

Minutes: North American End Device Registry Authority
(NAEDRA) Committee & KEMA

Place of Meeting: Conference Call, (Hosted by KEMA)

Date and Time: Tuesday, March 02, 2010
01:30pm – 02:30pm, EST

Conference Call Info: 877-715-1531, Conference Code: 0810106811

1. CALL TO ORDER

Harry Stephey called the meeting to order at 1:01pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Harry Stephey, KEMA, E-Mail: harry.stephey@us.kema.com.
Richard Tucker, Tucker Engineering, E-Mail: richardaet@aol.com.
Avy Moise, FDOS, Inc., E-Mail: avy@fdos.ca.
Terry Penn, Southern Company, E-Mail: tlpenn@southernco.com.

3. AGENDA

- a. This is a call to discuss (and hopefully resolve) a number of questions KEMA has regarding the details of the process for Registrar Certification.

4. MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

- a. Harry Stephey, representing KEMA has posed some questions to help KEMA understand the role that KEMA might play in this endeavor.
- b. Some discussion was given to KEMA regarding the role of the registrar and how the interaction between the registrar and the industry will occur.
- c. Dr. Avy Moise was invited into the discussion to help KEMA understand the particulars of the registrar and how KEMA's role would occur.
- d. Following is the questions posed by KEMA and answers.
 1. The OID Oversight Committee (is this NAEDRA or IEEE/ANSI/Measurement Canada?) seeks to select a "Certification Entity" to certify TDL representations on ANSI C12.19. KEMA is a possible choice for this position.

The IEEE/ANSI/Measurement Canada Object ID (OID) Oversight Committee is now renamed NAEDRA.

2. At the 6/22/09 OID Oversight Committee meeting in Halifax, it was noted that, "NIST is reluctant to sign up for enduring and continuous work tasks for manufacturer compliance." And, "NIST agreed to have more discussions before agreeing or

disagreeing to accommodate the certification procedure”. Was there a further response from NIST at the meeting in August? Minutes of the August meeting were not found on the NAEDRA website.

NIST is not interested in becoming the certifying agency for registrars. If KEMA accepts the invitation to be the certifying agency, it is very possible KEMA will be alone in that position since the certifying work will basically be a no a profit operation and be seen as a contribution to the industry.

3. The proposal from last week’s call indicated that, ”TDL Acceptance Approval Guidelines” will be produced by NAEDRA. Is there a timeline for this?

No specific date, but obviously it will need to be soon if KEMA accepts

4. It would be good to understand what types of entities would most likely apply to become registrars. We know that FDOS has applied. Has anyone else applied?

NEMA has indicated its interest, but has not completed its application. The number of applicants is expected to be small.

5. It would be helpful to clarify the roles of certifying agency, applicant and tester as used in the 2/10/10 proposal document.

Certifying agency and “tester” are synonymous. Applicant is one applying for certification as a registrar.

6. In the Registrar application form, it states, “To become a Certified Registrar, the applicant must provide a certificate of compliance, from an x agency selected by the Oversight Committee, of its TDL representation of the IEEE 1377/ANSI C12.19/ MC1219 and all Tables from the supporting Standards to the Oversight Committee. *[The criteria for TDL certification shall be determined by the Oversight Committee in a manner that the certification process is reasonable and does not impose undue financial hardship on the registrars]*

- This implies that the certification entity (e.g., KEMA) would charge a certification fee to the applicant, and that fee may need to be approved by the committee

It is expected that KEMA would charge a fee to any applicant seeking certification process. Terry Penn will send us a document produced by FutureDOS that estimates the amount of time required to perform the certification. This document will be labeled confidential.

- If every applicant is submitting a TDL representation of the same spec, would it make sense for the committee to approve a single generic XML/TDL version to be used by all? How much difference is expected between applicants?

It was explained that a single version would make sense in a non-competitive environment, but a registrar spends a lot of time and money developing its TDL tables and may not wish to give that away to any other competitor.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 02:38pm.

DRAFT