Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N13992
Date:	2009-06-16
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Report
Document Title:	Meeting Report of joint meeting of JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ASN1 Q12 17, 1-5 June 2009 in Tokyo, Japan
Document Source:	SC 6/WG 9 Convenor
Project Number:	
Document Status:	As per the SC 6 Tokyo resolution 6.9.7, this document is circulated to SC 6 national bodies for information.
Action ID:	FYI
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	4

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

ASN.1 Q.12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 Meeting Report to SC 6 of Joint meeting in Tokyo June 2009

1 General

1.1 In retrospect, the Convenor (writing this!) erred. All outstanding items were put on the agenda, but many important ones fell off the end.

1.2 The priority item was the progression of ISO/IEC 29168, with resolution of comments on the 2nd WD, and progression to a CD – this was achieved.

1.3 In the event, a lot of time was spent on technical discussions on how to handle the ORS within the DNS system, and many other (some quite important) agenda items fell off the end of the agenda (see clause 8).

1.4 Nonetheless, despite the Convenor going into "panic mode", we got a lot done. See the report on the ORS in clause 2.

1.5 The "big" issue of the positioning of the International OID root within the DNS system had extensive discussion, and an ITU-T TD was produced recording this discussion (see clause 6), but it was inconclusive.

2 ORS issues resolved

2.1 We had formal comments on the ORS WD 2, an Editor's proposed DoC, and some e-mail comments on both.

2.2 All were considered, and satisfactorily resolved to enable agreement to progression to CD text, with a view to FCD out of the Joint September meeting. This was routine work.

NOTE – However, it is recognised that there are still serious problems before an FCD will be possible and NBs are asked to try to address those by contributions or ballot comments. These are discussed in clause 5 below.

2.3 We had superb presentations from both Korea (NIDA) and China (CNNIC) on mapping the ORS into the DNS system (both were independent of the positioning of the root of the International OID tree within the DNS system.) But it took a large part of the meeting to resolve the issues these produced (see clause 4).

3 Other issues resolved

3.1 We agreed the change to the PER EI alignment to satisfy published Standards (the electronic meeting's group is to implement the change on the Web pages.)

3.2 The ISO Web-site on Maintenance agencies was discussed with Keith Brannon (ITTF), and satisfactorily resolved, subject to progression of the SC 6 Resolution formally appointing NIDA.

4 Implementation of the ORS in the DNS system

4.1 Korea (NIDA) provided a demonstration involving three DNS servers (see 6N13996), but the implementation proved to be too inflexible to handle the exponential explosion of DNS records with multiple Unicode labels on arcs, or to handle the exponential explosion of updates needed if a new Unicode label was added to a high arc.

4.2 Resolving this took a large part of the rest of the meeting, right up to the final day.

4.3 The US suggested that use of CNAME would solve the problem. It did so only partially. China suggested use of DNAME. Eventually, NIDA produced a solution using both that appeared to work (but we were on the last day now, and extensive testing was not possible.)

4.4 It became clear in discussion that we have requirements for a solution that does not involve an exponential explosion of DNS records with multiple Unicode labels, and that does not involve an exponential explosion of DNS updating when a high-level Unicode label is added. These were not clearly documented, but are understood by the group. It is believed that we have a solution to both problems.

4.5 The "final" solution was written up by NIDA as 6N13995.

4.6 This needs to be checked further at the September meeting, and we need to decide where to place Implementation Guidance related to it within the ORS standards text(s). (This issue is outstanding.)

5 ORS issues unresolved (or only partly resolved)

5.1 We have not yet decided where to position the "Implementation Guidelines" for use of CNAME and DNAME within the text(s).

5.2 There is a lot of text provided for earlier meetings related to the problems of case-folding and related issues such as puny-coding or %encoding. Unfortunately most of these documents where not discussed, due to lack of time, and need to be re-addressed in September.

5.3 Some time was spent on discussion of how to return child information. It proved impossible in the time available to agree minutes recording these discussions/agreements, and the provisional text was deleted. In essence, the proposal was to introduce categories of node information, and to treat child information as just another (special) category, returned by the same mechanisms (a URI and access method). But this category would be mandatory, and the format would be some machine-processable format – a Unix document was suggested. It would return a (possibly empty) sequence of children, and for each child it would either give a pointer to a server for that child (with the Unicode labels on the arcs leading to it), or will give the same info, but saying "no child server is available". This all needs further discussion later.

6 Positioning of the OID root in the DNS system

6.1 There was extensive discussion, and a TD was produced for discussion at the September meeting of SG 17, and there was homework assigned for further investigation, but there was no real conclusion.

6.2 If anyone wants a copy of this, please contact the Convenor j.larmout@btinternet.com, but it will be circulated to asn1dev.

7 Future meetings

7.1 We are planning to meet with SG 17 in Geneva September 2009 (including the middle Sunday), with SC 6 in London in January 2010, again with SG 17 in April 2010 (middle Sunday not yet decided), and with SG 17 in Geneva in October/November 2010 (middle Sunday not yet decided).

8 Items that fell off the agenda

8.1 Many of these items were referred to the electronic meetings, but it remains to be seen how much they can achieve.

8.2 We failed to progress any work on PER EIs, other than to agree a change of the octet alignment, which needs to be implemented by text from the electronic meeting.

8.3 There is also a fairly urgent need to review use of other PER EIs in other emerging standards that we did not have time for.

8.4 We have semi-mature text for a version 2 of the internet draft for an "oid:" IRI scheme, but are still bogged down by suggestions that the existing "urn:oid" scheme can be modified to satisfy all our needs - which most people in the group do not believe. We also need to get the ORS and canonicalization stuff further advanced before progressing this further. We are out of man-power to progress this stuff.

8.5 Another urgent item is to address the 3GPP requirement to provide for relaying. A solution is available in outline, but needs work.

8.6 Review of the intended revision of the Joint Work criteria (A.23) was carried forward.

8.7 CAP and WMO issues were carried forward.

8.8 There was no opportunity to review Defect Reports, or to discuss future work (although all this is likely to be cancelled - we have too much on already).

8.9 There are many items concerned with routine OID and Unicode label allocations that were carried forward.

JL

15 June 2009