

Please suggest
a better name!

Clarification of RFC7030 CSR Attributes definition draft-richardson-lamps-rfc7030-csrattrs

Michael Richardson <mcr+ietf@sandelman.ca>

Dan Harkins (Industrial Lounge)

D. von Orheimb (Siemens)

Owen Friel (Cisco)

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

```
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
           :           'rfc8994+fd739fc23c34401122334455000000000+@acp.ex'
           :           'ample.com'
           :         }
           :       }
           :     }
           :   }
           : }
```

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.ex'
      :    'ample.com'
      :    }
      :    }
      :    }
      :    }
      :    }
      :    }
      :    }
```

critical

Discussion/Questions

Time to adopt document?

