

Result of voting

Ballot Information

Ballot reference	JTC001-N-11932
Ballot type	DTR
Ballot title	Text for DTR ballot of ISO/IEC 29181-2, Future Network: Problem Statement and Requirements - Part 2: Naming and Addressing
Opening date	2013-12-05
Closing date	2014-03-05
Note	

Member responses:

Votes cast (30)	Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Austria (ASI) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MCCAA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Singapore (SPRING SG) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Arab Emirates (ESMA) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI)
Comments submitted (3)	Ghana (GSA) Jamaica (BSJ) Nigeria (SON)
Votes not cast (2)	Italy (UNI)

Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST)

Questions:	
Q.1	"Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"
Q.2	"If you approve the DTR 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
Armenia (SARM)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Australia (SA)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Austria (ASI)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Belgium (NBN)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Canada (SCC)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
China (SAC)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Czech Republic (UNMZ)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Denmark (DS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Finland (SFS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
France (AFNOR)	Abstention	Both	Ignore
Germany (DIN)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
India (BIS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Ireland (NSAI)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Japan (JISC)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Lebanon (LIBNOR)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Malaysia (DSM)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Malta (MCCAA)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Netherlands (NEN)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore
Norway (SN)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore

Singapore (SPRING SG)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
South Africa (SABS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Spain (AENOR)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Sweden (SIS)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
Switzerland (SNV)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
United Arab Emirates (ESMA)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
United Kingdom (BSI)	Abstention	Ignore	Ignore
United States (ANSI)	Approval as presented	Ignore	Ignore

Answers to Q.1: "Does your National Body approve the attached DTR to go forward to publication?"		
8 x	Approval as presented	Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Ireland (NSAI) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Malta (MCCAA) Netherlands (NEN) Russian Federation (GOST R) United States (ANSI)
0 x	Approval with comments as given below	
0 x	Disapproval the draft for the reasons below	
22 x	Abstention	Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Austria (ASI) Belgium (NBN) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Japan (JISC) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Norway (SN) Singapore (SPRING SG) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Arab Emirates (ESMA) United Kingdom (BSI)

Answers to Q.2: "If you approve the DTR Text with comments, would you please indicate which type ? (General, Technical or Editorial)"		
0 x	General	
0 x	Technical	
0 x	Editorial	
1 x	Both	France (AFNOR)
29 x	Ignore	Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Austria (ASI) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) Germany (DIN) India (BIS) Ireland (NSAI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Lebanon (LIBNOR) Malaysia (DSM) Malta (MCCAA) Netherlands (NEN) Norway (SN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Singapore (SPRING SG) South Africa (SABS) Spain (AENOR) Sweden (SIS) Switzerland (SNV) United Arab Emirates (ESMA) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI)

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?"		
0 x	Yes	
0 x	No	
30 x	Ignore	Armenia (SARM) Australia (SA) Austria (ASI) Belgium (NBN) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Côte d'Ivoire (CODINORM) Denmark (DS) Finland (SFS) France (AFNOR)

Germany (DIN)
India (BIS)
Ireland (NSAI)
Japan (JISC)
Korea, Republic of (KATS)
Lebanon (LIBNOR)
Malaysia (DSM)
Malta (MCCAA)
Netherlands (NEN)
Norway (SN)
Russian Federation (GOST R)
Singapore (SPRING SG)
South Africa (SABS)
Spain (AENOR)
Sweden (SIS)
Switzerland (SNV)
United Arab Emirates (ESMA)
United Kingdom (BSI)
United States (ANSI)

Comments from Voters

Member:

Comment:

Date:

Comments from Commenters

Member:

Comment:

Date:

Member:	Comment:	Date:
Ghana (GSA)	<i>Comment</i>	2014-02-20 18:36:34
1. Approval as presented 2. N/A 3. N/A		
Jamaica (BSJ)	<i>Comment</i>	2014-03-04 20:41:47
Jamaica approve as presented.		
Nigeria (SON)	<i>Comment</i>	2014-03-05 11:46:28
Approved as presneted		

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 25 Feb 2014	Document: J1 N11932	Project: DTR 29181-2
-------------------	---------------------	----------------------

MB/NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
FR1				ge	The report (e.g., introduction) mentions "deficiencies" but does not identify "problems" in the current schemes, merely shortcomings, which may arguably lead to defining a new scheme.	Identify what the problems are with the current schemes <u>(either in the document or with references to state of the art)</u>	
FR2		A.3.3	Item 4	ge	It would seem that a number of these comments should have been covered with liaising with external bodies. There is an editor's note on page 28 to this effect but the comments do not seem to have been take into account (see for example references to Rec. ITU-T E.163 which is deprecated).	Complete the yellow-highlighted item 4 "Related Liaison Organizations: ITU-T SG2 (General issues of Naming and Addressing), ITU-T SG13(Identification, Locator), ???" and contact them if not yet done.	
FR3		3.1		te	This is restricting the remit of IETF RFC 3403, which is meant to cover more than telephone numbers.	Change the definition to: A type of DNS resource record, used in particular (but not only) which is used for E.164 telephone number to URI resolution	
FR4		5.2		te	Clause 5.2 is obsolete with regard to numbering. The use of Rec. ITU-T E.163 is deprecated. Rec. ITU-T E.164 is in force.	Replace "E.163" by "ITU-T E.164" <u>throughout the document.</u>	
FR5		5.2		te	The use of subscriber numbers as addresses described in this clause is outdated in most countries. This is due to number portability.	<u>Add text that notes how the introduction of number portability can change this, e.g., "Note that the introduction of Number Portability, notably with All Call Query, changes the use of the subscriber number as an address into that of a name." Update this clause accordingly.</u>	
FR6		5.2		te	Clause 5.2 is obsolete with regard to addressing: It ignores anycast and multicast addresses.	Add text about anycast and multicast addresses, e.g., <u>"Note also that the use of any/multicasting changes the one-to-one association of an address with a physical endpoint."</u>	
FR7		5		ge	The approach of the document according to which " <i>Only after naming and addressing schemes are set, the whole architecture and other subsystems such as router designs and application services can have a base to start work on</i> " is questionable and generally not the way emerging addressing schemes are defined.	Remove the clean slate approach.	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 25 Feb 2014	Document: J1 N11932	Project: DTR 29181-2
-------------------	----------------------------	----------------------

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					Those are generally defined for a particular purpose and with specific requirements to address (it has been the case for legacy numbering/identification resources, for IP addressing and for Internet naming), not with a clean slate approach.		
FR8		5.5		te	Clause 5.5 refers to shortcomings of the current IP addressing resources but does not mention its references where these limitations have been identified. Most of the elements mentioned as deficiencies in annexes are more questions than actual limitations.	Quote sources/references (e.g., exhaustion, id/locator separation etc.).	
FR9		5.5.11, 5.6.8		te	The text refers to "IPv4 name" which is unclear (domain name is "IP version agnostic").	Replace "IPv4 name and address" with "IP domain names and IPv4 addresses".	
FR1 0		5, 6		ge	The document appears inconsistent with regard to requirements: Clause 5 says IPv6 format is too long/verbose while clause 6 says that future networks should use 256-bit addresses.	Update clause 5 accordingly.	

¹ **MB** = Member body / **NC** = National Committee (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