Telecommunications and Information Exchange Between Systems

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6

Document Number:	N14241
Date:	2010-03-10
Replaces:	
Document Type:	Disposition of Comments
Document Title:	Disposition of Comments on the text for CD ballot, ISO/IEC 2nd CD 29168, Information technology – Open Systems Interconnection – Object Identifier Resolution System (ORS)
Document Source:	JTC 1/WG 7 London meeting
Project Number:	
Document Status:	For your information.
Action ID:	FYI
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	8
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	

Title: **Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)**
Date: **8 March 2010**
Source: **Project Editor (Jun Seob Lee)**

This document contains the approved disposition of comments received from National Bodies on the 2nd CD ballot of ITU-T X.oid-res | ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098).

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

Date: 2010-3-8 | Document: **JTC1 SC6 N14098**

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No.	**MB¹**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment²**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**PE's proposal**
NOTE – The detail disposition of comments are reflected in FCD ballot text. There was substantial restructuring as a results of discussions during the BRM continuation.							
1	KR	8	Paragraph 1	te	6N14097 (Agenda, Timetable and Minutes for ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6/WG 9 and ITU-T Q.12/17 collaborative meeting on ASN.1, 16 – 25 September 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland) states that possible DNSSEC options for ORS should be included in 2nd CD text. As .ORG zone signed on June 2 2009 and ROOT zone to be signed by July 1 2010, it is proper to follow the policy .ORG or ROOT.	Replace 2nd text of paragraph 1 with the text "DNSSEC (RFC 2535) should be used with the policy of .ORG."	See NOTE.
2	KR	6.2.3	Paragraph 1	te	Needs to specify why Unicode Label should be encoded in ASCII.	Add "As ORS uses DNS protocol which only use ASCII to communicate," in front of 1st sentence.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
3	KR	Clause 7.1	Figure 5	te	The zone file information in Figure 5 is not correct.	Change Figure 5 as Attachment A.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
4	KR	Clause 6.3.3	Paragraph 2	te	As Figure 5 is modified, zone file example should be changed.	Change zone file example as "2.oid.foo. IN NAPTR 0 100 "u" "O2I+CINFO" "!^.*$!http://www.sample.com/27/cinfo.xml!" ".	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
5	KR	Clause 6.3.4	Paragraph 2	te	As Figure 5 is modified, zone file example should be changed.	Change zone file example as "99.27.2.oid.foo. IN NAPTR 0 100 "u" "O2I+COI" "!^.*$!/2/27/99!" ".	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
6	KR	Clause 6.3.2	Paragraph 1	ed	2nd sentence is duplicated.	Delete 2nd sentence "An access protocol is specified in the service field of a NAPTR Resource Record."	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
						Add "Each node should include the mapping all the possible combination of Unicode Labels into the canonical form of OID-IRI in FQDN form in DNAME or CNAME Resource Records. (See clause 6.2.1)	
7	KR	Clause 7.1	All	te	Need more explanatory text for Figure 5	The NS Resource Record indicates that the client should make another query to another ORS server to get the final answer. In Figure 4, "1.oid.foo. IN NS example.com" indicates that to get the results on "n.1.oid.foo." client needs to make another query to another ORS server at "example.com". See clause 6.3 for further explanation on each NAPTR Resource	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

Date: 2010-3-8 | Document: **JTC1 SC6 N14098**

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
No.	MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	PE's proposal
						Record in Figure 4." at the end of Clause 7.1	
8	KR	Clause 7.4	All	te	Need more explanatory text for Figure 6	Add "When the ORS client send query to local ORS server for "99.27.2.oid.foo", local ORS server perform recursive query. If the local ORS does not have cashed information for this query, it sends request to the root ORS server. The root ORS server does not have NAPTR Resource Record for "99.27.2.oid.foo" and it has NS Resource Record for "2.oid.foo" and returns this NS Resource Record to the local ORS server. The local ORS server send same query to the ORS server at "sample.com". The ORS server at "sample.com" also does not have NAPTR Resource Record for "99.27.2.oid.foo" and it has NS Resource Record for "27.2.oid.foo" and returns this NS Resource Record to the local ORS server. The local ORS server send same query to the ORS server at "oid.kr". The ORS server at "oid.kr" has NAPTR Resource Record for "99.27.2.oid.foo" and it returns this NAPTR Resource Record to the local ORS server. Finally, the local ORS server returns this NAPTR Resource Record to the ORS client." at the end of Clause 7.4.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
9	KR	All	All	ge	The zone file configuration of ORS root should be dealt in separate document which should specify administrative issues. See No. 24 and N.29 in 6N14087 (Approved DoC on CD of ISO IEC 29168)		**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
10	KR	Clause 6.3.5	All	te	To be aligned with ITU-T H.IRP.	Delete Figure 4 (renumber all figures) and replace Clause 6.3.5 with: The identifier structure information is specified in the service field of a NAPTR Resource Record. It contains an input data for Identifier Resolution Protocol [ITU-T H.IRP]. An example of a NAPTR Resource Record for the identifier structure information is:	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.

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.

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

Date: 2010-3-8   Document: **JTC1 SC6 N14098**

0	1	2	3	4	5	(6)	(7)
No.	MB¹	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment²	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	PE's proposal
						99.27.2.oid.foo. IN NAPTR 0 100 "u" "O2I+IS" "!^.*$!99.27.2.examplecode.kr!".	
11	KR	Clause 6.3.1		te	Service parameters "VFT" and "FFT" should be dealt in H.IRP. And new service parameter "IS" should be added to indicate Identifier structure information.	Change as: oprservice = "AI" | "COI" | "CINFO" | "IS"	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
12	KR	Clause 2.2		ed	ITU-T H.IRP should be added in Additional references.	Add H.IRP in Additional references	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
13	KR	Clause 6.3.2	new	te	Need explanation for service parameter "O2I+AI".	Add "The Service Parameter "O2I+AI" indicates that this NAPTR Resource Record includes a access information." at the end.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
14	KR	Clause 6.3.3	new	te	Need explanation for service parameter "O2I+CINFO".	Add "The Service Parameter "O2I+CINFO" indicates that this NAPTR Resource Record includes child node information." at the end.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
15	KR	Clause 6.3.5	new	te	Need explanation for service parameter "O2I+IS".	Add "The Service Parameter "O2I+IS" indicates that this NAPTR Resource Record includes identifier structure information." at the end.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
16	KR	Clause 8	Paragraph 2	ed	Do not use X.oid-res in the text	Change "X.oid-res" to "this Recommendation | International Standard"	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
17	GB	All		ed	The UK provides a number of editorial changes. These editorial changes are offered to the Editor as part of the ZIP of our comments, for consideration and inclusion as he determines. It is not considered necessary for the BRM to discuss these in detail unless the Editor wishes to raise specific points.	The document included in the ZIP containing these proposed changes is entitled "UK proposed changes to ISO 2nd CD (6N14098) text for ISO IEC 29168 - OID Resolution System.doc." This should be considered by the Editor and the change-marked text should be included where appropriate at the Editor's discretion.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
18	GB	All		ge	**Progression:** The UK reluctantly votes DISAPPROVE on this text. This is mainly because of problems with 6.3.5 and Clause 8 (see comments below). If these are fixed, then progression to FCD will be recommended and supported, but a normative reference to the	**It is important that ISO target dates are carefully considered, to make sure that cancellation is not imminent.** Process to FCD out of Barcelona may be possible, but the UK suggests that it may be better to produce (with SC6 authorization) an FCD out of the April meeting of SG17, when inputs to SG17 can also be considered.	**Withdrawn by the UK.** The currently proposed progression is documented in Barcelona minutes 8.2.1.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

0	1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
No.	MB[1]	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/N ote (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com-ment[2]	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	PE's proposal
					ITU-T Handbook entitled "Operation of the ORS root manager" will be needed, and progression beyond FCD cannot occur until that is near completion. It is strongly recommended that homework be given for production of a first drat **during** Barcelona, and approval at the end of the Barcelona meeting. It may be best to delay the start of an FCD ballot until after the ITU-T April 2010 meeting.	(An FCD ballot out of Barcelona could not complete before the April meeting, so delaying the FCD until after discussions in SG17 seems appropriate. This will also give time for further offline discussion related to 6.3.5, clause 8, and other issues.) It is suggested that the Editor produce a draft of text for an FCD to be circulated one month before the April SG17 meeting (and as an SG17 contribution from either the Editor or the Rapporteur), with a view to that text (revised as necessary in the April SG17 meeting) being submitted as FCD. ITU-T Approval would then be sought at the December 2010 meeting. DISCUSS	
19	GB	1 Introduction		ge	The UK has proposed adding to the Introduction: "but is supplemented by a document detailing (from time-to-time) the operation of the ORS root manager. This document is published by the ITU-T as an ORS Handbook entitled "Operation of the ORS root manager."	The UK considers it very important that the BRM has discussion on the contents of this document and produces a draft from Barcelona for consideration in the April meeting of SG17. This will probably need to be accompanied by a call for organisations to provide the Root Manager function, and text on the criteria for acceptance of an organisation to perform that. It is important that a first draft of such be provided by the BRM. The call to ISO NBs for offers to be the root manager should come from the Barcelona meeting, and be sent to ITU-T Member Bodies from the SG17 meeting in April 2010. The deadline for responses should be six weeks before the next SG17 meeting, when a decision can be taken.	**Noted.** See Barcelona 8.2.6.
20	GB	3.2.5		te	This definition is not clear (probably a grammar problem)	Discuss and clarify in the BRM.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
21	GB	3.2.6 and 3.2.7		ed	It is not clear that the difference is between these	Discuss, and possibly remove one of them (checking for occurrences in the document)	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

Date: 2010-3-8	Document: **JTC1 SC6 N14098**

0	1	(3)	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
No.	**MB¹**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment²**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**PE's proposal**
22	GB	3.2.9 and elsewhere		te	It I believed that we have now agreed on "oid.com", so it is appropriate to change .oid.foo into .oid.com.	Change .foo in all places. (Editor is to search for all occurrences of "foo" and eliminate)	**Accepted.** "oid.foo" will be changed to "oid-res.org"
23	GB	6.2.1 a) and 6.2.2 a)		te	It is not clear what "full form" means.	Define "full form" or remove use of this term. Suggest discuss	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
24	GB	6.2.3, but more generally		ed	The UK is concerned that these IETF references may become "obsoleted".	Add to all IETF references in both normative references and the bibliography "or any RFC that obsoletes these RFCs".	**Rejected.** As obsolete RFCs remain available, and the obsoleting RFC may not provide the functionality we require.
25	GB	6.3.1		te	It is not clear what "Identifier structure information" is. This probably needs a definition, and also text in several places earlier in the document It is probably important to identify the abstract syntax of such information.	The Editor is asked to check the text and recommend where there should be text explaining/defining "identifier structure information" and/or including an abstract syntax definition/description of that information.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
26	GB	6.3.3		te	There seem to be problems with this. First, this talks about " An example of a NAPTR Resource Record for access information", which is clearly wrong	Correct the text!	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
27	GB	6.3.3		te	The precise format of the XML file (using either ASN.1 (preferred) or XSD (preferably both, with identical specifications using the XSD to ASN.1 mapping) has to be specified.	Develop the specification of the XML document in the BRM and include it in the FCD text.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
28	GB	6.3.5		te	The UK regrets that it finds this text unclear. How does the NAPTR record contain processing rules (para 1)? It mentions a syntax for defining a "syntax processing rule", but it gives no references to the language and semantics of that language to be used for the syntax processing rule The paras on FFT and VFT are also totally obscure.	Add a reference to the Standard that provides the syntax and semantics of the syntax processing rule specification. Clarify the text on FFT and VFT, or provide references.	**Withdrawn.** As this comment is redundant due to changes resulting from earlier comments.
29	GB	6.3.5	Para starting "The ORS client converts the OID into	te	It is not clear why this text (and the diagram) is specific to "identifier structure". Is it in the wrong place? Is it more general?	Discuss in the BRM.	**Withdrawn.** As this comment is redundant due to changes resulting from earlier comments.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10

Approved Disposition of Comments on 2nd CD ballot of ISO/IEC 29168 (6N14098)

Date: 2010-3-8 Document: **JTC1 SC6 N14098**

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No.	**MB[1]**	**Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex** (e.g. 3.1)	**Paragraph/ Figure/Table/N ote** (e.g. Table 1)	**Type of comment[2]**	**Comment (justification for change) by the MB**	**Proposed change by the MB**	**PE's proposal**
			FQDN form"				
30	GB	6.3.5		ed	This talks about "ID". Should this be "OID"???	Clarify/change.	**Withdrawn.** As this comment is redundant due to changes resulting from earlier comments.
31	GB	6.3.5 and elsewhere	All	ed	These paragraphs need numbering. It is hard to comment on them without numbering	Ensure that all paragraphs are numbered.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
32	GB	6.3.5	Para starting "The ORS client converts the OID into FQDN form"	te	This introduces the term "virtual OID". This is not defined, and not used earlier. What does it mean?	Eliminate the term, or defined it.	**Withdrawn.** As this comment is redundant due to changes resulting from earlier comments.
33	GB	6.3.5	Figure 4	te	This figure seems to be more general than 6.3.5, but the decision of "Service field = FFT" or "Service field="VFT" is not inclusive. Are there other possible values (which might denote errors) or null values, which might denote ??? This is all very obscure.	Discuss and clarify.	**Withdrawn.** As this comment is redundant due to changes resulting from earlier comments.
34	GB	Clause 8		te	This is not good enough. Further discussion is needed on DNSSEC, and text needs to be included if this is to be used (optionally or otherwise). It is pointless to mention "DNSSEC" without proper normative references and clear text on how it is to be used.	The UK considers that use of DNSSEC should be mandatory, and should be fully described. The principle of mandatory (or not) use of DNSSEC needs to be discussed and agreed, and then appropriate text needs to be produced (hopefully during Barcelona). It needs to be made clear who (in the architecture) takes the decision on whether to make DNSSEC available, and what the client (in the architecture) needs to do to find out if it is available and how to use it. **Much** more text is needed in this clause.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.
35	GB	Clause 8	Para 2	te	This does not seem useful. Suggest deletion. The term "phishing" is colloquial, and should not be used in a standard unless a reference definition is available.	Delete this paragraph.	**Accepted with minor changes.** See NOTE.

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.

ISO electronic balloting commenting template/version 2001-10