



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

# Minutes of F2F-Meeting on 2008/10/03 (Draft)

- 1 Organizational Aspects .....2
  - 1.1 Location .....2
  - 1.2 Time .....2
  - 1.3 Attendees .....2
  - 1.4 Organizational parts of the agenda .....2
    - 1.4.1 Welcome by chair (Juan Carlos Cruellas) .....2
    - 1.4.2 Confirmation of minutes takers .....2
    - 1.4.3 Approval of the agenda .....2
- 2 Roadmap and Work Plan .....3
- 3 Discussion on new profiles .....4
  - 3.1 Visible signature profile .....4
  - 3.2 Individual verification reports profile .....5
    - 3.2.1 Discussion of topics concerning verification report .....5
      - 3.2.1.1 Main topics .....5
    - 3.2.2 Discussion of topics concerning archiving profile .....7
  - 3.3 Encryption profile .....8
  - 3.4 ebXML profile .....9
  - 3.5 European Signature Law profile .....9
- 4 Committee work-plan .....10
- 5 Any other business .....11
  - 5.1 Reply to ODF-question .....11
  - 5.2 BIOSIG2009-Workshop .....11

## 28 **1 Organizational Aspects**

### 29 **1.1 Location**

30 Ditton Manor, London, UK

### 31 **1.2 Time**

32 Start: 9:00 GMT - 10:00 CET

33 End: 6:00 GMT - 17:00 CET

### 34 **1.3 Attendees**

- 35 • Orthacker, Clemens (CO)
- 36 • Straat, Marc (partly) (MS)
- 37 • Farhi, Ezer (phone) (EF)
- 38 • Lanz, Konrad (phone) (KL)
- 39 • Burgos, Oscar (OB)
- 40 • Cruellas, Marta (MC)
- 41 • Cruellas, Juan (JC)
- 42 • Huehnlein, Dettlef (DH)
- 43 • Drees, Stefan (phone) (SD)
- 44 • Kuehne, Andreas (AK)
- 45 • Ernst Jan van Nigtevecht (partly) (EN)

### 46 **1.4 Organizational parts of the agenda**

#### 47 **1.4.1 Welcome by chair (Juan Carlos Cruellas)**

#### 48 **1.4.2 Confirmation of minutes takers**

49 DH will compile minutes based on input from the chat (see [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29561/Raw-material-for-F2F-minutes-taken-from-chat-at-17-28.txt)  
50 [open.org/committees/download.php/29561/Raw-material-for-F2F-minutes-taken-from-chat-at-17-28.txt](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29561/Raw-material-for-F2F-minutes-taken-from-chat-at-17-28.txt)  
51 for raw chat protocol).

#### 52 **1.4.3 Approval of the agenda**

53 The agenda, which is mirrored by the minutes, has been approved.

## 54 **2 Roadmap and Work Plan**

55 JC states that the F2F-meeting shall be used in particular to discuss

56 • hot topics for the different profiles

57 • issues related to the Work style in general

58 • Concerning the work style there are different proposals how the work of the TC could become more  
59 efficient/effective

60 ○ PvdE: Concentrate on certain profiles during telcos

61 ○ AK: Probably more F2F meeting

62 ○ CO/KL: Deadlines for certain actions/document versions

63 ○ EF: Editor and (2) distinguished reviewers

64 ○ DH: Combination of different approaches (in particular deadlines and more F2F)

## 65 3 Discussion on new profiles

### 66 3.1 Visible signature profile

67 The discussion is based on

- 68 • the WD at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/28679/oasis-dssx-1.0-profiles-visualsig-wd2.doc>
- 69
- 70 • the Wiki at [http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/Visible\\_signature\\_profile](http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/Visible_signature_profile) (which has been extended
- 71 during discussion)

72 EF states that

- 73 • he is waiting for comments and feedback from the committee
- 74 • VisSigProf will have Sign and Verify; it should be discussed whether there should be a standardized
- 75 visualization of verification results

76 MS raises the question, whether the visualization of verification results would be a standard (PDF@ISO)

77 or product (e.g. Adobe Reader) issue?

78 AK replies that this does not seem to be a product issue and the VisSigProf should cover such issues.

79 CO states that there is an Austrian visualization of an "official signature", which should be considered

80 (see [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29553/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf)

81 [open.org/committees/download.php/29553/Official\\_Signature\\_in\\_Austria\\_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29553/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf)

82 [20081003T104026.747Z.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29552/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf) , [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29552/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf)

83 [open.org/committees/download.php/29552/Official\\_Signature\\_in\\_Austria\\_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29552/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf)

84 [20081003T104026.747Z.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29552/Official_Signature_in_Austria_S%5B1%5D.pdf-pruefbericht-20081003T104026.747Z.pdf) ).

85 MS states that there is a similar discussion in a current ETSI-Project, which aims at standardizing issues

86 related to using (X/C)AdES with/in PDF.

87 KL mentions that it is not really clear yet, what a "visible signature" actually is? Basic definitions /

88 requirements should be discussed and settled.

89 PE asks how the ETSI-project and the VisSigProf are related?

90 KL asks what the questions of this project are and who tries to answer them?

91 JC/MS state that the two projects are complementary.

92 MS clarifies that the ETSI-project is focusing on formats, DSS-X not.

93 MS explains that this STF activity will be articulated into the following phases:

94 (see Terms of Reference at [http://www.oasis-](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29555/CL08_2635%20%284%29.pdf)

95 [open.org/committees/download.php/29555/CL08\\_2635%20%284%29.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/29555/CL08_2635%20%284%29.pdf) )

96 • **Phase 1**

- 97 ○ Specify an ETSI profile for a basic variant of advanced electronic signatures in PDF using the
- 98 existing features of PDF signatures.
- 99 ○ Detail requirements for full features to be specified in the next phase.

100 • **Phase 2**

- 101 ○ Specify profiles for advanced electronic signatures in PDF incorporating the features of CAdES
- 102 and XAdES
- 103 ○ Identify any changes necessary to TS 101 733 and / or TS 101 903 and produce change request
- 104 documents for detailing the specific changes recommended.
- 105 ○ Specify enhancements required to ISO 32000 to incorporate these features in ISO 32000-2.
- 106 ○ Detail requirements of PDF signature support for the next phase.
- 107

108 • **Phase 3**

109       ○ Specify enhancement to ISO 32000 for PDF conforming reader support of advanced electronic  
110       signatures including visible signatures and interfaces to signature support functions.  
111       ○ Continue liaison on ISO 32000 support for advanced electronic signatures.  
112   KL suggests that there should be a section in the Wiki for "Related work"  
113   EF suggests that it should be discussed, whether the visualization of a verification result should be within  
114   the scope of the VisSigProf.  
115   DH states that this is similar to requesting the addition of a "verification report page" to a pdf.  
116   KL suggests that we should gather the requirements first and then discuss, what should be within the  
117   scope and what not.  
118   KL asks whether there are references to such implementations ... ?  
119   DH will try to provide links / further information.  
120   KL states that we should define the abstract content of such a visual verification report - but rather not the  
121   way how to render this information.  
122   MS asks EF what should be in the scope of DSS?  
123   JC suggests to put an ACTION for ALL to put ideas and requirements into Wiki.  
124   JC states that the committee agreed that the visualization of a verification result is an OPTIONAL feature.  
125   CO states that the focus should not be on the HOW something is visualized, but WHAT. Furthermore  
126   he gives examples of what elements could be comprised: signer-name, ..., logo-image .  
127   EF states that it is also important to discuss issues in the intersection of different profiles (e.g.  
128   visualization of advanced el. sig ...).  
129   JC suggests to put ACTION on EF (and ALL) by 2008/10/10 to collect and structure initial ideas in the  
130   Wiki.  
131   EF adds that it is not clear what happens, if multiple profiles are combined?  
132   KL states that in the charter there is point, which deals with the interrelationship of multiple profiles.  
133   JC mentions that this issue is also in the agenda. We should reserve some time in the afternoon to  
134   discuss this topic and develop a general strategy to solve this issue.  
135   CO provides an example of a "visual verification report" including an official logo and other important info:  
136   [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/25700/proposal-visible-signatures-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/25700/proposal-visible-signatures-v1.1.pdf)  
137   [v1.1.pdf](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/25700/proposal-visible-signatures-v1.1.pdf)  
138   JC states that PE and KL will serve as distinguished reviewer of the VisSigProf.

## 139   **3.2 Individual verification reports profile**

140   DH suggests to start with the verification report (5.2.1), then archival (5.2.2)

### 141   **3.2.1 Discussion of topics concerning verification report**

142   DH sketches the agenda:

- 143   1) main topics/general directions of profile
- 144   2) details

#### 145   **3.2.1.1 Main topics**

146   There are multiple approaches

- 147   1) Profile is not defined in a separate schema, but existing definitions of the Core valid/invalid details are  
148   used.
- 149   2) Define structure of individual signature report details as optional elements in schema. This is the  
150   proposal in the draft
- 151   3) Approach based on core, but a separate schema that adds the extra options. Drawback is that the  
152   schema becomes more complex complex.

153 DH wants the TC to agree on the direction to take, based on evaluation of pros and cons of each option.  
154 A separate XML schema is better when an accountant needs to determine the legal compliance of a  
155 solution. A separate schema makes this possible. Option (1) does not support this well.

156 Option (3) results in a much more complex schema. Do we prefer to stay close to the core, or to have a  
157 simple schema?

158 CO says that in general sticking to the core is preferable, but not if it becomes too complex.

159 JC points to the examples in <http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/MultiSignatureVerificationReportsProfile>  
160 below "25-07-2008. [BR] [BR]"

161 JC states that the ProcessingDetails element has three elements that can be combined:

- 162 • ValidDetail,
- 163 • IndeterminateDetail,
- 164 • InvalidDetail

165

166 KL states that they are based on the DetailType, which is defined as follows:

```
167 <xs:complexType name="DetailType">  
168   <xs:sequence>  
169     <xs:element name="Code" type="xs:anyURI" minOccurs="0" />  
170     <xs:element name="Message" type="dss:InternationalStringType"  
171       minOccurs="0" />  
172     <xs:any namespace="##other" processContents="lax" minOccurs="0"  
173       maxOccurs="unbounded" />  
174   </xs:sequence>  
175   <xs:attribute name="Type" type="xs:anyURI" use="required" />  
176 </xs:complexType>
```

177

178 The above mentioned elements (ValidDetail, IndeterminedDetail, InvalidDetail)  
179 reference the parts they refer to using URIs. So the URIs would need to be constrained.

180 JC explains that the profile defines fixed values for the Type attribute, and allowed values.

181 DH states that the semantics of the approaches is the same, the difference is the organization of the  
182 schema (more/less core re-use, more/less redundancy). In particular the same information is contained in  
183 the verification report in each approach.

184 JC states that he has no strong opinion on the two approaches, goal was to explore the alternatives.

185 DH states that current draft defines two levels of verification report, one based on DSS Core and the  
186 second for individual verification structure.

187 JC mentions that at Xades plug-test it was found that several vendors are already providing some types  
188 of verification reports. Vendors agreed on a need to standardize these reports. So a report structure  
189 would be useful in other contexts than DSS.

190 KL the plugtest did not constrain the format of the report, some vendors used DSS-derived syntax.

191 KL suggests that we could contact the vendors and ask them what their reporting structures are.

192 MC asks whether it is easier to implement a Core-compliant approach? Is one more efficient than the  
193 other?

194 JC mentions that the option that is closest to the core is less readable.

195 KL adds "Readability, what about XSLT ..."

196 DH asks how tools would use the XML reports? Do they display them using a stylesheet?

197 DH adds that XSLT stylesheets would likely be more complex for the core-compliant approach, as the  
198 main navigation would need to be based on attributes rather than elements.

199 JC asks whether we are ready for a decision?

200 KL points to the relevant part of the Core: [http://docs.oasis-open.org/dss/v1.0/oasis-dss-core-spec-v1.0-  
201 os.html#\\_Toc159076085](http://docs.oasis-open.org/dss/v1.0/oasis-dss-core-spec-v1.0-os.html#_Toc159076085)

202 Pim in particular states that the `DetailType` is extensible.  
203 CO proposes that JC and DH make a proposal to the TC, the other participants have not looked in details  
204 at the options.  
205 KL asks, whether the proposal requires any changes to the core?  
206 DH clarifies that, there is no conflict with core, but the profile does not reuse some DSS Core structures.  
207 JC states that it is not a good message if an extensibility feature that is in the DSS Core is not used.  
208 JC proposes that he and DH will document a proposal that makes a choice and provides the rationale for  
209 the choice.  
210 JC suggests that the document will also contain some example XML documents  
211 KL suggests that the profile could also contain this explanation of the choice so implementers of DSS  
212 understand the options and trade-offs.  
213 JC agreed to add this information as optional non-normative part of the spec.  
214 JC volunteers to contribute to the rationale document. CO and KL volunteer to review this document.  
215 PE asks if there are provisions for PDF in the verification report?  
216 KL states that he will review visible signatutres  
217 DH explains that for XML there is XPath, for PDF there is fieldName, for binary documents offset. So  
218 multiple document types are supported.  
219 EF mentions that he thinks that Andreas wanted to review the Verification Report Profile.  
220 DH states that PDF has "Reason", XAdES has "CommitmentType" and ask whether both should be  
221 supported?  
222 JC recalls that at a workshop of PDF and XAdES someone mentioned that there is overlap between the  
223 two.  
224 AK clarifies that he volunteers to review the verification report profile.  
225 DH asks whether we should wait for the ETSI group to resolve these issues?  
226 JC replies "yes, that is their charter".  
227 PE stresses that some user communities want this today.  
228 EF states that he agrees with Pim. And the terminology used by these users is "Reason" and not  
229 "CommitmentType".  
230 DH proposes that we support multiple options for the moment, and revise (if needed) if the ETSI/PDF  
231 work group comes with a better proposal later.  
232 DH proposes to postpone the discussion of the minor issues until a decision on the main strategy is  
233 made.

huehnlein.detlef 6.10.08 15:54  
Kommentar: Check.

huehnlein.detlef 6.10.08 15:55  
Kommentar: Check.

### 234 3.2.2 Discussion of topics concerning archiving profile

235 Discussion is based on document at <http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/29543/2008-10-03-An%20Archiving%20Profile%20for%20OASIS%20DSS.pdf>  
236  
237 DH starts presentation  
238 DH asks whether the TC supports this use case?  
239 MC replies "yes, CatCert supports this, strong interest from customers".  
240 PE states that there is also interest in the Netherlands.  
241 CO asks whether e-invoicing also needs archival?  
242 DH states that in Germany, archival is needed but not the cryptographic conservation.  
243 DH states that the main interest in this kind of archiving is in government projects.  
244 PE states that there are some additional requirements, like document transformation (e.g. from a usage-  
245 format (e.g. .doc) to .pdf/a)  
246 EF asks whether this is not beyond our scope? Like document management functions?

247 DH replies that document management is out of scope. The proposal only considers the final (archival)  
248 stage.  
249 SD states "ahem, document management no, archival stage yes, this sounds like a floating requirement"  
250 MS asks what kind of archival formats (PDF/A?) are supported?  
251 EF underlines that he wanted to make sure that doc mgmt is out of scope  
252 DH explains that in Germany the recommendation is to first produce durable format (e.g. PDF/A), then  
253 wrap this in XML with metadata.  
254 JC points to the XML-schema for the proposed LTAP-protocol at [http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ltans-](http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ltans-ltap-06#page-55)  
255 [ltap-06#page-55](http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ltans-ltap-06#page-55)  
256 DH explains that the proposed protocol has a similar purpose, but the XML interface in LTA seems to be  
257 underdeveloped. Hence the proposal here would be to base such an interface on DSS base types. The  
258 "storage interface" from middle layer to Long Term Storage could be LTA. The Middle layer serves as a  
259 kind of proxy.  
260 JC stresses that we need a strong case to justify such a development or liaise/collaborate with LTA  
261 people.  
262 AK mentions that this looks like this is an orchestration of multiple services, including DSS.  
263 EF asks, whether the interface to DSS is similar to that of the AdES profile?  
264 EF suggests to re-use or update this profile instead of creating a new archival profile.  
265 JC suggests that we should look more at requirements and study LTA more, before deciding whether to  
266 develop this profile or not.  
267 AK suggests to call this development rather a "usage recommendation" than a profile.  
268 The TC agrees that a rationale / requirements document should be created in order to be able to agree  
269 on further steps.  
270 Ernst Jan van Nigtevecht joins the meeting

### 271 3.3 Encryption profile

272 The following discussion is based on <http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/EncryptionProfile>  
273 CO shows some encryption samples  
274 The TC agrees upon the fact that there should be an encryption-only variant such that encryption can be  
275 used without signing. There are no objections against the standalone-encryption.  
276 PE recalls that the conformance section gives the possibility to defined encryption as minimum  
277 requirement.  
278 DH asks how such a statement would comply with the conformance of the core?  
279 CO explains `EncryptRequest ... EncryptResponse`  
280 KL points at <http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/EncryptionProfile#line-250>  
281 AK states that `EncryptedDocuments` is critical as it maybe empty, in contrast to `DocumentBaseType`.  
282 JC explains to Konrad/Ezer/Stefan that it is a split example with text interleaved.  
283 KL points to <http://wiki.oasis-open.org/dss-x/EncryptionProfile#line-126>  
284 CO introduced a change to next version of the core / errata regarding the `KeySelector`  
285 The TC agrees to adding the `KeySelector` as a top level element.  
286 JC asks Stefan to put an action to add the `KeySelectorType` issue to the errata list.  
287 The TC agreed upon the fact that CMS encryption should be allowed.  
288 JC recalls that profiles have a common way to define urns for profile specific use.  
289 CO asks whether the version should be added to the profile schemas?  
290 JC asks to look for "Same as above, with `xenc:CipherReference`..."below  
291 CO explains that there is one key selector element but maybe there are multiple encryption content to  
292 have several encryption types

huehlein.detlef 6.10.08 16:00  
Kommentar: Check



293 CO asks whether this multiplicity has a real usecase?  
294 SD creates an Action#0085.CREATE Add the KeySelectorType issue to the errata list  
295 JC explains "The second element (InsertEncryptedData), selects a document ( #opaque-data) to  
296 be encrypted and the resulting xenc:EncryptedData to be inserted at the specified destination in  
297 EncryptedDocumen#structured." ... "the one that contains EncryptpANdReplaceData, and  
298 InsertEncryptedData"  
299 JC suggests that there are some explanantions required as the path expressions are absolute, but refer  
300 to the input document  
301 PE asks, whether there is some sort of pipelining available: encrypt with key A, than encrypt with key B?  
302 CO clarifies that it is only possible to 'chain' encryption and signing.  
303 CO states that in case of chaining of encryption and signing the appearance of encryption elements and  
304 core signing elements decide.  
305 DH states that it's good practice to sign first and encrypt in second stage.  
306 JC suggests to take into account what's defined in DecryptionTransform  
307 KL points to <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlenc-decrypt> and <http://www.w3.org/TR/xmlenc-decrypt#sec-introduction>  
308 introduction  
309 CA asks whether there are problems when using chaining of CMS encryption and signing?  
310 CO answers a question concerning the use of attachments and states that it's perfectly correct to refer to  
311 attachment data.  
312 KL adds that attachment references are treated as being implicitly part of the request. [OK?]-5  
313 CO states that SignedReferences cannot be interleaved with other ( encryption ) elements.  
314 CO suggests to make SignedReference a named top level element.  
315 DH and JC volunteer as reviewers for the encryption profile.

huehnlein.detlef 6.10.08 16:02  
Kommentar: Check.

### 316 3.4 ebXML profile

317 PE states that there were no comments on ebXML profile.  
318 The TC agreed on motion for progressing the ebXML profile as committee spec.  
319 KL abstained, all others agreed.  
320 There is an Action#0086.CREATE Open ballot for progressing the ebXML profile as committee spec

### 321 3.5 European Signature Law profile

322 EF states that one question is 'can DSS align with EU directive?'  
323 EF adds that there are too few real use cases to define such an EU profile  
324 MC suggests to write some recommendations to build a EU directive compliant server  
325 AK remarks that the DSS TC is at the interface level, we can't solve the EU compliance problems in DSS  
326 DH suggests to check whether legal measures (as sketched in Section 2 of  
327 [http://www.ecsec.de/pub/2004\\_PKI.pdf](http://www.ecsec.de/pub/2004_PKI.pdf) ) can be used to solve the problem.

328 **4 Committee work-plan**

- 329 JC states that we should concentrate on one or two profiles for the near future.
- 330 DH makes clear that he would prefer to accomplish encryption and verification asap.
- 331 JC suggests to concentrate for two or three meetings on one profile.
- 332 KL suggests that the editors and reviewers may meet in every second week where there is no conf call.
- 333 JC suggests to start with two TC meetings per profile.
- 334 EF states that there is no personal restriction for the work on visual profile
- 335 KL points to [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/manage/add_event.php?day=1223287200)
- 336 [x/manage/add\\_event.php?day=1223287200](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/manage/add_event.php?day=1223287200)
- 337 DH suggests to start with encryption profile.
- 338 The TC agreed on the schedule: encryption, verification report, visual signatures
- 339 There will be an ACTION on the chairs to contact the editors to build deadlines for the different profiles
- 340 JC states that he will circulate the work plan before the next meeting
- 341 JC states that we will discuss the work plan on the Oct, 13.
- 342 JC suggested a discussion to have f2f meetings with a 3 month frequency.
- 343 SD created an Action#0087.CREATE Contact the editors to build deadlines for the different profiles.

344 **5 Any other business**

345 **5.1 Reply to ODF-question**

346 JC pointed to [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/email/archives/200809/msg00027.html)  
347 [x/email/archives/200809/msg00027.html](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/email/archives/200809/msg00027.html) and explained that some of the question regarding ODF are  
348 forwarded to the ESI group, one issue ( #4 ) left for the DSS-X TC.

349 There is an action on all to review the reply to ODF until October 8th, 2008

350 SD created an Actio#0088.CREATE Review the reply to ODF

351 **5.2 BIOSIG2009-Workshop**

352 DH stated that there will be a workshop on (biometrics and) electronic signatures in June or September  
353 2009 (in Darmstadt, Germany). It would be highly appreciated, if TC-members would like to

- 354 • join the program committee (suggest topics, help to review submissions etc.)  
355 • contribute papers / talks  
356 • etc.

357

358 As in the last years there will be proceedings for the workshop, which are indexed by DBLP for example  
359 (see <http://www.informatik.uni-trier.de/~ley/db/conf/biosig/biosig2007.html> and [http://gi-](http://gi-ev.de/fachbereiche/sicherheit/fg/biosig/index.htm)  
360 [ev.de/fachbereiche/sicherheit/fg/biosig/index.htm](http://gi-ev.de/fachbereiche/sicherheit/fg/biosig/index.htm) ).

361 The draft of the CfP is at [http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/29566/BIOSIG2009-CfP-eng_081004.doc)  
362 [x/download.php/29566/BIOSIG2009-CfP-eng\\_081004.doc](http://www.oasis-open.org/apps/org/workgroup/dss-x/download.php/29566/BIOSIG2009-CfP-eng_081004.doc) .