

Ad Hoc meeting on positioning of .oid in the DNS

(13.30 to 14.30 Thursday 17 Sept 2009)

Chaired by Q.12 Rapporteur

John Larmouth

Purpose of the meeting

- (These are in priority order)
- **P1: To agree how to progress the positioning of the root of the OID tree in the DNS system (Note that nobody now proposes a gTLD)**
- **P2: To discuss and resolve the question of TAP v AAP**
- **P3: To note and refer to Q.12 any other major (not detailed) issues that Q.12 needs to address in relation to the ORS**

Documents available

- These are all listed in Clause 6 of TD 407
- Many are considered historical, and will not be directly addressed in this meeting
- Documents considered relevant are:
 - TD 424 Contribution from KISA and CNNIC – Attachment 2
 - C 90 US contribution proposing TAP and not AAP
 - C 93 UK contribution and comments on first CD
 - C167 France Télécom Orange proposals for the ORS

Agenda (1)

- **Rapporteur's introduction (these slides)**
- **Participants – please correct and initial the sheet**
- **Introduction of attendees (no time!)
 - **But please introduce yourself the first time you speak****
- **Agreement on the agenda and the purpose**
- **Other relevant documents needing discussion?**

Agenda (2)

- **Address P1 (please ignore P2 or P3 at this stage) – finish 2.15**
 - **(Presentation of C 90 is deferred to P2)**
 - **Brief presentation of C 93 (UK) (5min max)**
 - **Brief presentation of C 167 (France Telecom Orange) (5 min max)**
 - **Brief presentation of TD 424 (Korea/China) (5 min max)**
 - **Statements concerning P1 from other attendees**
 - **Discussion and resolution of way forward on P1**

Agenda (3)

- **Address P2 – finish 2.25**
 - **Brief presentation of C 90 (US)**
 - **Comments from Rapporteur (slide below)**
 - **Comments from other attendees**
 - **Discussion and resolution**
- **Address P3 – finish 2.29**
 - **Any other issues (in broad terms) affecting the progression of the ORS, to be referred to Q.12**
- **Any other business? – over run if raised!**

Rapporteur on TAP v AAP (1)

- **First, I will openly state that I am opposed to use of TAP**
- **It has been agreed that TAP should only be used when there are Regulatory Issues involved. I believe that, as we are not attempting a gTLD, there are no Regulatory Issues involved**
- **The default for Joint Work with ISO is AAP**
- **TAP will add approximately six months to ITU-T approval, and could lead to ISO cancellation of the project**
- **Deciding to use TAP will send a very bad signal to SG16, SC31, and TC215, all of whom we are hoping to use this work rather than doing an equivalent.**