

DRIP Architecture IESG Review Summary

Stuart Card, Adam Wiethuechter, Robert Moskowitz, Shuai Zhao, Andrei Gurtov

IESG review on draft-ietf-drip-arch-24

- Received 11 IESG reviews: 1 x Discussion, 10 x no objections
- Mostly Editorial
- Discussion points focusing on:
 - Figure 4, DRIP Architecture
 - Some terminologies (ex. V2I, GPOD, PSOD, V2V) are not used in DRIP-architecture.
 - CS-RID is not referenced in the architecture diagram.
 - Missing Reference to [I-D.ietf-drip-rid]
 - Outdated ASTM F3411 information
 - Security concerns from Roman Danyliw.

Proposed fix in draft-ietf-drip-arch-25

- Replied to all reviewers with proposed solutions for each the comments.
- Fix the editorials based on the IESG review. Thanks [Dave Thaler] for the detailed markup.
- Discussion on “Definition of a HHIT”.
 - Update in sections 1, 3, 3,3 and add reference to ietf-drip-rid.
- Discussion on “Verification process of claims/assertions”
 - Propose no changes, but more text may be added in I-D.ietf-drip-auth
- Discussion on Section 9 “Privacy & Transparency Considerations”
 - Propose no changes.

Proposed fix in draft-ietf-drip-arch-25

- Figure 4. “This diagram introduces a lot of complexity, but then doesn’t reference architectural elements later by these names – GPOD and PSOD; and these use cases too -- V2I, VV. Are those additional labels needed?”
 - added an Informative note under figure 4 “Informative note: see [RFC9153] for detailed definitions.”
- Updated reference for F3411-12a: <https://www.astm.org/f3411-22.html>
- Section 3.2: Provide clear text on how to compute 84 bytes
- Section 4.1.2: updated text reflect informative reference to [I-D.ietf-drip-auth] and [I-D.ietf-drip-registries]
- Section 7: updated text for 3rd paragraph explaining secure communication channel

Next up...

- Wrap up the remaining minor issues in two weeks and upload new revision draft-ietf-drip-arch-26.

Thanks