO	TD 0610	NO
12D388 (Word)	Agenda and minutes of Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 in Geneva 16-25 Sept 2009. C/F	Information 6N14097	Information TD 0407/Rev.2	YES
NO	Logistic information for the interim meeting of Q.12/17 in Barcelona (Jan 2010) C/F	NO	TD 0554	NO
12D383r1	Text for CD2 ballot for X.oid-res ISO/IEC 29168 C/F	Ballot 6N14098	NO	YES
NO	Approved Disposition of Comments on CD1 ISO/IEC 29168	Information 6N14087	NO	NO
NO	Liaison to SC 6/WG 9 concerning an OID tree Resolution. C/F	NO (sent by SG17)	Resolution TD 0612	NO
NO	Liaison to WMO concerning the proposed allocation of an OID for Alerting	NO	Liaison TD 0499	NO
NO	Liaison to SG11 about NID-USN test specification	NO	TD 0613	NO
NO	Liaison to SG16 on the OID Resolution System	NO	Liaison TD 0614	NO
NO	Update for the General Secretariat "Emerging Trends" web page	NO	TD 0576	NO
NO	Object Identifier Tree Allocations	NO	TD 0615	NO
NO	Minutes of the Ad Hoc meeting on positioning of .oid.xxx and related topics C/F	NO	TD 0616	NO
NO	Liaison to SG16 concerning H.325 (in reply to COM 16 – LS 58)	NO	TD 0617	NO
NO	Liaison to TC 215 concerning collaborative work on an export format for OID repositories C/F	NO	TD 0618	NO
12D319r4	Update of Q.12/17 Summaries	NO	TD 0619	YES
NO	Liaison to GRIFS concerning inclusion of ITU-T X.668 in the GRIFS RFID standard database	NO	Liaison TD 0620	NO
NO	Publicity material from Q.12	NO	TD 0622	NO
NO	WG 9 Recommendations and SC 6 Meeting Report C/F	Information and Secretariat action 6N4099	NO	NO
NO	Liaison to SG16 concerning CD2 for X.oid-res (ISO/IEC 29168)	Information and Secretariat action 6N4101		

35 HW during Geneva Sept 2009 DONE

HW was given to OD to draft a Liaison statement to WMO explaining that we intend to allocate (in the new Recommendation X.alerting) the OID {joint-iso-itu-t(2) alerting(49) wmo(0)} and a Unicode label allowing WMO to perform further allocations under oid:/Alerting/WMO/etc…. The liaison statement will ask WMO to confirm that this meets their requirements. DONE.

HW was given to JSL to draft a liaison to SG16 (see Agenda Item 9). DONE.

HW was given to JL to send the email to uri-review after inserting some newlines and adding a paragraph saying that we know about the errors that Steven Legg reported. DONE.

HW was given to the Editor to review TD 0420 and to provide to Q.14/17 a revision of the part that affects Q.12/17. DONE. No revision needed.

HW was given to the Defect Editor to record a defect on X.660 saying that it should contain a government health warning about phishing in the use of Unicode labels (particularly noting the use of those labels in DNS lookups using the ORS). The government health warning will use the text (modified as necessary) from the second proposed internet draft as a note (somewhere in X.660). The precise requirement should be that after replacing any character which is subject to phishing with a wildcard, no two Unicode labels from the same node shall be the same after case folding and NFKC mapping. DONE

HW was given to OD to produce a TD 0576 with the proposed new Sec Gen's pages. DONE.

HW was given to PET to add the list of attendees at the ad hoc to 4.2. DONE

36 HW immediately post Geneva Sept 2009 – REVIEW IN ELECTRONIC MEETINGS

HW was given to PET to move all the 12Ds in clause 28 into a single new Futures 12Dxxxx which is output and carried forward. The old 12Ds will be marked DONE and not yellowed.

HW was given to JL to complete and revise the 3GPP EI proposal (including proposed changes to the actual website to specify directly the actual with a hyperlink to the rationale document). This homework is for review in an electronic meeting if possible with a view to approval by SC6 in Barcelona (and subsequent ratification by SG17). See clause 20.

HW was also given to JL to check again the EIs used in the published ISO/IEC 17974-7 and in the CD2 of ISO/IEC 17974-11 with UK ballot comments. JL should then propose specific text for the web pages that would enable these EIs to move to the next stage. This homework is for review in an electronic meeting if possible with a view to approval by SC6 in Barcelona (and subsequent ratification by SG17). See clause 21.

HW was given to OD to draft and send Q.12/17 material to Craig Harmon.

HW was given to JSL to send the Approved DoC to Jooran.

HW was given to JSL and PET related to the latest version of Unicode, which is 5.1.0: http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.1.0/. The HW is to evaluate any ORS impact (JSL) or impact on other ASN.1 texts (PET)

HW was given to JL to produce and post Internet Draft 02 on Monday, 28 Sep 2009.

HW was given to PET to produce a 12D listing of all the URLs for free availability of *all* ASN.1-related texts (in ISO and in ITU-T), checking whether all those listed in the list of published documents are already freely available (and obtain and record in the 12D) the URLs, or whether free availability is still pending.

HW was given to PET to record in 12D97 the full text of the agreements on free availability of ASN.1 texts (see the inputs in clause 5).

HW was given to the Defect Editor to record that X.660 has a defect. It should require that all Unicode labels from a given node (A) shall be distinct after case folding and NFKC mapping. This defect report is for progression during an electronic meeting and then at the next SC6 meeting.

37 HW post Geneva Sept 2009 REVIEW IN ELECTRONIC MEETINGS

HW was given to JL to determine the IANA registration procedures and to initiate steps 5 and 6 of clause 22 above in conjunction with the electronic meeting.

HW was given to PET to produce RERs and A.5 justifications as needed for CD2/FCD 29168.

HW was given to OD to reserve the arc 2.48 will in the OID repository following this meeting.

HW was given to OD to reserve the arc 2.49 in the OID repository following this meeting.

HW was given to PET to add Henri Barthel henri.barthel@gs1.org (GRIFS) to 12D??? (Contacts) and upload.

HW was given to JL (once uri-review interaction has ceased) to take appropriate action to formally request the IANA registration (See clause 22)

HW was given to PET to check whether the information in the table in agenda item 5 is in 12D097, and to add or complete it as necessary.

HW was given to JSL to check the limit dates for ISO/IEC 29168 on the ISO Portal (do we need any action to extend the limits)? See Portal Explanatory Notes. **Current limit for starting FCD is 5 June 2010**).

38 Items for electronic meetings

The electronic meeting should check at each meeting the progress of JL's HW in clauses 36 and 37 related to PER EIs, and IRIs and IANA submission and review when there is text available. Circulation to asn1dev should occur once there is agreement in the electronic meeting, in order to obtain wider comments (particularly from tool implementors).

HW was given to the defect editor to record that X.660 has a defect. It should require that all Unicode labels from a given node (A) shall be distinct after case folding and NFKC mapping. This defect report is for progression during an electronic meeting and then at the next SC6 meeting.

The electronic meeting should address agenda items 23, 26, 27, 36, 37, with asn.dev circulation, ready for approval in the Barcelona meeting.

It should for any other items referred to the electronic meetings, and produce a consolidated report of any actions taken on these items.

39 Items for SC6 January 2010 meeting – Jl to check for agenda items and files carried forward.

OID an long-arc allocations for 2.49

It is agreed that conformance testing of ORS implementations (clause 8 above) is now closed, and will not be discussed further unless there is new input.

It is agreed that discussion of ONS and EPCglobal is now closed, and will not be discussed further unless there is new input.

It is referred to the next meeting to identify an initial editor to draft the text for the new ITU-T Recommendation X.alerting ("Procedures for registration of arcs under the Alerting object identifier arc").

Do we need an SC6 Resolution to extend the project dates for the ORS? (See the SC6 PoW and the ISO Portal).