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| **Abstract:** | This is the draft of a proposed new A-series Supplement on "Guidelines on the appointment and operations of registration authorities". It reflects the results of the discussion at the 28 Feb 2023 interim meeting of RG-WM. |

**Action required**:RG-WM is invited to discuss this document.

In 2012, a TSAG correspondence group on the synchronized appointment of a registration authority by ITU-T and JTC 1 agreed to recommend to TSAG that it develops a supplement to the ITU-T A‑series Recommendations entitled "*Guidelines on the appointment and operation of registration authorities*."

Excerpt of the report of the correspondence group on the synchronized appointment of a registration authority by ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1 (TSAG-[TD391](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T09-TSAG-120702-TD-GEN-0391) [2009-2012]):

No rules are defined for the mutual agreement of an RA (associated with a joint or twin text) by an ITU-T study group and the collaborating JTC 1 sub-committee. While this has not posed problem for many years, in two recent cases (joint work between ITU-T SG 16 and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 31; joint work between ITU-T SG 17 and ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6) this absence resulted in difficulty to establish the coordination. This generated a lot of discussions and concerns between the involved groups, and the result was not satisfactory for the ITU-T study group.

The first draft of this proposed Supplement (developed in 2012 as TSAG-[TD393](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T09-TSAG-120702-TD-GEN-0393) [2009-2012], with a few editorial updates) is contained in this document. It is based on ISO/IEC JTC 1 Standing Document 16 which has been withdrawn in the meantime but Annex H of the [ISO/IEC Directives](https://www.iso.org/directives-and-policies.html) contains similar material (ISO and ISO/IEC JTC 1 have had quite detailed guidelines on the appointment and operations of registration authorities for many years).

This document also includes comments from the United Kingdom in contribution [DOC6](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-230228/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-230228-DOC-0006.docx) to the 23 Feb meeting interim meeting of RG-WM.
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| SummaryThis Supplement provides guidance to aid ITU-T study groups in developing Recommendations with a registration function and in selecting a registration authority to provide this function. |

DRAFT Supplement n to ITU-T A-series Recommendations

Guidelines on the appointment and operations of registration authorities

# 1 Scope

Interoperability between information systems in the field of telecommunications/ICT sometimes requires specific identifiers to be assigned by a competent body designated as a registration authority (RA).

Study groups developing Recommendations shall make every attempt to avoid the necessity for registration and registration authorities in particular. Where this is not possible, the use of existing registration processes (e.g. use of ISO 3166 for country codes) is preferred to creating a new process.

This supplement concerns study groups which develop Recommendations with a registration function and which need to select registration authorities that provide this function. This supplement does not apply when the TSB is the RA for a particular Recommendation.

In case of joint work with ISO/IEC JTC 1, clause II.5 of [ITU-T A.23] gives guidance on the synchronized appointment of a registration authority by both an ITU-T study group and a JTC 1 sub-committee.

# 2 References

[ITU-T A.23] Recommendation ITU-T A.23 (2000), *Collaboration with ISO and IEC on information technology*, Amendment 1 (01/2022).

[ITU-T X.660] Recommendation ITU-T X.660 (2011) | ISO/IEC 8824-1:2011, *Information technology –Procedures for the operation of object identifier registration authorities: General procedures and top arcs of the international object identifier tree*.

[ITU-T X.680] Recommendation ITU-T X.680 (2021) | ISO/IEC 8824-1:2021, *Information technology – Abstract Syntax Notation One (ASN.1): Specification of basic notation*.

# 3 Terms and definitions

## 3.1 Terms defined elsewhere

None.

## 3.2 Terms defined in this supplement

This supplement defines the following terms:

**3.2.1 applicant**: An entity (organization, individual, etc.) which requests the assignment of a name (or address, identifier, etc.) for an object from an RA.

**3.2.2 object** [ITU-T X.680]: A well-defined piece of information, definition, or specification which requires a name in order to identify its use in an instance of communication.

**3.2.3 procedural Recommendation**: ITU-T Recommendation specifying the procedures for an RA to follow.

**3.2.4 register**: A set of files containing the names assigned by an RA and the information associated with that named object.

**3.2.5 registration** [ITU-T X.660]: Assignment of an unambiguous name to an object in a way that makes the assignment available to interested parties.

**3.2.6 registration authority**: Entity entitled and trusted to perform the registration service as described in an ITU-T Recommendation.

**3.2.7 technical Recommendation:** ITU-T Recommendation containing the definition of the classes of objects requiring registration.

# 4 Abbreviations and acronyms

This supplement uses the following abbreviations and acronyms:

RA Registration Authority

# 5 Conventions

None.

# 6 Guidelines for procedural Recommendations

**6.1** For every type of registration involving an RA, two different Recommendations are required. The first is the technical Recommendation in which the objects to be registered are defined. The second is the procedural Recommendation which defines the procedure according to which the RA shall work, and specifies its duties and obligations.

**6.2** Where an RA is required, the study group responsible for the technical Recommendation also develops the associated procedural Recommendation based on the requirements in clause 6.4.

**6.3** The procedural Recommendation and the technical Recommendation are consented for AAP Last Call (or determined for TAP consultation) at the same meeting.

**6.4** A procedural Recommendation includes definitions for:

* when not already included in the technical Recommendation, a description of the naming domain, the syntax of names used and, if applicable, the conditions and the process to re-use or reclaim names (see clause 6.6);
* criteria for applicants for registration (e.g. ITU members, organization meeting specific criteria defined in the technical Recommendation, etc.);
* information to be included on application (see clause 6.7) including (when applicable) the technical definition of the object to be registered;
* if applicable, requirements for confidentiality of portions of the information;
* steps involved in review and response to applications including the process by which the object definition is validated (possibly by consulting with the study group in charge of the technical Recommendation) and maximum time intervals between steps;
* assignment process for names such that assigned names are unique within the register and the same name is not assigned to another object;
* criteria for rejection of applications (see clause 6.10), including an appeals process (see clause 10);
* procedures for maintenance of a register (see clause 6.11), including review of successful applicants on a periodic basis;
* if applicable, procedures for publication of the register (see clause 6.9).

**6.5** A procedural Recommendation is not to include:

* the name of the RA;

Note – The name and contact information of the RA for a given Recommendation can be found on the web site of the study group in charge of that Recommendation.

* the types of fees and amounts;
* a copy or an adaptation of the selection process in clause 7.

**6.6** Wherever possible, the naming domain should be open-ended to accommodate future registration requirements. In selecting the naming domain, the following should be considered:

* the reservation of space for special assignments;
* the syntax (e.g. numeric, alphabetic, alphanumeric, etc.) from which the names are assigned;
* the length of the name;
* the matching criteria to be used for determination of duplicate entries.

Depending on the volume of registrations anticipated, and technical and other considerations, reuse of names may be necessary. The procedural Recommendation states if:

* a name can never be re-used; or
* a name can be re-used after specific time period to identify another object.

To be available for re-use, previously assigned names may either be given up voluntarily or be reclaimed by the RA. In both cases, the conditions and the process are described in the procedural Recommendation.

**6.7** The contents of forms for registration application, request for update, notification of assignment or update, and rejection of application include:

* name of applicant;
* postal/email address, telephone/facsimile number of applicant;
* if the applicant is an organization, the name, title, postal/email address, telephone/facsimile number of a contact person within the organization.

Depending on the type of form, additional information to be included are:

* authorization to release specific data (registration application);
* any justification required for the assignment (registration application);
* where required by the technical Recommendation or the associated procedural Recommendation, a technical definition of the object to be registered (registration application);
* data to be updated, old and new values (request for update);
* reasons for action taken (notification of assignment or update; rejection of application).

The procedural Recommendation may define additional information relevant to the class of objects to be registered.

**6.8** After the assignment has been made, the name and associated information is included in the register and the RA informs the applicant of the assignment in a timely manner (within the maximum response time specified in the procedural Recommendation) using the information in clause 6.7.

**6.9** At a minimum, the register contains:

* the assigned name;
* name of initial applicant;
* address of initial applicant;
* date of original assignment;
* date of last transfer of assignment, if allowed (updatable);
* name of current owner (updatable);
* postal/email address of current owner (updatable);
* if the owner is an organization, the name, title, postal/email address, telephone/facsimile number of a contact person within the organization (updatable);
* date of last update (updatable);
* where required by the technical Recommendation or the associated procedural Recommendation, a technical definition of the object.

The procedural Recommendation may define additional register information relevant to the class of objects to be registered.

**6.10** The criteria for rejection of applications include the following as well as any additional criteria deemed necessary:

* ineligibility of applicant;
* the absence of proper fee;
* incomplete or incomprehensible information in application;
* the justification for inclusion in the register (as defined in the procedural Recommendation) is not adequate;
* the object to be registered does not conform to the technical Recommendation.

**6.11** The requirements that the RA should follow for maintenance of the register include, at a minimum:

* mechanisms for maintaining the integrity of the register including adequate backup (such as off premises storage) and records retention requirements. In addition, there shall be provision for the owner of a name to provide updated information;
* mechanisms for maintaining confidentiality of data elements where such confidentiality is required.

# 7 Selection and appointment of organizations to fulfill RA functions

**7.1** The selection process needs to be open and transparent. It begins with a call for offers made by the study group to all stakeholders (in particular members of the study group). The call for offers is published as a TD of the study group at least three months before the plenary meeting which will select a candidate. It is also sent as a liaison statement to TSAG for information.

Note – It is recognized that study groups may have difficulties identifying organizations willing to assume a RA function and it may be necessary to approach particular organizations which may be able to fulfill the function. Such a process shall be done with full transparency through liaison statements.

**7.2** Nominations are received no later than ten days before the plenary meeting which will select a candidate and published as a TD of the study group. Each nomination shall include a statement stipulating that the candidate is willing to assume the responsibility. If applicable (see clause 8) the nomination also describes the fee structure.

**7.3** Once the deadline for receiving nominations is reached, they are reviewed by the study group and a report is produced. The study group ensures (if necessary, in consultation with the ITU legal adviser) that the selected candidate is a legal entity. This means that the organization has been formed under the laws of a particular jurisdiction and that it is therefore subject to governance related rules. This requirement promotes a higher level of assurance regarding the accountability and credibility of the organization selected to be the RA.

**7.4** The report is presented for approval at a plenary meeting. It is then sent as a liaison statement to TSAG for information and the study group submits the name and any relevant information about the organization to the TSB for formal designation.

# 8 Charging of fees for RA services

RAs may charge fees for the services they provide subject to authorization by the study group. The level of such fees would be set on a cost-recovery basis. The proposed fee structure is included in the answer of each candidate and considered by the study group in its decision to authorize the charging of fees.

# 9 Oversight and accountability of RAs

Study groups have the main responsibility for the oversight of RAs. They maintain ongoing communication and remain informed of the activities of the RA relative to its function in relation to ITU-T Recommendations. Study groups require RAs to provide annual activity reports which are published as a TD of the study group.

# 10 Dispute resolution

Although instances of disputes between RAs and applicants are rare, it is expected that the RA will make reasonable efforts to resolve the dispute. The procedural Recommendation addresses any specific requirements for this informal process.

Additionally, to resolve the dispute, the procedural Recommendation defines a formal appeal process for use when the informal efforts to resolve the dispute fail. The study group in charge of the procedural Recommendation participates in any formal appeal process.
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