Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N14055
Date:	2009-08-21
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Agenda
Document Title:	Agenda, Timetable and Minutes of the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q12/SG17 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:	22

**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 – It is intended that we meet on Sunday 20th Sept (but not the Saturday)

Contents

1   Documents for consideration

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: COM 85, 86 (clause 6) (done to COM 86, check for more later)

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) (done to TD 372-PLEN, check for more later)

Other documents: T09-SG17-R-0001!!MSW-E 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 Encoding Instructions Required (clause 20), PER Encoding Instructions (clause 21), Revision of A.23 Joint work rules (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), 6N14006 SC6 PoW June 2009 (clause 5), Introduction to OIDs by OD (clause 16).

<mark>Other documents expected:</mark> Members contributions re top-level for oid; CD ballot comments; Editor's proposed Disposition of Comments; Description on the use of DNS zone files to implement the ORS, Proposed text for Sec Generals pages

2 Timetable

<mark>JL to revise – too much not yet settled. It is important to slot in all agenda items somewhere, but it will be impossible to avoid some things falling off the agenda, even with the Sunday meeting!</mark>

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

Wed 16 AM2 WP 3 Plenary

Wed 16 PM   Preparatory work (Item 3 below).

Thu 17 AM   Discuss ORS contributions and prepare for lunch-time meeting

Thu 17 13.30 to 14.30   Joint meeting on position of .oid and other non-technical issues

Thu 17 PM   Wrap-up on Joint meeting and start ORS Ballot Resolution

Fri 18 AM   Finish ORS Ballot Resolution

Fri 18 PM   Review agenda and prepare for Sunday

Sunday 20 AM (9.30 start)   PER EIs

Sunday 20 PM   IRI progression

Mon 21 AM1 Security Coordination

Mon 21 AM2 Progress work

Mon 21 PM1 <mark>(Tentative)</mark> Joint meeting with Q.4 re clauses 14, 12 and 16)

Mon 21 PM2 Electronic meeting re clause 19, 4pm)

Tue 22   Remaining TDs etc referred to us and finish dangling threads

Wed 23 AM   Defect Reports

Wed 23 PM   Finalize work, prepare Meeting Report and revised Summaries and Action Plan

Thu 24 AM1 Progress any remaining work

Thu 24 AM2 WP 3 meets

Thu 24 PM1 WP 3 meets

Thu 24 PM2 Final review of HW, admin tidies of Document Register, Agenda and Minutes, etc

Fri 25   SG 17 Plenary

3 Preparatory work

3.1   Distribute initial ZIP on a stick as necessary

3.2   Check attendees and identify availability

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

3.4 Agree Agenda and time allocations

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

4 Attendees and IPR (Wednesday PM1)

4.1 Attendees

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-paris-diderot.fr

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

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

Jong-Pyo Kim (NIDA, Korea), kimjp@nida.or.kr

Dong Mei Xu (CESI, China), lxudm@126.com

Ning Kong 孔宁(CNNIC, China), nkong@cnnic.cn

ByoungHo Ahn 안병호(KATS, Korea), bhahn@ok.ac.kr

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

Susumu Yoneda (SoftBank, Japan), susumu.yoneda@tm.softbank.co.jp

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

Herb Bertine? (ITU-T Liaison), hbertine@optonline.net

Tony Rutkowski (Verisign and Verisign Switzerland), trutkowski@verisign.com

Mohamed Elhaj? (National Telecom Corporation, Sudan, Vice Chair SG17), mohamed.elhaj@ntc.org.sd

Philip Rushton? (BT Telecom and HOD of UK ITU-T delegation), philip.m.rushton@bt.com

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

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

Rick Reed? (UK ITU-T delegation), rickreed@tseng.co.uk

Paul Redwin? (Dept for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, UK Gov and UK ITU-T delegation), Paul.Redwin@berr.gsi.gov.uk

4.2 IPR

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.

5 Standardization Status

6N14006 SC6 PoW June 2009

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 know. 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.

NOTE that there was an agreement dating to earlier than 2000 that were 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.

Actions needed: Agree a number for X.oid-res. Progress clause 6. Complete or check the table below:

Designation	Edition number	Publication Date
X.680	ISO/IEC 8824-1	4	ITU-T 2008	ISO?
X.681	ISO/IEC 8824-2	4	ITU-T 2008	ISO?
X.682	ISO/IEC 8824-3	4	ITU-T 2008	ISO?
X.683	ISO/IEC 8824-4	4	ITU-T 2008	ISO?
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?
ISO/IEC 9834-2	?	ISO 1993?
X.662	ISO/IEC 9834-3	4	ITU-T 2008?	ISO?
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?
X.667	ISO/IEC 9834-8	2	ITU-T 2008?	ISO?
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 (Not on ISO Portal.)	1	ITU-T?	ISO?

6   OID top-level domain discussion

COM 85 UK letter,
COM 86 Germany letter,
T09-SG17-R-0001 Attachment 1,
TD 242r1 (Proposed ICANN letter),
TD 332 Recommendations on root positioning,
12D375 Establishing OID as a gTLD,
Positioning of .oid and related issues (old),
A very early expressed requirement from IETF for DNS support of OID (very old),
rfc3172 - arpa guidelines.txt

Summary:

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

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

COM85 and COM86 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

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.

Discussion:

7   Ballot resolution on CD 29168 (X.oid-res)

TD 325 CD ballot text,
Ballot Comments,
Editor's proposed resolution

Summary:

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

The cancellation date for failure to start an FCD ballot is xxxx – it is not on the ISO Portal

Clarification needs to be sought before or at Geneva by an e-mail to Jooran

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).

Actions needed:

Review Editor's proposed DoC.

The Editor is to send the Approved DoC to Jooran.

Determine CD2 or FCD ballot.

The Editor is to send new text to Jooran for immediate ballot.

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

Discussion:

8 Conformance testing of the ORS

TD0328 ORS conformance testing, TD0239 Conformance testing

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:

9 Relation of SG17 ORS to EPCGlobal

6N 13997 Research on the OID (Object Identifier) Resolution System

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: No actions needed?

Discussion:

10 Case sensitivity in ORS

12D385 Draft for Implementation guidance for the ORS,
Discussions on case sensitivity in Unicode labels,
Some e-mail discussions on case-insensitivity of Unicode labels

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.

Actions needed: Needs discussion **and production of text for the next CD**, or an output document.

This issue was briefly reviewed Friday PM Tokyo, but it was agreed that this is a difficult area, and the all the documents were carried forward as an unnumbered output for the Geneva September 2009 meeting (they are listed above).

Discussion:

11 Implementation issues for ORS (using CNAME and DNAME etc)

TD0331 Draft Implementation Guidelines for DNS,
12D378 Discussion on use of a crawler to synchronize OID repository with DNS,
arpa, root and int zone files,
An alternative approach to zone files,
Use of DIG,
rfc1035 - domain implementation and specification,
rfc2181 - clarifications to the DNS specification.

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."

Actions needed: Basically, we need text for all the above in the next CD, where it is not already present.

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.

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:

12 ORS security/trust and performance issues

M34 - Trusted Provider Identity presentation,
M10 Verisign contribution on TPI,
TD 283 ATIS trust,
Comments from TR on TD283,
rfc2535 - DNS security extensions (DNSSEC)
Domain Name System Security Extensions (Wikipedia)

Summary:

Currently scheduled for Monday PM1, joint meeting with Q4.

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?

Actions needed:

Discuss the problems with DNSSEC, and determine how to handle the need for a trust anchor. Presumably the OID DNS RA 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:

13   Review of proposed text for Sec Generals pages

<mark>No documents available yet</mark> – awaiting JL document "Proposed text for Sec Generals pages"

Summary:

The TSB has requested text for inclusion in the Sec Generals pages to balance the text on DOI.

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

Discussion:

14   Request from Q.4 for an OID arc for Cyber Security

TD0369 Request for OID arc for cyber security

Summary:

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

Currently tentatively scheduled for Monday PM1 joint meeting with Q4.

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!).

Discussion:

15   SG16 liaison on use of XML, XML Schema, FastInfoset, and ASN.1 in H.325

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

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:

16   OID arcs for WMO CAP

TD0222 OIDs for CAP,
TD0338 WMO CAP,
Presentation to CAP Workshop WIS-CAP-2009,
Introduction OIDs by OD

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

Currently schedule for Monday PM1 – 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 JL: "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).

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.

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 an RA.

Make the OID presentation by OD a 12D?

Discussion:

17   Review Languages and description techniques used in ITU-T

TD0290 ITU-T languages and description techniques

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

Discussion:

18   TC215 New Work Items on OID repository interworking

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

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?

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:

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.)

No documents available

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 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 (not yet set up) and GotoMeeting (not yet set-up). JL needs to get these both arranged – it is in hand.

Actions needed: Attend telecom on date/time Mon 21 Sept 4pm Geneva time

Discussion:

20 PER Encoding Instructions for 3GPP

3GPP PER Encoding Instructions required

Summary: This problem is broadly understood. JL will try to summarize it. Colin has agreed that our outline solution is OK. JL is not clear what the difference is between the two documents in the .zip.

Actions needed:

Discard one of the documents in the ZIP?

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:

21 Other PER Encoding Instructions

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

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:

22 IRI oid scheme

12D377 Internet draft for OID IRI registration
E-mail correspondence re IRIs
First IRI-review
Second IRI submission

Summary: (This item was referred to the Electronic Meeting, but no action was taken.)

Note that he 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.

Actions needed:

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

Step 1:   Agree fairly complete word text for the content of a second Internet Draft for the IRI Scheme

Step 2:   Convert to Internet Draft format

(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 .txt extension, then to use Notepad, and then do the editing, and then change the extension back to .xml. A change record is being maintained within the document using xml comment.)

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

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

Review all currently available documents, merge, and if possible progress and agree text for the next internet draft.

Document 12D377 ("Internet Draft for OID IRI registration (XML version)" is the only 12D, but is somewhat dated. There was an input folder to this meeting that was intended to contain the most useful and current documents. This was transferred to the outputs folder, but not listed as outputs.

There are many e-mails in JLs inbox for the IRI Scheme, some (but not all) of which have been consolidated (but some are duplicated in the para 1 material. An urgent action was placed on the

electronic meeting to produce at least a full consolidation of all available material (including text below), and preferably to progress a further draft.

The following changes are needed for the next internet draft:

_____

oidiri = "oid:/" firstarcid subsequentarcid

in the Larmouth internet draft is incorrect, and should be

oidiri = "oid:/" firstarcid [subsequentarcid]

to reflect that the subsequent arc need not be present.

We need a corrigendum to X.892 to correct the IRI to a legal value.

Discussion:

23   OID arc and Unicode label allocations

12D368 Unicode labels allocated in ASN.1 specifications

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. It needs serious tidying up to produce an authoritative record.

Actions needed:

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:

24   Revision of A.23 Joint Work Rules

Revision of A.23 Joint work rules

Summary: It is noted that a proposed revision is contained in TSAG TD 36 (http://www.itu.int/md/T09-TSAG-090428-TD-GEN-0036/en).

Actions needed:

Review the text and determine if we want to make any comments. Herb Bertine and OD are active in this area. JL has already expressed comments that the text still refers to FCD ballots as a precursor to SG17 approval. Can we leave all this stuff to Herb and OD? (They certainly need both to be present for any discussion of this item.

Discussion:

25   Web services study group

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:

26   Review of SG17 Web pages

Summary:

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

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:

27   Defect Reports

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

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:

28   Review of Future Work proposals

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.

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 (this is HW for all attendees before the meeting), 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.

Discussion:

29 Items needed for WP3/SG17 Plenary

12D380 Q12 Meeting Report Geneva Feb 2009
12D306r7 Q12 Geneva February 2009 Action Plan
TD0333 Letter from Uruguay
12D360r1 Question 12 for Study Period 2009-2012
12D319r4 Draft Summaries for Q.12
Liaison Statement to Q.12 concerning OID allocations

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

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 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)

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

- a) Meeting report (see TD 252 – Feb meeting report).
- 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

- a) Recommendations from WG9 (Circulation of outputs etc, possibly OID top-arc registrations, other?)
- b) Agenda and Minutes (this document, tidied up after the meeting – Action JL)
- c) ISO Meeting report (JL to produce after the meeting.)
- d) Approved Disposition of Comments on CD 29168 (Jun-Seob to produce and mail to Jooran with CD2 text by 1 Oct?)
- e) Text for immediate CD ballot for CD2 29168 (Jun-Seob to produce and mail to Jooran with Approved Doc by 1 Oct? A three month ballot that needs to close comfortably before Jan 18 2010, unless we miss a slot and do other business. Decision needed.)

31   Final admin

12D097 - Team - status of work
Document Register, Agenda and Minutes

32   Review of Tokyo HW and electronic meeting minutes and related actions

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?

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

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.

33   Future meetings

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

    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 (Use of the middle Sunday is to be discussed in Geneva September.)

- 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.

- October 27 - November 5, 2010 in Geneva with SG17 (Use of the middle Sunday is to be discussed in Geneva April 2010.)

- 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).

34   Table of output documents

12D#	Title	Going to SC6 (for xyz?)	Going to SG17 (for ?)	12D needs upload

				?
NO	Meeting Report	NO	TD xxxx	NO
NO	Action Plan	NO	TD xxxx	NO
NO	Summaries	NO	TD xxxx	NO
12Dx382r1 (Word)	Agenda and minutes of Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 in Geneva 16-25 Sept 2009 (this document).	Information 6Nxxxx	Information TD xxxx	YES
12Dx383r1	Text for xxx ballot for X.oid-res ISO IEC 29168	Ballot 6Nxxxx	Information TD xxxx	YES
NO	Approved Disposition of Comments on CD1 29168	Information 6Nxxxx	NO	NO
12Dx364r2	SC 6 September WG 9 Resolutions	Yes	Information TD xxxx	YES

35   HW during Geneva Sept 2009

36   HW immediately post Geneva Sept 2009

37   HW post Geneva Sept 2009

38   Items for electronic meetings

39   Items for SC6 January 2010 meeting