

**Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems**

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6**

<b>Document Number:</b>	N14069
<b>Date:</b>	2009-09-14
<b>Replaces:</b>	
<b>Document Type:</b>	Summary of Voting/Table of Replies
<b>Document Title:</b>	Summary of Voting on SC 6N13994, Text for CD ballot, ISO/IEC CD 29168 Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Object Identifier Resolution System
<b>Document Source:</b>	SC 6 Secretariat
<b>Project Number:</b>	
<b>Document Status:</b>	For your information.
<b>Action ID:</b>	FYI
<b>Due Date:</b>	
<b>No. of Pages:</b>	14
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 : <a href="mailto:jooran@kisi.or.kr">jooran@kisi.or.kr</a>	

## Committee internal balloting

Lee, Jooran Ms.  
???, 2009-09-14[Closed last 2 weeks](#) > [Text for CD ballot, ISO/IEC CD...](#)

Information

Result

Participation

Audience

**Reference:** Text for CD ballot, ISO/IEC CD 29168 Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Object Identifier Resolution System (6N)**Committee:** ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6**Start date:** 2009-06-10**Status:** Closed**End date:** 2009-09-11

## Download

Download voting result and comments



as a Zip file

## Member responses

## Votes cast (15)

Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Greece (ELOT)  
Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland  
(SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)

## Comments submitted (0)

## Votes not cast (3)

Japan (JISC) Russian Federation (GOST R) Venezuela (FONDONORMA)

## Questions

**Q.1** "Do you agree with approval of the CD/FCD Text?"**Q.2** "If you approve the CD/FCD Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"**Q.3** "If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

## Votes by members

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3
Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
France (AFNOR)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore

<b>Canada (SCC)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Kenya (KEBS)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Korea, Republic of (KATS)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>United Kingdom (BSI)</b>	Disapproval of the draft	Ignore	Yes
<b>Netherlands (NEN)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Greece (ELOT)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Switzerland (SNV)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Czech Republic (UNMZ)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Belgium (NBN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
<b>China (SAC)</b>	Disapproval of the draft	All	Yes
<b>USA (ANSI)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Spain (AENOR)</b>	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
<b>Germany (DIN)</b>	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore

#### Answers to Q.1: "Do you agree with approval of the CD/FCD Text?"

<b>10 x Approval as presented</b>	Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) France (AFNOR) Greece (ELOT) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) USA (ANSI)
<b>3 x Abstention</b>	Belgium (NBN) Germany (DIN) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)
<b>2 x Disapproval of the draft</b>	China (SAC) United Kingdom (BSI)
<b>0 x Approval with comments</b>	

#### Answers to Q.2: "If you approve the CD/FCD Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"

<b>14 x Ignore</b>	Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Greece (ELOT) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) United Kingdom (BSI) USA (ANSI)
<b>1 x All</b>	China (SAC)

- 0 x Editorial
- 0 x General
- 0 x Technical

Answers to Q.3: "If you Disapprove the Draft, would you please indicate if you accept to change your vote to Approval if the reasons and appropriate changes will be accepted?"

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 13 x Ignore | Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) Greece (ELOT) Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Kenya (KEBS) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SNV) USA (ANSI) |
| 2 x Yes     | China (SAC) United Kingdom (BSI)  |
| 0 x No      |   |

Comments from Voters

- Belgium (NBN)
- Canada (SCC)
- China (SAC)
- Comment File

[China\(SAC\).doc](#)
- Czech Republic (UNMZ)
- France (AFNOR)
- Germany (DIN)
- Greece (ELOT)
- Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)
- Kenya (KEBS)
- Korea, Republic of (KATS)
- Netherlands (NEN)
- Spain (AENOR)
- Switzerland (SNV)

**United Kingdom (BSI)**

Comment File

[UnitedKingdom\(BSI\).zip](#)

**USA (ANSI)**

**Comments from Commenters**

[Back to list of ballots](#)

# Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-9-10	Document: <b>6N13994</b>
-----------------	--------------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CN	all	all	G	The CN is voting APPROVE WITH COMMENTS on CD1. If the proposed comments are adequately addressed, the CN believe it will continue to process. Nonetheless, the CN believes that there should be a second CD ballot.		
CN	8	1	G	In order to ensure the ORS operating successfully, it should take some measures. CN suggests there should be some discussion about the number of mirror root servers.		
CN	Add Clause 10		G	CN suggests adding clause 10 to define the OID Resolution System's administration. The content mainly involves the relevant OID-tree nodes' Registration Administration Authority, OID Resolution System's maintain and relevant charges etc.	Add clause 10 The administration of the OID Resolution System.	
CN	Add Clause		G	CN suggests adding clause 11 to define the OID Resolution System's implementing. The implementing should include the general and the specific OID resolution process implementing.	Add clause 11 The implementing of the OID Resolution System.	
CN	1	1	T	The last sentence is not specific.	The OID Resolution System provides information associated with a given OID through resolution process.	
CN	1	2	T	The last sentence is not specific.	The general OID resolution process completes the DNS-based protocol resolution.	
CN	3.2	all	E	Most of the definitions' first letters are small ones.	Capitalize the first letters of all the definitions.	
CN	5		T	After first paragraph, insert a paragraph defining the content in ORS.	Insert a second paragraph. A ORS may have metadata describing the OID for STEP 1, which could be access information, child nodes information, the canonical form of the IRI, or the OID-associated specific information.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2009-9-10

Document: **6N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CN	5.1	Second paragraph	T	If a ORS has the information for STEP 1 OID, then STEP 2 should return the information associated the OID. In this case, there should be no STEP 3 and STEP 4.	Change "The associated information related to an object identified by the OID in STEP 2 in Figure 1 could be access information (see 6.62.21), child nodes information or the canonical form of the OID-IRI." To "The associated information related to an object identified by the OID in STEP 2 in Figure 1 could be access information (see 6.62.21), child nodes information, the canonical form of the OID-IRI, or the OID-associated specific information."	
CN	6.1		T	In 6.1, the draft only puts forward two converting cases. The draft should make sure all the available notations of OID, and then define respective converting methods for all the different notations of OID, such as the ASN.1 notation, the dot Notation, and the IRI Notation.		

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Proposed Editors Disposition
GB 1	All		Ge	<p>This comments document is part of a .zip file containing:</p> <p>UK comments on 6N13994 (this document)</p> <p>UK contribution to Geneva meeting – Attachment A</p> <p>UK proposed revision of CD1 ballot text – Attachment B</p> <p>The UK draws attention to Attachment A, which has also been submitted to ITU-T SG17 as a UK contribution.</p> <p>Note that 1.12 of Attachment A recommends parallel progress of the standard's text and resolution of governance, managerial, and charging issues.</p> <p>The UK is voting DISAPPROVE WITH COMMENTS on CD1, based largely on Attachment A.</p> <p>The following UK comments in this document provide further clarification and text to address most of these issues.</p> <p><b>If the proposed new text is adequately addressed, the UK vote will change to APPROVE.</b></p> <p>Nonetheless, the UK believes that there should be a second CD ballot, with a view to an FCD ballot out of the Barcelona meeting of SC6 in Jan 1010 if possible.</p>	See detailed comments below.	
GB 2	All		Ge	<p>The UK also draws attention to Attachment B. This contains a number of minor editorial/grammatical changes to the CD1 text, plus proposed new text referred to from comments in this document.</p> <p>In some cases, the propose changes have not been completely finished, and there is a TBD in yellow for these, in some cases supplemented by notes of the intended content.</p> <p>Also all clause references inserted are yellowed, as they need to be replaced by bookmarks and then the entire</p>	<p>Accept the minor editorial changes, and review the new text when disposing of the comments below.</p> <p>For items marked TBD, produce text in Geneva if possible (by the Editorial team or by Q.12   WG 9) or else flag them as areas needing comment on CD2.</p> <p>For yellowed clause references, the Editor should insert appropriate bookmarks, use bookmark references, and delete the yellow.</p>	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.



# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Proposed Editors Disposition
				document clauses renumbered.	It would also be desirable to add a Contents list (immediately before the Introduction) for ease of access.	
GB 3	Clause 7		Ge	The UK believes that details of zone files need to be included in the standard, and not as a separate Implementers Handbook. See 1.13 of Attachment A	Produce text in clause 6ter of Attachment B that clearly and simply describes the necessary zone files, including the handling of the keys needed for DNSSEC (RFC 2535)	
GB 4	Clause 2 revised		te	The Editorial team should begin preparation of RER and A.5 justifications for the references to the RFCs as necessary.		
GB 5	New		Q	Q1 The UK recognises that the ORS provides for the authenticated return of information, but it is not clear whether the use of authentication is optional or mandatory  Q2 The UK asks whether there is also a need for return of encrypted access information from the DNS look-up?	For Q1: Agree that authentication is mandatory  For Q2: Discuss. If this is an agreed requirement, then further discussion of encryption key issues will be needed.	
GB 6	Everywhere		Ed	The use of the acronym "ORS" needs to be agreed. The UK has proposed adding it to the title as "Object Identifier Resolution System", but it is used in the body to mean "OID Resolution Server" (see Figure 1). It is not defined in clause 4	Define "ORS" as "OID Resolution System" in clause 4, and do not use it for OID Resolution Server in Figure 1 and elsewhere.	
GB 7	Introduction		te	More text is needed, particularly to introduce the use of the DNS, and a summary of the International Object Identifier Tree (including Unicode labels and the canonical form of an International Object Identifier (OID)	See proposed text in Attachment B	
GB 8	Clause 2		te	1) There appear to be some important references missing, that have been included in Annex B  2) It is necessary to ensure that all normative references are referenced in the text.	1) Insert the references  2) Check they are referenced, and insert references where appropriate, or move to the Bibliography	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed Editors Disposition</b>
				3) It is possible that some normative references should instead be part of the Bibliography	3) Addressed by 2) above	
GB 9	3.2		Te	<p>The UK believes that some important concepts are missing from the definitions.</p> <p>Also it should be noted that neither X.660 nor X.680 define "object identifier", so this cannot be imported from either, and should probably be added to the ORS standard.</p> <p>There are terms defined in X.660 that are needed, namely:</p>	<p>(See Attachment B for proposed text)</p> <p>Remove "object identifier" from 3.1.1 and add the definition in 3.2 (see 3.2.1quat)</p> <p>Add the following imports from X.660 in 3.1:</p> <p>integer-valued Unicode label</p> <p>international Object Identifier tree</p> <p>OID international resource identifier</p> <p>registration authority (RA)</p> <p>Add the following definitions to 3.2:</p> <p>application-specific OID resolution process</p> <p>DNS protocol</p> <p>general OID resolution process</p> <p>high-level nodes of the OID tree</p> <p>object identifier</p> <p>partial DNS-OID-mirror</p> <p>high-level OID DNS administrative Registration Authority</p> <p>trust anchor</p> <p>The Editor is to renumber all clauses and sub-clauses once changes are all done, after checking that all references are bookmarks.</p>	
GB	Clause 4		te	Add abbreviations	See Attachment B for text	

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed Editors Disposition</b>
10					Add: OID DNS RA	
GB 11	New clause 4bis		Te	Text is needed to explain the relationship of the OID tree to the DNS tree	Review and insert the text in 4bis of Attachment B	
GB 11 bis	Clause 5 and later	All figures	Ed, Q	<p>The UK wishes to draw attention to JTC1 N9656 (dated 5 Aug 2009).</p> <p>It is not totally against the use of colour, but does suggest strongly that unnecessary colour should be avoided, and when it is used colors should be selected such that they remain distinguishable when reproduced on a monochrome printer.</p> <p>JL has been involved with several other standards that used colour (arguably) unnecessarily that have been accepted by ITTF, so the UK has no strong views on this, but the issue should be discussed.</p>	Discuss the use of colour in the figures.	
GB 12	5.1	Figure 1	ed	<p>See GB 5 on the use of "ORS".</p> <p>In Step2, the return of "Associated information" should perhaps say "Associated information (URLs)"</p> <p>It is not clear what is the purpose of the further DNS lookup in the figure?</p>	<p>The nature of the returned information needs further specification:</p> <p>There seem to be:</p> <p>a) Return of a canonical form</p> <p>b) Return of child information, including a DNS name where available or a statement that there are OID children that are not part of the DNS-OID-mirror</p> <p>c) Return of (URLs for?) application-specific information – is a type or category field needed for this, or both access methods and a URL, as currently described in the last sentence of 5.3?</p> <p>This was discussed briefly at the Tokyo meeting.</p> <p>Discuss further, and determine what functionality</p>	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Proposed Editors Disposition
					and text is needed.	
GB 13	All		ed	In the text there are frequent occurrences of .oid.foo, or .oid.xxx.yyy.  These need eventually to be replaced, and should be yellowed with an Editors note at the head of the document.	Yellow all occurrences of .oid.foo.	
GB 14	6.1new		Te	The UK is aware of existing material addressing case sensitivity (or not) or Unicode labels, and the handling of this in the DNS, and of case-folding issues.  Also of the possible use of punycode or % encodings.  There is an agenda item for these in Geneva	After discussing the agenda item(s), produce at least basic text for the clause 6.1new in Attachment B. (currently marked "TBD"  Ideally, produce some examples for the handling of non-ASCII Unicode labels, and for the handling of case folding.	
GB 15	6.1		te/Q	Does this clause need to make some reference to the difference between port 53 and port 80 for DNS interrogation?	Discuss, and add text if necessary, probably as a sub-clause between 6.1new and 6.1?	
GB 16	6.2		Te	It is not clear how the authentication is conveyed, or where the trust anchors are to be found.  More text is needed here.	Discuss in Geneva, and add at least outline text if possible.	
GB 17	6.2	last para	Te	This states that " This Recommendation   International Standard specifies new Service Parameters for the general OID resolution process"  Which of these "orpservice" values are already allowed?	First, it does not! (But possibly should!), but we need to establish a plan to get these agreed and recorded by IETF.  Will it need an RFC?  Discuss, and establish the way ahead.  Avoid the use of "new", as that dates the standard.	
GB 18	6.2.1		te	Are these access methods the right ones?  If we use a URL, perhaps we don't need any restriction?  How will these be extended in the future?		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

# Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed Editors Disposition</b>
				The last part of 6.2.1 appears to be obscure	Discuss and perhaps clarify?	
GB 19	6.2.2		Te	The XSD specification of this XML file (and perhaps also an ASN.1 specification) is needed.	Develop the XSD and ASN.1 specifications	
GB 20	New 6bis		Te	There is a lot of text based on experimental implementations and demonstrations on use of DNAME and CNAME records and e-mails in 12D documents.	This text should be inserted (after further discussion) as 6bis	
GB 21	New 6ter		Te	Add new clause on security matters.	Discuss the location of the trust anchor for the OID root (the IAB – not yet available), the ICANN Repository, of the OID Repository.  (Text will be needed as the result of the discussion.)  (Detailed) text, following implementation, is also needed on the handling of the KEY records in the DNS zone file and in its parent (see DNSSEC)  (It may be that detailed clause references to clauses in DNSSEC will be sufficient.)  We need to determine what is mandatory, and also to discuss encryption (see GB 5). Discuss.	
GB 22	7	Figure 5	ed	Do we really need the abbreviation "ORC"? If so it needs to be added to clause 4.  Some of the servers labelled "ORS" are surely just DNS servers?	Discuss avoiding the abbreviation "ORC"  Call any DNS servers "DNS servers", not "ORS servers"?	
GB 23	7	Figures 4 and 5	te	These figures really need a little more explanatory text	Develop text in Geneva.	
GB 24	8		te	Some text has been proposed for addition to this clause.  It is probably not sufficient!	Review and accept pro-tem.	
GB 25	9		ed	This is probably better merged into the proposed new clause before clause 7	Do security overview earlier, and expand the text.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

## Template for National Body comments and Proposed Editors Disposition

Date: August 2009

Commented Document:  
**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6 N13994**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of com- ment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed Editors Disposition</b>
GB 26	New 10		Te	The UK believes that a substantial new Clause 10 is needed to cover the operation of the DNS OID RA	Some headings and some outline text is provided in Attachment B, but this is not complete and needs expansion.	

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.