Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/(Privacy Policy)
Agenda

- Note Well, technical difficulties and administrivia – 5 min
- Document Status (chairs) – 10 min
- ACME Integrations (Owen) – 10 min
- ACME Subdomains (Owen) – 10 minutes
- Where do we go from here? (chairs) – 15 minutes
- AOB – 10 minutes
Document Status (1/4)

- Extensions to ACME for End-User S/MIME Certificates
  - draft-ietf-acme-email-smime
  - Published in April as RFC 8823
  - Thanks for the work, Alexey.

- An ACME Profile for Generating Delegated Certificates
  - draft-ietf-acme-star-delegation
  - Went through IETF LC, directorate reviews and IESG review
  - Now in RFC Editor’s queue.
  - Thanks, Yaron, Diego, Antonio, and Thomas.
Document Status (2/4)

- **ACME Challenges Using an Authority Token**
  - draft-ietf-acme-authority-token
  - Received AD review in October
  - New version in July

- **TNAuthList profile of ACME Authority Token**
  - draft-ietf-acme-authority-token-tnauthlist
  - Submitted to IESG review last August
  - Waiting for authority-token
Document Status (3/4)

• ACME DTN Node ID Validation Extension
  - draft-ietf-acme-dtnnodeid
  - Went through WGLC and submitted to IESG review
  - Roman reviewed the draft (just last week). Changes are required.

• ACME Integrations
  - draft-ietf-acme-integrations
  - Revision -04 posted.
  - Very few comments at WGLC. This needs more review.
Document Status (4/4)

- **ACME for Subdomains**
  - draft-friel-acme-subdomains
  - Have version -05
  - Not (yet) adopted

- **ACME Extension for Single Sign On Challenges**
  - draft-biggs-acme-sso
  - Version -01 published
  - Not much discussion on the list
PRESENTATIONS
WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?
Where do we go from here?

- The group has low energy
- Documents get little review
- We’re not likely to run out of people wanting a small extension or a novel use-case, but very little in the way of adoption or widespread interest beyond the web use-case covered by the base document.
- So the question to discuss is whether it’s worth continuing as a working group.
OPEN MIC / AOB