Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N13991
Date:	2009-06-16
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Meeting Agenda
Document Title:	Draft Agenda, Timetable and Minutes of the ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q12/SG17 collaborative meeting on ASN.1, 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:	19

**Draft Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for
ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q12/SG17
collaborative meeting on ASN.1 in Tokyo
1-5 June 2009**

Contents

1 Documents DONE

Documents for the meeting are included in sub-folders of the meeting input folder. The names of the sub-folders correspond to agenda items below. Note – in some cases e-mails in JLs e-mail folder have not been converted into documents. Where applicable, this is noted below, and these will either be handled by the electronic meetings or carried forward to Geneva September 2009.

2 Timetable DONE

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. Unless otherwise agreed, we will start at 09.00 (AM1), break for coffee 10.00 to 10.30, then we have 10.30 (AM2) to 12.00, lunch 12.00 to 13.00, then 13.00 (PM1), break for tea 15.00 to 15.30, then 15.30 to 17.00 (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.

Mon AM1   Preparatory work – see Item 3 below.

Mon AM2   ORS presentations

Mon PM   ORS presentations continued, and ballot resolution

Tue AM1   IRI progression

Tue AM2   PER EI progression

Wed AM   Review and progress other agenda items

Wed PM   HodC Meeting

Thu AM   Finalize Recommendations/Resolutions

Thu PM   Defect Reports

Fri AM   SC 6 Plenary

Fri PM   Final admin to tidy up document register, agenda and minutes, etc

3   Preparatory work DONE

3.1   Distribute initial ZIP on a stick as necessary

3.2   Check attendees and identify availability

3.3   Agree Agenda and time allocations

3.4   Review Document Register and check all documents carried forward are on the Agenda. It is believed that the following are carried forward, but are not yet in the ZIP: 12D381 (Agenda 5 - ORS), 378 (Agenda 5 – ORS), 377 (Agenda 6 – IRI), 374r2 (Agenda 15 – Defect Reports), 368 (Agenda 11 – Unicode labels), 356 (Agenda 8 – PER EIs), 338r4 (Agenda 8 – PER EIs), 323 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 276 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 251 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 195 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 168 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 147r3 (Agenda 14 – Defect Reports), 136 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 124 (Agenda 16 – Futures), 097 (Agenda 17 – Final admin), 096r7 (Agenda 17 – Final Admin), TD242 Rev.1 (Agenda 5 – ORS), TD239 (Agenda 5 – ORS), TD222 (Agenda 10 – CAP), TD 176 (Agenda 5 – ORS), 12D375 (Agenda 5 – ORS).

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 (Monday AM) DONE

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 (after Monday)

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

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

        (after Monday)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Valerie Barnole (France), Valerie.barnole@orange-ftgroup.com

Keith Brannon (ITTF ISO Head), brannon@iso.ch

There were others that came in from other Working Groups that finished early, but they were not recorded, due to pressure of business.

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   Object Identifier Resolution system (ORS) <mark>DONE FOR TOKYO</mark>

12D375, 12D378, 12D381, TD 176, TD 239, TD 242r1

The proposed letter to ICANN, and the Attachment 1 to the plenary report COM 17-R1 were retained in the folder that was copied to the outputs folder, but not listed as an output. <mark>They are needed for Geneva September discussions.</mark>

5.1   China presentation on research activity related to OID resolution <mark>DONE FOR TOKYO</mark>

China was thanked for a very useful and illuminating presentation.

The presentation was given by Ning Kong from CNNIC (China Internet Network Information Center). They are developing software in this area, and are working closely with NIDA (Korea) in some aspects of this work. The ORS in this presentation 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.

A later presentation concerning case sensitivity "12D <mark>xxxx</mark> Draft for the implementation guidance for ORS.doc" was <mark>carried forward to Geneva.</mark>

5.2   Korea presentation of an OID resolution system demonstration DONE

5.2.1   A series of slides were presented showing screen captures and DNS information for the various steps involved in the use of DNS for use of: CASE 1 (canonical form of OID to access info), CASE 2 (OID-IRI to access info), and CASE 3 (OID-IRI to canonical form of OID).

This was followed by a live demonstration of ORS.

NIDA was complimented on producing a very useful trial implementation and demonstration. The following were some of the discussions that resulted from it.

5.2.2   The steps in the presentation assume no caching. There could be other slide produced showing a reduced number of steps when caching is in place (this is standard DNS implementation).

5.2.3   As a result of discussion, the presentation was expanded to illustrate error cases in the input in case 1. The error cases can apply to any of the Unicode labels in the IRI if the DNS is not aware of any node addressed by that Unicode label. The effect of errors in the input can be to truncate the number of steps involved due to a reply in an earlier step of an empty string.

5.2.4   The current pilot implementation does not cover the case of multiple Unicode labels on arcs. 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 whether a tutorial annex describing these options and their consequences may or may not be useful. 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.

5.2.5   The discussion on Case 3 identified that the situation illustrated 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 a superior arcs. 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.

5.2.6   The demonstration was based on an input of 1.27.2.oid.foo. and mcode.tag-based.joint-iso-itu-t.oid.foo. These both worked. By changing the requested DNS record in the input, the demo returned both the access information and the canonical form of the IRI. This was successful. Variant demonstrations (which had not been planned) were then attempted.   The first was to input 101.27.2.oid.foo. and then to input 1.127.2.oid.foo. These both worked perfectly with a return of "no such name". There was then an attempt to input mcode.27.joint-iso-itu-t.oid.foo. (this is one of 8 possibilities of IRIs in this demonstration system). Unfortunately, the current version of the demo could not handle these 8 variants. It can be amended by putting in 8 zone files or by use of CNAME (which is almost certainly preferable). A subsequent demonstration on Wednesday morning showed that simple use of CNAME did not work. There was then considerable discussion of the exponential explosion problem that had been demonstrated above, and particularly the problem of additional Unicode labels being added to a high arc not requiring zone changes for a lower arc. It was recognized, that as the first demo failed to produce a correct implementation, a tutorial annex (or a separate Part, or an implementer's Handbook would be needed explaining these problems and the (CNAME?) solution would be highly desirable.

It later became clear that the CNAME "solution" did not work. Some depression (by the Convener) followed, as we appeared to have no acceptable solution using DNS. A very important contribution was made by Ning Kong (China), who suggested that DNAME might solve the problem. After several experiments by Jong-Pyo Kim (Korea), it became clear that a combination of DNAME and CNAME looked likely to work. However, time did not permit a final demonstration of an acceptable working look-up system.

When discussion of this topic had to be closed, it was believed that we had an approach to zone files that would satisfy all requirements, but this had not been fully documented or described.

The group now agreed that we need to progress text about how to handle zone files to meet the requirements of ORS. Two pieces of homework were assigned:

a)   Jong-Pyo Kim (Korea) was asked to provide (for input to September) a fairly full description of the zone-files (using DNAME and CNAME) needed to provide ORS for the limited part of the tree that was covered in the demonstration this week.

b)   It was agreed that we needed (for input to September) 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 new Unicode labels at a high arc. The placement of any resulting text (within the current Recommendation | Standard, an Implementers Handbook, etc) is referred to the September meeting, but it is agreed that such text (and how to satisfy it using DNS) is certainly needed in some form of international standardization.

5.2.7   The present pilot implementation and presentation does not handle the return of child information, nor does it illustrate the use of % escapes for non-ASCII characters or for case sensitivity. This topic is deferred for discussion in September.

5.3   Review of "General discussions on the ORS infrastructure" DONE

This document was reviewed. The two questions that were posed and that DNS and X.500 could not easily answer are questions which we agreed were not part of our requirements on the ORS. The only useful remark was related to the use of CNAME to solve the exponential explosion problem, which we have already discussed.

It was decided that we do not need to discuss this document further.

5.4 Review of "Old TR document on use of gTLD" <mark>DONE FOR TOKYO</mark>

Clause 1: There was some discussion of the merit of having "0.OID.", "1.OID.", "2.OID." in the zone files for the ".OID." root. This discussion had taken place at a previous meeting, and was deferred in order to keep any request for a ".OID.foo." DNS name as simple as possible. This meeting agreed that efficiency concerns were not important at this stage of ORS implementation, and any request for part of the domain name structure should be restricted to a single entry pointing to a .OID server to be managed by (for example) TSB or NIDA.

There was some further discussion that identified the value of having either a gTLD of ".OID." or "OID.ARPA.". If we had either of these, the top level zone files would be automatically distributed to up to 13 servers in different continents around the world.

Discussion identified that even if we used (for example) ".oid.int" or ".oid.com", it would still be possible to have a number of mirrors for the zone files for the top of the OID tree. The servers for these mirrors would be unlikely to be as highly optimized as the servers for the top level of the DNS tree. There was a view that this would not matter for the initial deployment of the ORS. A further issue was raised that having a number of mirrors of the zone files for the top level of the OID tree would be desirable in order to avoid dependency on any state/country. **It was therefore decided 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.".** In the case of a gTLD and ".oid.arpa.", the mirroring would come automatically from the normal operation of the current DNS. It is recognized that this discussion, and its conclusions, is important. However, it does not seem to have a place in the base Recommendation | International Standard for the ORS. It is suggested that we may wish to consider the production of an ITU-T Implementer's Handbook that would record these kinds of issues. <mark>Further discussion of this is carried forward to the September Geneva meeting</mark>, and comments will be invited in the CD ballot text.

Clause 2: The only interesting text in this clause was the reference to the possible need for a WHOIS server that would take an IRI and would return all of the synonymous IRIs (including the canonical IRI) together with the sort of registrant information which is recorded in the current OID repository. The meeting agreed that **there was no requirement for a WHOIS service in the initial Recommendation | International Standard or implementation**.

There were no other items in this document that required further discussion.

5.5 Review of attachment 1 to COM 17-R1 <mark>DONE FOR TOKYO</mark>

This attachment records the inputs from France Telecom, the UK, and Germany concerning the proposed letter to ICANN in TD 242 Rev.1.

These comments were reviewed and analyzed. There appear to be some common features:

a)   All three contributions felt that submission of a request for a gTLD at this time would be premature (but not always with the same reasons), but none of the contributions ruled out the possibility of this being a solution in the longer term.

b)   Both France Telecom and the UK objected to any suggestion of the rules and fees for applying for a gTLD being relaxed (Germany did not mention this issue).

c)   All three contributions referenced the costs of the application, but with slightly different emphasis. There are costs associated with application for a gTLD; there are costs associated with maintenance of servers associated with the top level; approval for TSB expenditure in this area may need approval at ITU Council level.

d)   Germany asked that issues of management of the resulting domain name should be considered and addressed.

e)   Germany requests that there should be consideration of alternatives to DNS.

The meeting noted that the only alternatives that had so far been identified were X.500 (rejected in Montreux November 2008 Joint Meeting) and establishment of a "private DNS" with a separately managed root and with different TCP/IP ports, but using the same DNS software. The latter alternative only appeared in recent email discussions (which are yet to be reviewed) but the UK and Korean delegates stated that their countries are firmly opposed to such a solution.

Noted in discussion:

Recommendations by the joint meeting to the September SG17 meeting, for discussion at a meeting which will be well-advertised for anyone at the SG17 meeting to attend:

The joint meeting now believes that there are sufficient costs and problems with obtaining a gTLD that this approach should be abandoned.

The next preferred solution technically is ".oid.arpa". **However, the group is fearful that it may require a lot of administrative effort and time (but no actual cash) to obtain ".oid.arpa".**

SG17 is invited to consider taking the simple choice of buying "zilch.com", where "zilch" is chosen to be an available name as meaningful as possible. **This will cost a small amount of money, which it is hoped that the TSB may be prepared to pay.** There was an objection (from China) to using ".com", as it is managed by a US company.

It is likely that for anything other than a gTLD of ".oid." or use of ".oid.arpa.", we would find that ".oid" is already taken, so we would need to use something like ".oid-res." instead.

The joint meeting felt unable to recommend any one of the other choices, but the following were discussed:

Parent name	Cost	Difficulty of getting it.
None (gTLD)	Very large	Large/impossible?
.arpa	None	Heavy perhaps
.com	Possibly $7 per annum (Precise cost to be determined. Would TSB pay?)	Easy?
.int	small	May not be allowed?
.itu.int	zero	Easy?
.org	Possibly $7 per annum	Easy?

A view was expressed that the order of preference is a gTLD, .arpa, and then .int.

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

Another option mentioned but not discussed much was: 0.oid-info.com, etc and any other Unicode label from the root apart from "www" (which is already taken). (.oid-info.com is owned by France Telecom, so their agreement would be needed).

There was further discussion of these options, and JL was given HW to produce a TD recording this discussion. We could not make any further recommendation, except that a well-publicized meeting should be held in September at a time when all HoDs (but particularly France Telecom and UK and Germany) were able to attend.

5.6   Review of "Positioning of .oid and related issues" DONE FOR TOKYO

Clauses 1 and 2 are factual, historic, but still useful.

Clause 3 is a further reason why a letter to ICANN would be premature at this time.

In relation to the statement and questions: "We took a decision in the February 2009 SG17 Joint Meeting in Geneva to go the DNS route. Does anyone want to revisit that decision? Does anyone have second thoughts on using a DNS base? Or are we still FIRMLY trying to move forward on a DNS base?" **there was unanimous agreement that we did not want to reopen the decision to use DNS.**

The Rapporteur | Convener was requested to ensure that the decision to stay with a DNS base was recorded in both the meeting reports for SG17 and SC6. This decision should also be recorded as the groups answer to the German request that "the technical aspects of an OID Resolution System should be sufficiently clarified and also possible alternative solutions should be investigated."

The group will, of course, consider any new alternatives if they are submitted as written contributions in the near future, but has already extensively discussed the only two alternatives that have been raised thus far (an X.500 base or a "private" DNS) after extensively discussing the technical requirements of an OID Resolution System. The record of these discussions is recorded in previous minutes of the ASN.1 group.

In relation to the other questions in clause 4, these need further discussion in Geneva, but it is noted that clause 6 provides some answers.

It was agreed that clause 6 and 7 was useful material that needs to be carried forward to Geneva, but that no further action will be taken concerned with .oid.arpa until Geneva.

This whole document was placed in the outputs folder for discussion again in Geneva, but was not given a 12D number, as it remains transient.

5.7   Disposition of Comments on 2nd WD

Review of e-mails "Comments on the DoC for the 2nd WD. This document was reviewed after the Approved DoC had been produced. It was agreed that it did not require any change to the DoC that we had agreed, and that the document need not be carried forward to the outputs. On clause 2, it was noted that this had been dealt with and a liaison issued. On clause 4, had already spent a lot of time on this in Tokyo and believed we had resolved it (see document "Implementation Guidelines on the use of DNS for the ORS (from Korea)"). JL was asked to inform Steven Legg of this. DONE)

The proposed disposition of comments was reviewed, and an approved disposition of comments produced.

5.8   Review of "Discussions on case sensitivity in Unicode labels" CARRIED FORWARD TO GENEVA.

This was briefly reviewed Friday PM, but it was agreed that this is a difficult area, and the entire document is carried forward as an unnumbered output for the Geneva September 2009 meeting.

5.9   Progression of ORS (to CD or FCD?)

After some discussion, it was agreed that this work should be balloted as a CD. This imposed a tight time-scale to allow resolution in Geneva.

5.10   Other matters CARRIED FORWARD TO GENEVA SEPTEMBER 2009

The following was minuted in Montreux in relation to trust issues. Is any further action needed?

"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. However, it was felt that it was outside the remit of WG 9 and Q.12 replacement to agree progression of this. VeriSign was invited to resubmit these documents as a zipped TD for the February meeting to be considered by Q.2, 8, 10/17 replacements."

The following was minuted in Montreux in relation to performance issues. Is any further action needed?

"These have not yet been addressed, but there may be interactions between the ability to cache, and the use/non-use of DNSsec."

There was no time to discuss this item. It is carried forward in toto, together with the referenced M34 and M10 documents which have been copied into the output folder for convenience.

6 IRI oid scheme <mark>REFERRED TO ELECTRONIC MEETING for urgent consolidation and perhaps progression</mark>

Document 12D377 ("Internet Draft for OID IRI registration (XML version)" us 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 preferable to progress a further draft.

6.1 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.

6.2 Actions needed

Determine who/when and progression. NOT DISCUSSED

We need a corrigendum to X.892 to correct the IRI to a legal value. <mark>CARRIED FORWARD TO GENEVA</mark>

6.3 Steps needed

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

6.3.2 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, then do the editing, 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.

6.3.3 Step 3: Submit as revised Internet Draft

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

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

6.3.6 Step 6: Initiate corrigendum to X.892 (referred to Feb 2009 Geneva meeting)

7 TC215 NWI proposals <mark>DONE FOR TOKYO</mark>

These were discussed, and a liaison was output (see clause 21).

8 PER Encoding Instructions including 3GPP requirements <mark>REFERRED TO ELECTONIC MEETING</mark>

Documents: 12D356, 338r4

The input folder documents were not discussed, and this was copied to the output folder, but without listing as outputs.

8.1 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.

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

8.3 19794-7 (published) uses PER EIs in an informative Annex, with a SIZE for the optionality that puts the PER encoding of the bit-map at the most significant end. Our current proposed definition has it at the least significant end. JL has sent to asn1dev a recommendation that we align with the current usage, and put the PER encoding at the most significant end. There was agreement in the electronic meeting that we should go for left-alignment. Do we just change the current non-approved suggested EI, or can we make much further progress? The latter is clearly desirable, but we need text during Tokyo. The agreement that we go for left alignment of the unaligned PER encoding within the EI specified field, was both to accommodate published and CD Standards, and because it is more consistent with ALIGNED PER. This needs ratification in Tokyo. This was approved by the Group.

8.4 19794-11 (under CD ballot closing June 2009), for discussing in Moscow (July 2009) has the same problem, but it is normative, and uses a number of other PER EIs. <mark>We need to check which.</mark>

9 Revision of A.23 Joint Work Rules <mark>Referred to electronic meeting</mark>

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). The content of this (and the changes it introduces) will need discussion in Tokyo. There have been further e-mail discussions on this, which JL will either include in the Agenda and Minutes or will report on verbally. NOT DONE (NO TIME).

The input folder has been copied to the outputs, but not listed as an output.

10 CAP and WMO matters <mark>Referred to Electronic Meeting</mark>

Documents: TD 222

There are documents in the input folder that have been transferred to the outputs folder but not listed as outputs. There are also e-mails in JL inbox that need to be summarized or resolved.

10bis Registration Authorities and Maintenance Agencies DONE.

There was discussion involving Keith Brannon and the group on what Registration Authorities in the OID trees needed to be officially established as ISO maintenance authorities.

It was agreed that the present mechanisms for recording country registration authorities was acceptable, and no action was needed in this regard. Similarly, it was agreed that the software agent handling and recording UUID allocations was sufficient and no further action was needed. Finally, the operation of BSI as the maintenance authority for ICDs is already established by the SC responsible for 9523 and no action is needed for that.

That left the allocation under {2 27} (Rec. ITU-T X.668 | ISO/IEC 9834-9). It was agreed that we should have formally established NIDA as the RA. This will be rectified by an SC6 resolution at this meeting to start the process, which will end with an agreement between NIDA and ISO/IEC and an entry in the ISO maintenance authority web page.

It was also agreed that the mechanisms now being used for registering joint arc allocations, replacing the action of ANSI as an RA, were acceptable, but we need an SC6 resolution to have the ISO/IEC 8824-1 entry in the ISO maintenance web page removed.

HW was given to OD to draft two resolutions for this, with two accompanying explanatory documents which will go to JTC1 with the request for a JTC1 recommendation. DONE (See Resolution 6.9.6)

11 Unicode label allocations <mark>CARRIED FORWARD TO ELECTRONIC MEETING</mark>

See 12D368

11.1 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.

11.2 Develop registration text for Unicode Labels (including Chinese and Korean text if appropriate).

11.3 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.

11.4 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.)

11.5 There was a Korean application from TTA approved in Geneva Feb 2009. Feb 2009 minuted: "We should consider whether we want a Unicode label for a long arc from the root to {2 27}".

11.6 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.

12 Record of OID allocations (brought forward from Geneva) <mark>CARRIED FORWARD TO ELECTRONIC MEETING</mark>

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.

<<<<<

Is further work needed at this meeting?

13 Administrative matters for HodC and Plenary <mark>Not done - review in September</mark>

Review of Business Plan (6N13934) and Work Program (6N13941) and pending ballots

13.1 The ballot on 8824-1 to -4) FDIS terminate on 23 June, and for 8825-1 to -6 terminate on 30 June. Tokyo is 1-5 June, so the ballot will not have closed. We need to resolve any problems electronically after Tokyo, unless there are known problems.

13.2 The ballots (<mark>which? PET?</mark>) on 9834-3, 7, 8 were all approved with 100% affirmative votes, no negative, and no comments. <mark>This list should include 9834-1, we need to check the SC6 ballot result announcement.</mark>

13.3 Report from PET on 8824 and 8825 progression. Due date for 8824 is June 23 2009. Due date for 8825 is <mark>….</mark> Action on Paul to record the dates in 12D97.

13.4 There is an e-mail re publication dates for the new editions (same for ITU-T and ISO or not) that is unresolved. Needs further consideration after the FDIS for the ASN.1 texts are issued by ITTF for balloting. Action PET in due course.

13.5 Tokyo Resolutions and the Participants list were copied into the outputs folder, but are not listed as outputs.

13bis Miscellaneous problems <mark>DEFERRED</mark>

13bis.1 There is a possible replacement for the JTC1 WSSG (Web Services Study Group) with a JTC 1/WG or a JTC 1/SWG. This is expected to be determined at the next June 3 WSSG meeting. We should consider a possible liaison statement to JTC1 on this subject <mark>from the next SC6 meeting, London 2010</mark>.

13bis.2 Review of SG17 Web pages. 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.

14 Draft Resolutions and associated documents

Documents: 12D364r2

The Tokyo meeting should note SG 17 COM 067 into the Feb 2009 Geneva meeting. We need to respond to Q.4/17 on the use of ASN.1 for this purpose, and if possible to provide text. This was drafted as 6N14002, and should be attached to the ITU-T Meeting Report.

The letters from Iran (SG 17 TD 40) and Uruguay need to be posted as an SC6 document at the Tokyo meeting for information) DONE (6N13998). The letter from Uruguay also needs to be posted as a TD for information (TD<mark>xxxx</mark>).

We forgot to do the liaison to Q.12 entitled "6Nxxxx - Proposed Liaison Statement to Q.12/17 concerning OID allocations.doc". It has been moved to the output folder <mark>and needs to be addressed in Geneva September 2009.</mark>

15 Defect Reports DEFERRED to online meeting or September

Documents: 12D374r2, 147r3

15.1 Note particularly the addition of: "The present text of X.660 defines a long arc in a very generic way, but other text, particularly A.1.2 and A.7 restrict its use to an arc from the root to a node beneath Joint-ISO-ITU-T. It is considered that the facility should be extended to allow long arcs from the root to any subordinate arc (at any level) subject to joint agreement. The spirit of the intended change is to restrict long arcs to end on nodes of international importance. The corrigendum will need careful text to implement this. Possible text could be "The end node shall be a node which has been allocated either in an X.660 series recommendation, or by joint resolution." Reservations about the impact on tools were expressed."

15.2 ECN defects from JPL. The document "Some questions about ECN.doc" was placed in the outputs, and referred to the electronic meetings.

15.3 There appears to be a Defect on the 2008 ASN.1 texts in that PDU is defined as an abbreviation in some parts, but Protocol Data Unit is nowhere defined.

15.4 B.3.2.2h of X.680 2008 seems to contradict 28.5c of X.680 2008.
This needs review and discussion in Tokyo.

15.5 We should consider adding the following as an X.668 Defect: "It was noted that for a technical assessment of the application, 7.3 of X.668 requires a statement that the allocation will be used within 12 months of approval of the allocation. However, clause 8 does not specify this as information required in an application. This would be recorded as a defect report on X.668.

16 Review of Future Work proposals Defer to September

12D323, 276, 251, 195, 168, 136, 124

It is believed that there is no future agreed work. However, the issue of conformance testing for the OID resolution system software (ORS software) is a live issue. We need to review the Future Work 12Ds and finally mark them "DONE".

17 Final admin DONE

12D-097, 096r7, Document Register, Agenda and Minutes

18 Review of Geneva HW and related actions DONE

JL was given HW to provide a 12D of "useful contacts and URLs". This should include the contact details for IETF issues (extract from the OHN issues list), and the contact details for Bob Rowley (Editor of ISO 8601) And for the new Editor of 8601, and for Francois. Also to investigate whether there is information in exchanges with Bob Rowley concerning different time differences on start and end points of intervals that needs to be captured, apart from contact details. The URL for free access to ASN.1 documents (provided by JPL) is

 http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/fetch/2000/2489/Ittf_Home/PubliclyAvailableStandards.htm.

Carried Forward to Post-Tokyo

Consolidated document of e-mails is to be prepared by JL. DONE FOR Tokyo

JPL was given Homework to add the following as an X.668 Defect: "It was noted that for a technical assessment of the application, 7.3 of X.668 requires a statement that the allocation will be used within 12 months of approval of the allocation. However, clause 8 does not specify this as information required in an application. This is to be recorded as a defect report on X.668, and NIDA is requested to require assertion of this condition in its application form. Carried forward DONE

The following items were given to the Electronic meetings:

To review and approve the "final outputs", including the ISO Meeting Report and the updated Agenda and Minutes. DONE

To review the Document Register and identify documents relevant to the Tokyo meeting. DONE
> Note that 12D 360r1, 319r4 and 306r7 should be carried forward to Geneva September. Note also that it was decided not to progress 12D373 as either part of a revised X.660 or as part of the ORS standard, since its content (while interesting) is peripheral to the ORS activity. DONE

To establish the agenda for the Tokyo meeting - Done by Convener

To progress the Internet Draft for an IRI namespace NOT DONE Carried forward

To progress PER EIs as necessary NOT DONE Carried forward

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. NOT DONE Carried forward

19 Items referred to SC 6 Tokyo Jun 2009 meeting from the February meeting DONE

The Tokyo meeting will send a further liaison to SG 16 following TD 176, with the standard boiler plate, but showing "Approved by Q.12/17", with the source Q.12/17 Rapporteur, and attaching the latest draft of X.oid-res. It will invite SG 16 to confirm that this meets their requirements, and will welcome comments on the draft. Inserted in Agenda.

We need to progress a JTC 1 resolution to make the new editions of all ASN.1 material free, justification being the importance of notation standards for their use in the development of other standards and to ensure their take-up. Assigned as HW to OD.

We need to consider the Defect Report on X.660 and to progress(?) a Technical Corrigendum that will allow long arcs from the root node to anywhere in the "international part" of the tree. Inserted in Agenda.

20 Future meetings DONE

Face to face meetings will occur as follows:

- September 16-25, 2009 in Geneva with SG17 (NOTE – It was agreed to meet the middle Sunday during this meeting.)

- January 18-22, 2010 in London 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.)

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

Subsequent SC6 meeting 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 have ITU-T approval for GotoMeeting sessions from Tokyo every Tuesday 5pm UTC until the next SG 17 meeting (apart from the last Tuesday before SG17, when people will be travelling. Further meetings need to be established from the Sept meeting to the Spring 2010 meeting.

21 Table of output documents

12D#	Title	Going to SC6 (for xyz?)	Going to SG17 (for ?)	12D needs upload?
12D0379rx (Word)	Agenda and minutes of Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 in Tokyo 1-5 Jun 2009 (this document).	Information 6N13991	Information TD xxxx	YES
NO	Meeting Report to SG 17 on the Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 in Tokyo 1-5 June 2009	NO	TD xxxx	NO
NO	ASN.1 Q12/17 and SC 6 WG 9 Meeting Report to SC 6 of Joint meeting in Tokyo June 2009	Information 6N13992	NO	NO
NO	Approved Disposition of Comments on 6N13884	Information 6N13993	NO	NO
12Dxxxx	Text for CD ballot for X.oid-res ISO IEC 29168.doc (to be supplied to secretariat by Thursday, 11 June 2009 with ballot to clause, Friday 11 September 2009).	Ballot 6N13994	Information TD 325-PLEN	YES
12Dxxxx	Implementation Guidelines on the use of DNS for the ORS (NIDA and CNNIC).	Information 6N13995	Information TD xxxx	YES
NO	The demo of ORS (NIDA)	Information 6N13996	NO	NO
NO	Research on OID Resolution system (China)	Information 6N13997	NO	NO
NO	Letters from Iran and Uruguay concerning the establishment of national OID RAs	Information 6N13998	NO	NO
NO	Letter from Uruguay concerning the establishment of a national OID RA	NO	Information TD xxxx	NO
NO	Liaison to ITU-T SG 16 concerning the OID Resolution System	NO	Liaison TD 327-PLEN	NO
NO	Liaison to ISO/TC 215 concerning the new work items on Object Identifiers	Liaison 6N14001	Liaison TD xxxx	NO
NO	Liaison to ITU-T SG 17 (Q.4/17) concerning use of ASN.1 for Digital Evidence Exchange File Format	Liaison 6N14002	Attach to meeting report	NO
NO	Rationale for the deletion of an entry to the ISO Web page on maintenance agencies and registration authorities	Resolution Attachment 6N14003	NO	NO
NO	SC 6 Nomination of NIDA as the Registration Authority for ISO/IEC 9834-9	Resolution Attachment 6N14004	NO	NO
NO	Letter to the GRIFS Project concerning SC 6 work related to RFID		NO	NO
NO	Proposed Liaison Statement to Q.12 17 concerning OID allocations.doc	Not acted on. Needed for Geneva	NO	NO

NO	Some questions about ECN.doc Referred to electronic meetings or to Geneva September 2009	NO	NO	NO
12Dxxxx	Implementation Guidance for ORS (China)	NO	NO	YES
NO	Positioning of .oid and related issues	NO	NO	NO
NO	Discussions on case sensitivity in Unicode labels	NO	NO	NO
NO	M34 - Trusted Provider Identity 1.2 presentation	NO	NO	NO
NO	M10 Verisign contribution on TPI update 1.0	NO	NO	NO
12Dxxxx	Recommendations from the Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6/WG 9 in Tokyo 1-5 Jun 2009 on the positioning of the International OID root in the DNS system	NO	TD xxxx	YES
12Dxxxx	SC 6 Tokyo WG 9 Resolutions-Ver3	NO (in SC 6 Resolutions)	TD xxxx	YES

The following additional items are in the output folder, but not listed above:

M34 - Trusted Provider Identity 1.2 presentation, M10 Verisign contribution on TPI update 1.0, Final Participants list for SC 6 Tokyo meeting 2009, Revision of A.23 Joint work rules (folder), PER Encoding Instructions (folder), Object Identifier Resolution System (folder), IRI oid scheme (folder), CAP and WMO matters (folder).

22   HW during Tokyo Jun 2009

JL was given HW, see 2nd paragraph of item 18. DONE FOR TOKYO

JSL was given HW to draft a liaison to SG16 following TD 176. See first paragraph of 19. DONE (TD 327-PLEN)

OD was given HW to draft a resolution in accordance with the second paragraph of 19. DONE (Res 6.9.5)

23   HW immediately post Tokyo Jun 2009

JSL, as the Editor, will produce the CD text (by Friday 11 June) (6N13994 and TD 325-PLEN). DONE. He will send the CD text with the approved DoC to Jooran (copy to JL) and will also as ITU-T Editor send it to Georges Sebek for posting as a TD for information. DONE. JSL will also send the liaison to SG16 (TD 327-PLEN to Georges saying that the CD text from JSL needs to be attached to it DONE.

Further discussion of an Implementer's Handbook is carried forward to the September Geneva meeting, and comments will be invited in the CD ballot text DONE.

HW was given to JSL, YI, JP and NK to prepare the first draft of the implementation guidelines for the ORS by Friday, June 12, 2009. DONE.

All outputs need to be finalized within one week of close of the meeting. In particular, the final Agenda and Minutes, the approved DOC on the ORS and the two meeting reports (to SC 6 and to SG 17) need to be finalized in this time-scale. The Liaison to Q.4/17 is to be attached to the ITU-T Meeting Report. NOT YET DONE.

24   HW post Tokyo Jun 2009

JL was given HW, see first paragraph of item 18.

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.

There was further discussion of the options for positioning of .oid and the responses to the proposed ICANN letter. JL was given HW to produce a TD xxxx recording this discussion as "TDxxxx Recommendations from the Joint Meeting of Q.12/17 and SC 6/WG 9 in Tokyo 1-5 Jun 2009 on the positioning of the International OID root in the DNS system (for discussion in Geneva, September)", noting clause 5 and the texts in the rest of this clause. We could not make any further firm recommendations, except that a well-publicised meeting should be held in September at a time when all HoDs (but particularly France and UK and Germany) were able to attend. See clause

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.

The Rapporteur | Convener was requested to ensure that the decision to stay with a DNS base was recorded in both the meeting reports for SG17 and SC6. This decision should also be recorded as the groups answer to the German request that "the technical aspects of an OID Resolution System should be sufficiently clarified and also possible alternative solutions should be investigated."

The report of the discussions should also say: "The group will, of course, consider any new alternatives if they are submitted as written contributions in the near future, but has already extensively discussed the only two alternatives that have been raised thus far (an X.500 base or a "private" DNS) after extensively discussing the technical requirements of an OID Resolution System. The record of these discussions is recorded in previous minutes of the ASN.1 group.

25   Items for electronic meetings

To review and approve the "final outputs", including the ISO Meeting Report and the updated Agenda and Minutes.

To review the Document Register and identify documents relevant to the September meeting
    Note that 12D 360 r2, 319r4 and 306r7 are carried forward to Geneva September

To urgently progress the Internet Draft for an IRI namespace (see Clause 6 above)

To establish the agenda for the September meeting

To progress PER EI text as necessary in accordance with 8.3 above, and to resolve 8.4 before the Moscow meting of SC 37.

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.

To progress the document "Some questions about ECN.doc" (in meeting outputs)

Note – in some cases e-mails in JLs e-mail folder have not been converted into documents. Where applicable, this is noted in the agenda items above, and these will either be handled by the electronic meetings or carried forward to Geneva September 2009 as consolidated documents.

See 5.2.6b) and 5.2.7 and progress if possible

To consider clauses 11, 12, 13, 13bis.2 and 15 above

26   Items for SG17 September 2009 meeting

The following documents were referred to this meeting from the February Geneva outputs:

12D306r7 = TD264 (Action Plan), 12D380 = TD252R3 (Meeting Report), TD242r1 (Proposed letter to ICANN), 12D360r1 (The Question 12), 12D319r4 = TD191 (Summaries of pending Recs).