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Please suggest a better name!
The Story so far

- RFC7030 was unclear about CSR attributes
- RFC8994 (ACP) and RFC8995 (BRSKI) made an assumption that values could be provided
  - (RFC7030 and RFC8995 have one author in common)
- We had a virtual interim meeting at the end of August
  - https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/interim-2021-lamps-02/session/lamps
  - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yAg9hKE844g
- We seemed to come to conclude that we need to issue an Updates RFC7030 to fix the CSR Attributes
  - That the document was correct, and the ACP usage was wrong.
  - That the only real problem was that we needed an extra layer of ExtentionRequest to hold the subjectAltName components.
What WRONG looked like

```plaintext
0  72: SEQUENCE {
2  70:   SEQUENCE {
4  3:     OBJECT IDENTIFIER subjectAltName (2 5 29 17)
9  63:     SET {
11  61:       SEQUENCE {
13  59:         [1] {
15  57:           UTF8String
2:             'rfc8994+fd739fc23c34401122334455000000000+@acp.example.com'
3:             'ample.com'
4:             }
5:               }
6:             }
7:           }
8:         }
9:     }
10:   }
11: }
```
What RIGHT now looks like

```
0  90: SEQUENCE {
2  88:   SEQUENCE {
4   9:     OBJECT IDENTIFIER extensionRequest (1 2 840 113549 1 9 14)
15  75:     SET {
17  73:       SEQUENCE {
19  3:         OBJECT IDENTIFIER subjectAltName (2 5 29 17)
24  3:           [0] {
26  1:             BOOLEAN TRUE
:           }
29  61:         SEQUENCE {
31  59:           [0] {
33  57:             UTF8String
:               'rfc8994+fd739fc23c3440112233445500000000+@acp.example.com'
:             }
:           }
:         }
:       }
:     }
:   }
: }
```
Discussion/Questions

Time to adopt document?