

Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N14268
Date:	2010-04-26
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Agenda
Document Title:	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 7-16 April 2009
Document Source:	SC 6/WG 9 Convenor
Project Number:	
Document Status:	For your information.
Action ID:	FYI
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	15
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	

Question(s): 12/17

Geneva, 7-16 April 2010

TEMPORARY DOCUMENT**Source:** Rapporteur of Q.12/17**Title:** Agenda and Minutes of the Q.12/17 April 2010 Meeting

**Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for
ITU-T Q12/SG17 and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9
collaborative meeting on ASN.1 in Geneva
7-16 April 2009**

Contents

1	Documents for consideration	2
2	Timetable	2
3	Preparatory work DONE.....	3
4	Attendees and IPR DONE.....	3
4.1	Attendees at Q.12 meetings	3
4.2	IPR DONE.....	4
5	ORS Progression DONE	4
6	ORS Technical discussion.....	6
7	PER EIs and other SG 17 Web pages.....	7
8	OID Allocations	7
9	Defect Reports.....	7
10	Other contributions and liaisons.....	8
11	Internet Draft.....	8
12	Cybex, Cybersecurity and X.alerting	8
13	Joint meeting with Q.4	8
14	Handle discussions and Russian contribution on Distributed Name Resolution System	9
15	Output documents	9

Contact:

John Larmouth
Retired
UK

Tel: +44 161 928 1605
Email: j.larmouth@btinternet.com

Attention: This is not a publication made available to the public, but an **internal ITU-T Document** intended only for use by the Member States of ITU, by ITU-T Sector Members and Associates, and their respective staff and collaborators in their ITU related work. It shall not be made available to, and used by, any other persons or entities without the prior written consent of ITU-T.

16	Review of Barcelona etc HW DONE.....	9
16.1	HW immediately post Barcelona Jan 2010.....	10
16.2	HW post Barcelona Jan 2010	10
16.3	Items for SG17 Apr 2010 meeting.....	10
17	Future meetings.....	10
18	Table of output documents.....	11
19	HW during Geneva April 2010.....	12
20	HW immediately post Geneva April 2010.....	13
21	HW post Geneva April 2010.....	13
22	Items for electronic meetings	13
23	Items for SC6 September 2010 meeting.....	13

1 Documents for consideration

Documents for consideration at the meeting are in the meeting input folder.

They are referenced from agenda items.

Note particularly the documents in "Documents posted for Q.12 by 4 April 2010"

2 Timetable

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 AM2, lunch, Wednesday. Unless otherwise agreed, we will start at 09.30 (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.

Discussion of C-278 is expected to be 8:30-8:50 Monday, with discussion of C-269 (Handle) from 8:50-9:30. These discussions are joint with Q.10. It is understood that any progression of C-269 is a Q.12 responsibility (assisted by Q.10), and that any progression of C-278 is a Q.10 responsibility (assisted by Q.12). If necessary, there will be a continuation session 8:30 Wednesday.

Wed 7 AM1: SG 17 Plenary DONE

Wed 7 AM2: WP 3 Plenary DONE

Wed 7 14:00: Progression of the ORS DONE

Wed 7 PM1: Preparatory work – agenda, attendees, review homework etc DONE

Wed 7 PM2: Technical work on ORS DONE

Thu 8 AM: Work on PER EIs and other SG 17 Web pages PART DONE

Thu 8 PM: Work on PER EIs or ORS as necessary

Fri 9 AM1: Review ORS Texts and Determine OID allocations to be made at this meeting DONE

Fri 9 AM2: Review Defects to be resolved NOT DONE

Fri 9 PM1: Review all other contributions and CAP/H.323 and CAP 1.2, review actions needed on Web pages. Outline items for Meeting Report DONE

Fri 9 PM2: Review and discuss skeleton of OID Handbook. NOT DONE

Mon 10 AM1: Security Coordination DONE

Mon 11 AM2: Determine text for next internet draft PART DONE

Mon 11 PM1: Complete and submit internet draft NOT DONE
Mon 11 PM2: Finalize text for PER EIs output, NOT DONE Technical Corrigenda output NOT DONE
Tue 12 AM1: Discuss Cybex, Cybersecurity and X.alerting DONE
Tue 12 AM2: Joint meeting with Q.4 DONE
Tue 12 PM1: Joint meeting with Q.4
Tue 12 PM2: Preparatory discussion on Handle DONE
Wed 13 AM1: Handle discussions (8.30 am) Joint meeting with Q.10 DONE
Wed 13 AM2: Discuss outstanding work and determine future meetings DONE
Wed 13 PM: Review and finalize all output documents and Agenda and Minutes document DONE
Thu 14 AM: Discuss and resolve further defects as appropriate. Continue any other work that does not affect the Meeting Report NOT DONE.
Thu 14 PM: WP 3 meets DONE
Fri 15: SG 17 Plenary DONE

3 Preparatory work DONE

- 3.1** Distribute initial ZIP on a stick as necessary
- 3.2** Agree Agenda and time allocations
- 3.3** Check attendee list
- 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 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 (France), lemaire@univ-parisdiderot.fr

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

Olivier Dubuisson (France Telecom Orange, France), olivier.dubuisson@orange-ftgroup.com
(Not Thursday and Friday am)

Seung Jai Yi 이승재 (KISA, Korea), king7@kisa.or.kr

Patrice Lyons (USA) palyons@bellatlantic.net

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Emily Talaga (USA) Emily.talaga@fcc.gov

Erik Andersen (Denmark) era@x500.eu

John Savage (USA) savageje@state.gov

Takeshi Takahashi (Japan) takeshi_takahashi@nict.go.jp

Vladimir Krylov (Russia) vkrylov@meralabs.com

Isaac Kwarko (Ghana) isaac.kwarko@nca.org.gh

Bob Kahn (CNRI) rkahn@cnri.reston.va.us

Gary Hunt (Dept for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, UK Gov and HoD UK ITU-T delegation) garyandmandi@mac.com

4.2 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 ORS Progression DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

See also "Miscellaneous e-mails" folder for discussions on Determination etc.

- 1) To note the intended progression (by Q.12) prior to this meeting:
 - a) AAP for X.oid-res (called "the technical document");
 - b) Approval of a Supplement to that (called "the procedures document").
- 2) To note that the only Contributions were from the UK (C-274, C-275, and C-276) and from Germany (C-200), of which C-200 was essentially technical. The UK C274 was also technical. The UK C275 raised some difficult issues which potentially affect the progression discussions.
- 3) To note the UK contribution C-276, that proposed:
 - a) That the technical document (as amended in Geneva as a result of contributions) be submitted for Consent under the AAP process, with Last Call to follow closure of the FCD ballot in ISO, in accordance with Joint Work procedures;
NOTE – As Rapporteur, I will ensure that any changes made in Geneva are reflected in comments on the ISO FCD ballot.
 - b) That what was hitherto proposed as a Supplement be instead progressed as a separate Recommendation (with an associated number) and another part of the ISO Standard;
NOTE – The Rapporteur will report that there is approval in ISO/IEC SC 6 for a project split to accomplish this, and that a WD has been circulated for comments closing on 16th April on ISO/IEC 29168-2 (the procedures document). If TAP Determination were to be accepted by SG 17 in April, the Consultation would in this case be based on the text resulting from that FCD ballot.
 - c) That the procedures document should proceed under TAP, and was unlikely to be ready for Determination at this Geneva meeting.
NOTE – The UK delegate will be invited to explain the reasons for the latter, but it largely relates to the need for a contract with the maintenance agency and who would be the organisation that lets that contract.
 - d) That the call for nominations in SC 6 be withdrawn until the procedures document is approved by both parties.
- 4) To invite the UK delegate to present alternative proposals and changed UK positions that have emerged since the UK contributions were submitted. These will include:

- a) A proposal that the procedures document be progressed solely as an ISO/IEC Standard, and that there are precedents in SC 31 for such an approach. And that the contract with the maintenance agency be between the ITTF and based on the contract used for Registration Authorities;

NOTE – The Rapporteur will report that there is approval in ISO for a project split, that the procedures document has been circulated as a WD, and that there is approval for an FCD to be issued out of Geneva, but that there has been no discussion on a contract based on the RA contract. (If this direction were to be taken, there would be no need to withdraw the call for nominations in SC 6, and approval would be simplified.

- b) That the UK would oppose TAP Determination at this meeting on the procedures Recommendation (and has concerns that its requirement for a Contract with an appropriate superior authority could not be met for TAP Determination even at a later date. If TAP Determination is proposed and accepted for the procedures document at the April meeting, the UK will ask for the following statement to be written into the Meeting Report: **“The UK notes the progress made with respect to the draft recommendation, but considers that further consideration of the proposals made is required to ensure that issues have been addressed. In that respect the UK opposes Determination at this meeting, and reserves the right to return to the substance of the text, through written contributions, to the next SG17 meeting in order to address outstanding issues.”**
- c) That the UK would strenuously oppose AAP Consent on the procedures Recommendation. If AAP Consent was approved at the April meeting, the UK will ask for the following statement to be written into the Meeting Report: **“The UK has policy issues associated with the procedures document, and within the UK Government this has national sovereignty implications, and as a consequence the UK disapproves of AAP and requests that TAP be applied to this Draft recommendation, but not at the April 2010 meeting.”**

5) The Rapporteur will invite the German delegate to introduce C-200, and to confirm that this is their only currently known problem with the technical document, and will invite other delegates to confirm that this contribution is a valuable addition and should be added to the document after any necessary editorial discussions.

6) The Rapporteur will ask for confirmation that there is no known opposition from any Administration or Member for a Q.12 proposal for AAP Consent at this meeting on the technical document, as appropriately revised in Geneva based on the Contributions.

7) An open-ended discussion of the available options for Q.12 to propose to SG 17, which include at least:

- a) Progress as in 1) above;
- b) To move to two Recommendations with joint text in two Standards, progressing to AAP on both at the April meeting;
- c) To move to two Recommendations, with AAP Consent on the technical Recommendation and TAP Determination on the procedures document, both at the April meeting;
- d) As c), but to defer a proposal for TAP Determination until the December meeting, and to request SC 6 to withdraw their call for nominations;
- e) To progress to AAP Consent on the technical document (X.oid-res), but to announce that the procedures document will no longer be joint work, and to progress that solely in ISO/IEC SC 6, with an FCD ballot out of the April meeting (hopefully).

NOTE – The UK will in this case request that the following text be included in the procedures document: "The procedures for the appointment and operation of the Maintenance Agency are specified in ISO/IEC 29168-2. These procedures do not involve ITU-T."

If item 7) cannot be resolved before 13.30 Wednesday, then a further (early lunch-time or early evening or week-end?) meeting may be needed in Geneva as soon as possible. The timing of this would need to be discussed.

Discussion:

After several bilateral and joint meetings, agreement was reached to progress with X.672 | ISO/IEC 29184-1 as joint work with AAP Consent (resolved in the plenary) and with X.673 | ISO/IEC 29184-2 as joint work with TAP Determination (resolved in the plenary).

29184-1 is currently under FCD ballot, and the BRM is planned for 25-26 July (electronic).

29184-2 was submitted for immediate FCD ballot on 18 April, with the BEM planned for 24-25 August (electronic).

See the ITU-T Meeting Report for when the texts are needed for Last Call and Consultation.

6 ORS Technical discussion DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

Detailed review of German contribution C-200

Related to DNSSEC: <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-27jan10-en.htm>

See "Miscellaneous e-mails" folder and "Additional ORS documents" folder

Consider UK detailed changes and Steven Legg problems re FINAL. See emails in folder.

Add "..." where it seems sensible to the ASN.1. PET is sure this will not upset a X.693 encoding using EXER.

If we go AAP, Last Call should be delayed until August 16th. If TAP, we should go for 8th August for the start of Consultation.

Discussion:

It was noted that the proposals in C-200 were based on an earlier version of the text. It is believed that they have all been incorporated in the latest text, but control of the DNSSEC mechanism by ITU-T will not be acceptable to the UK, and needs to be discussed further.

There was discussion of the UK comment on clause 7.3.2 f). The group did not feel able to determine whether a change was needed, but rejected referencing text that did not have an RFC number. It is currently proposing to reject the UK change (as it is not sufficiently clear what change to make). The current text will be used for Consent, but (if agreed in email discussions) a similar comment with detailed text changes can be submitted as FCD ballot comments, and incorporated in Last Call text.

A problem was flagged relating to the retrieval of NAPTR records for intermediate nodes. Work overnight by Seung Jai Yi established that the present text did not work for intermediate nodes. There were also experiments using the word "final" that did not work either, and the conclusion was that all DNS lookups had to use the canonical (numeric) form of the IRI. This clearly defeats one of the main applications of the ORS. There was further discussion on Thursday morning when Paul Thorpe suggested that what Steven had intended was that within the DNS, all nodes that are ORS supported will also have a child node with a reserved name (in addition to any real child nodes from the OID tree). JS and SJ confirmed that this would probably work, subject to an experiment. This was considered slightly dirty/complex, and would need careful explanation. But in essence, it only affects the rules for DNS Resource Record configuration, and the rules for the transformation of an IRI by the ORS client into a DNS query.

We need to produce detailed text amendments for both the DNS Resource Record configurations to support all ORS supported OID nodes, together with detailed text amendments for the transformations performed by the ORS client.

Discussions with ISO Central Secretariat showed that describing the ORS agency as a "maintenance agency" would not work. Only two contracts are available from ISO/IEC. One is for a maintenance agency (which has restrictions and does not work). The other is for a "registration authority". It is proposed to change the name "maintenance agency" to "ORS operational Agency" throughout both documents with text saying that the contract with the nominated agency will be handled as if it were a registration authority.

Other options are now emerging. ISO Central Secretariat would prefer the procedures document to be a Normative Annex rather than a separate part. If we did this we have several choices (and JL would need to unravel things with Jooran). One choice is to continue with two separate parts in ISO, and a single recommendation in ITU-T. A second would be to move to twin text with a normative Annex in the ISO standard and non Annex in the ITU-T recommendation (or an informative annex in the ITU-T recommendation. JL needs to confirm with the UK what the TAP/AAP position would be and a similar indication is needed from Germany and the US before we can decide which option to adopt.

The group progressed the technical document, including the UK caveat saying "no ITU-T involvement", and the procedures document as the procedures for an ORS Registration Authority to be specified in a Normative Annex. It was noted, however, that the UK and the US may wish to comment on the FCD ballot that the appointment of the operational agency (the RA) should be done in consultation with ITU-T, as they have interest in this work (which was originally joint work).

Discussion:

All technical issues were resolved, and text was noted for Korea to submit as FCD ballot comments. The UK also stated that it would comment on Annex A to include material in the file "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects" in the Additional Outputs folder.

7 PER EIs and other SG 17 Web pages PARTIALLY DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

See "PER EI work" folder

Also 12D356 Web Page for PER EIs
12D338r4 Proposals for PER encoding instructions as at 21 Dec (2008)

Wrap-up PER EIs. We want to agree what to do to wrap-up, and to get SG 17 approval (with SC 6 approval to follow in September).

Review all SG 17 Web pages that are ASN.1 or OID related.

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

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:

It was noted that we can move items to the READY category out of this meeting, but can only move them to the APPROVED category in December SG17 provided we have SC6 approval in September. ITU-T approved the PER EIs in TD 1024r2, but text is still needed for the Web pages, based on 12D338r5. This is an action for London SC 6.

The PER EIs Web Page was simplified with the removal of some PER EIs and their insertion into 12D356r1.

The shortened Web Page was only partially revised, and is carried forward as a new 12D338r5.

The other Web pages were not reviewed and are carried forward to London SC 6.

It was noted that there are PER EIs in the published ISO/IEC 19794-7 that we have not included. HW was given to JL to input to London SC 6 on this.

8 OID Allocations PARTIALLY DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

Allocate an arc (and a long arc) for ORS – we need that for the module identifiers.

Barcelona 16 said " There is a recommendation needed for the allocation of arc 49. DONE. A decision on allocating arc 48 still needs to be discussed. NOT DONE – CARRIED FORWARD to Geneva."

Discussion:

It is agreed that we allocate arcs and Unicode labels for 2.999 as described in "A variety of emails".

We have also agreed to continue to use initial uppcase for Unicode labels (so no deletions are needed).

We will allocate 2.50 for joint work on the ORS with a Unicode label of ORS on arc 50, and a long arc to arc 50 with the Unicode label ORS.

It is agreed to continue to reserve this, but to consider allocating arc 2.48 for use in X.cybex.1 will a long arc called Cybersecurity in December 2010.

TD 1025 records the allocations made in Geneva.

9 Defect Reports NOT DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

See "Miscellaneous e-mails" folder

We have Defect Reports, but the major one is Defects on X.660 (and X.680?) etc to support case-folding and normalization of Unicode labels.

We need to prohibit use of any Unicode label which maps (after appropriate case folding) into "ORS".

10 Other contributions and liaisons DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

" The report of the SC 6 Liaison officer to SC 31/WG 6 does not report about ISO/IEC 29168 which is the only work of SC 6 that is relevant to SC 31/WG 6. I think we should send them an LS out of the April meeting, informing them about where we are with X.oid-res and the procedures for the maintenance agency." DONE for SC 6.

See Barcelona 12 for TC215. DONE

Discussion:

C-269, C-278 deferred until joint meeting with Q.10 No further action

C-185, C-189r1, C-190, TD-702, TD-711, TD-713, TD-715, TD-796, TD-819, TD-820 deferred until joint meeting with Q.4 No further action

TD-701, TD-703 DONE Generated a Liaison statement to SG2

The following contributions were addressed, and appropriate changes were made to Q.12/17 documents: C-200, C-274, C-275, C-276

The following contributions were noted, but no further action is needed: C-187, TD 687, TD 738, TD 746, TD 777, TD 782, TD 783, TD 823, TD 824, TD 825, TD 830

11 Internet Draft PART DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

See "Internet Draft" folder.

Review e-mails and determine changes to be made.

Write, agree, and submit 05. (See clause 6 in Barcelona minutes for editing instructions etc.)

Discussion:

We partially discussed this, but there is a lot still to be done. HW was given to JL and OD.

12 Cybex, Cybersecurity and X.alerting DONE FOR GENEVA

Rapporteurs Comments:

See "Miscellaneous e-mails" folder

Review X.alerting (C 185) and progress, in advance of joint meeting with Q.4.

Determine when it will be ready for AAP, and record in Meeting Report (check last meeting report).

Discussion:

It is not expected to be ready or AAP Consent at the December meeting.

13 Joint meeting with Q.4 DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

Alert Namespace, X.cybex.1, X.cybex.2, X.disc, X.cybex-disc-oid, X.cybex-disc-rdf with Q.12/17 (C185, C189, C190, TDs 0711-PLEN, 0713-PLEN, 0715-PLEN, 0819-PLEN, 0820-PLEN)

Discussion:

No further actions needed.

14 Handle discussions and Russian contribution on Distributed Name Resolution System DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

See C 269. See also some JL questions comments in "Miscellaneous e-mails" folder

Request that the contribution be made into a "work item" in either Q10 or Q12 or both.

See C-278.

Discussion:

There was discussion on this, but it was considered out of Scope for both Q.10 and Q.12 (and perhaps out of Scope for SG 17), but Q.2 agreed to set up a Correspondence Group to discuss this.

It is not expected that Q.12 will need to return to this.

15 Output documents PARTIALLY DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

Meeting Report, Action Plan, Summaries, review Question, A5 texts and RERs, and supporting documents for liaisons etc. Also SC 6 outputs, for example FCD for 29168-2.

It was noted that arc 48 under joint-iso-itu-t has been reserved for cybersecurity (X.cybex.1). Q.12 is merely assisting with this. We need take no further action.

Document Register update NOT DONE.

The meeting report will change the editorship of X.oid-res to PET. NOT DONE, as PET continued availability is not guaranteed.

The Rapporteur is to copy the checklist from TD 737 into the meeting report in relation to X.oid-res DONE

The work program and work items are to be updated after the joint meeting with Q.10, see TD-793, TD-822. NO CHANGE.

OID allocations are needed as specified in clause 8. DONE FOR GENEVA

Discussion:

FCD text for SC 6 for 29168-2 was produced and submitted for immediate FCD ballot.

Cancellation does not appear to be a current problem.

Editorship was not changed to PET, as there is some doubt about his availability for future meetings.

16 Review of Barcelona etc HW DONE

Rapporteurs Comments:

TD727 r1 is Barcelona minutes. The final output zip is in the folder.

16.1 HW immediately post Barcelona Jan 2010

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 of the Geneva Sept 2009 meeting) Carried Forward.

HW was given to PET to check whether the information in the table in agenda item 5 of the Geneva 2009 minutes is in 12D097, and to add or complete it as necessary Carried Forward.

PET was given HW immediately post Barcelona to produce the necessary RERs and A.5s for X.oid-res (needed by 1 March 2010) Carried Forward.

All other HW was done.

16.2 HW post Barcelona Jan 2010

HW was given to 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 impact on ASN.1 texts. PET has already initiated actions to determine if there is any impact on the ASN.1 Character Module. PET will report further in Geneva April 2010 Carried Forward.

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 (for either or both of ISO and ITU-T), or whether free availability is still pending. This 12D should also include a clear reference to the location of the word masters for each of the texts Carried Forward.

16.3 Items for SG17 Apr 2010 meeting

(Item and para numbers refer to Barcelona minutes, which need to be accessed – in folder.)

See 7.1.4 above DONE

See 7.2 para 1. DONE

See 8.2.1 b) for AAP Consent on ORS, and confirmation of 8.2.1 c) for BRM on the FCD, and possible TAP in 8.2.1 d). DONE

Items 10 and 11 – PER Encoding Instructions for 3GPP and other PER Encoding Instructions DONE

Item 12 – Review progress on possible TC 215 joint work. DONE

Item 13 – Review again any necessary actions re OID arc and Unicode allocations including rules on long arcs DONE

Item 14 – Review all sub-items in Geneva, including 14.8. DONE

Item 15 – Review in Geneva DONE

17 Future meetings

- BRM for ISO/IEC FCD ISO/IEC 29156-1 25-26 July (electronic) – see 6N14271

- BRM for ISO/IEC FCD ISO/IEC 29156-2 24-25 August (electronic) – see 6N14271

- September 27 - 1 October, 2010 in London with SC6

- December 8 – 17 2010 with SG 17 preceded by a security workshop December 6-7

- April 11-20 2011 Geneva with SG 17 if necessary (could be Rapporteur only, depending on outstanding work and expected attendees)

- June 2011 SC 6 is likely to be in the US if necessary (could be Convenor only, depending on outstanding work and expected attendees)

- Feb 27 – 2 March 2012 Geneva with SG 17 (could be Rapporteur only, depending on outstanding work and expected attendees)

- Aug 24 – 2 Sept 2012 Geneva with SG 17 if necessary (could be Rapporteur only, depending on outstanding work and expected attendees)

- Sep 3 – 7 2012 with SC 6 if necessary (could be Rapporteur only, depending on outstanding work and expected attendees)

All SC6 meeting and SG17 meetings after December 2010 need to be considered as the work progresses, based on outstanding work and expected attendees.

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 ISO/IEC tcsupport, with Skype as a fall-back for the audio. It is noted that we need ISO/IEC tcsupport approval for GotoMeeting sessions from 27th April 2010 every Tuesday 5pm UTC until the September 2010 SC 6 meeting.

18 Table of output documents












18.1 Main outputs

12D#	Title	Going to SC6 (for xyz?)	Going to SG17 (for ?)	12D needs upload ?
12Dxxx1	Agenda and Minutes (this document).doc	6N14268 Information	TD836R1 Information	Yes
N/A	AAP Consented document (does not agree with current FCD text) for X.672 29164-1.docx	NO (under ballot)	TD771R4 Consented	No
N/A	TAP Determined document and FCD ballot document for X.673 29164-2.docx	6N14264 FCD ballot	TD914R1 Determined	No
N/A	TD1024R2 Approval of PER EIs.doc	NO	TD1024R2 Approved	No
12Dxxx2	Object Identifier arc allocations.doc	London meeting	TD1025 Approved	Yes
12Dxxx3	OID Handbook.doc	NO	TD1026R1 Information	Yes
N/A	Calling Notice and Draft Agenda for London Sept 2010 Meeting.doc	6N14270 Information	TDxxxx Information	No
N/A	Calling Notice for electronic Ballot Resolution Meetings .doc	6N14271 Action	TDxxxx Information	No





18.2 Additional SG17 only outputs as JPEG (not expected to be referenced further)

These are not posted to SC 6, nor are they uploaded as 12Ds. If needed further, the TD will be consulted.

The only one that may need further work is X.alerting, which is on the agenda for the London meeting.

 TD-0715 X.alerting.doc	71 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	17/04/2010 11:49
 TD-0922r1 Liaison to IAB.doc	71 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	17/04/2010 10:45
 TD-0935 Liaison statement on XML namespaces.doc	76 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 09:46
 TD-0938R7 ITU-T Meeting Report.doc	309 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	17/04/2010 11:51
 TD-0950 London meeting logistics.zip	49 KB	WinZip File	16/04/2010 09:42
 TD-0980 Liaison to TC 215.doc	72 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 09:40
 TD-0981 Liaison to SG2 Future of numbering.doc	1,537 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 16:50
 TD-0982 Update of Summaries.doc	178 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 09:10
 TD-0983 A.5s for X.672.docx	36 KB	Microsoft Office Wo...	16/04/2010 09:09
 TD-1041 Liaison to SC 38 about use of ASN.1 for Fast Web Services.doc	74 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 08:54
 TD-1048 WP3 Meeting Report.doc	416 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	16/04/2010 19:02

18.3 Additional SC 6 only outputs as JPEG (not expected to be referenced further)






 6N14265 WG 9 Recommendations from the April 2010 Geneva meeting.doc	27 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	24/04/2010 11:55
 6N14266 Change of terminology for ORS Maintenance Agency.doc	28 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	18/04/2010 10:28
 6N14267 Meeting Report for WG9 April 2010 meeting in Geneva.doc	32 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	24/04/2010 18:53
 6N14269 Liaison statement to SC 31 WG 6.doc	70 KB	Microsoft Word Doc...	18/04/2010 10:45

18.4 Additional 12D only outputs as JPEG (expected to be referenced further in London)

12D338r5 needs uploading (see item 3 in clause 23 below).

12D356r1 needs uploading (see item 3 in clause 23 below).

12Dxxx4, 5, and 6 need numbers and need uploading for action in London (see items 5, 6 and 7 in clause 23 below).

 12D338r5 Proposals for PER encoding instructions as at 11 Apr 2010 (inc material deleted from Web.docx	41 KB	11/04/2010 03:31
 12D356r1 Proposed Updated text for the PER EI Web pages at end of April Geneva meeting (more work needed).doc	95 KB	17/04/2010 09:02
 12Dxxx4 Arc allocations for Example translated.doc	56 KB	24/04/2010 11:17
 12Dxxx5 Comparing Unicode labels.doc	24 KB	24/04/2010 11:19
 12Dxxx6 E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects.doc	88 KB	17/04/2010 09:29

19 HW during Geneva April 2010

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 of the Geneva Sept 2009 meeting).

HW was given to PET to check whether the information in the table in agenda item 5 of the Geneva 2009 minutes is in 12D097, and to add or complete it as necessary.

PET was given HW to produce the necessary A.5s for X.oid-res to be posted as a TD no later than 5pm Wednesday.

HW was given to 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 impact on ASN.1 texts. PET has already initiated actions to determine if there is any impact on the ASN.1 Character Module. PET will report further in Geneva April 2010.

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 (for either or both of ISO and ITU-T), or whether free availability is still pending. This 12D should also include a clear reference to the location of the word masters for each of the texts.

20 HW immediately post Geneva April 2010

JSL offered to submit Korean comments on the FCD text to align the text with the agreed Determination text in ITU-T, together with editorial changes agreed late in the day between JSL and JL and PET.

JL offered to submit UK comments on the FCD text to clarify Annex A with the material in the file "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects" in the Additional Outputs folder.

JL has HW to arrange GotoMeeting through ISO for Tuesday 27th April onwards (Tuesday 20th April may not be possible because of volcano problems from JL and PET, but it is possible that JL and JPL could meet.)

21 HW post Geneva April 2010

PET was given HW to produce the necessary RERs for X.oid-res (needed by September 2010).

JL and PET were reminded to comment appropriately on the FCD ballot for both the technical and the procedures documents for ORS to align them with agreements at the Geneva meeting (see clause 6).

JPL offered to produce two XSD schemas that would generate the same ASN.1 as is present in the X.672 Annexes.

JSL was given HW to produce change marked text (via a Word compare) to align the FCD with the Consent text for submission by Korea as ballot comments on the FCD.

JL and OD were given HW to progress the Internet Draft, based on "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects.doc" in the Additional Outputs and the change marks in draft-larmouth-oid-iri-04.txt.doc.

22 Items for electronic meetings

The electronic meeting should start each meeting with a review of HWs and attempt to progress these before dealing with incoming e-mails.

Reviewing Defect Reports and producing Technical Corrigenda is now getting urgent.

Update the Document Register for London. Remove all finished items to a separate section at the bottom of the Register, and review the need for further work on other items and which items for the London meeting they would fit into, proposing updates to the proposed agenda items below for the London meeting .

23 Items for SC6 September 2010 SC 6 meeting

- 1) **PER Encoding Instructions for 3GPP:** Are any still wanted?
- 2) **Editor:** Seung Jai Yi 이승재 (KISA, Korea), king7@kisa.or.kr is to be appointed as the editor for ISO/IEC 29168-2, replacing Jun Seob, providing there is no conflict of interest with KISA being nominated for the ORS Operational Agency.
- 3) **Approval of PER EIs:** The PER EIs listed in TD 1024r2 need to be approved (with movement to the APPROVED category at the December SG 17 meeting. The text in 12D338r5 needs to be reviewed and completed. 12D356r1 needs to have the Annex merged in. Discussion is needed on PER EIs used in the published 19794-7 that are not currently in TD 1024r2 (see JL HW).
- 4) **Review of other SG 17 Web pages:** This review is overdue.
- 5) **OID allocations:** The allocations made in TD 1025 need to be approved by SC 6, an allocation of a Unicode label "ORS" to arc 50 from node 2 needs to be made (an oversight in Geneva). Note that allocation of 2.48 for X.cybex.1 was deferred to the December 2010 SG 17 meeting. We also need to progress the "Examples" arc 2.999 in multiple languages as described in "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects.doc" (12Dxxx6) and "Arc allocations for Example translated" (12Dxxx4) in the Additional Outputs for 12Ds.
- 6) **Defect Reports:** Reviewing Defect Reports and producing Technical Corrigenda is now getting urgent. There is some material in "E-mails related to internet draft, ORS service specs and defects.doc" (12Dxxx6) and in "Comparing Unicode labels" (12Dxxx5) in the Additional Outputs for 12Ds.

- 7) **Internet Draft:** Review progress and progress further as necessary. See also 12Dxxx6
 - 8) **X.alerting:** Review progress, or defer to December SG 17 – see TD715.
 - 9) **Future meetings:** Consider when/if to move ASN.1 into maintenance in SG 17 and SC 6. Note that X.500 is not yet in maintenance, but that all other specifications originally developed under OSI are now in maintenance. Note that if key participants move to other work or cease to have funding, both Q.12 and WG 9 will no longer be viable.
-