Trust Anchor Management (TAM) Specifications

November 10, 2009

Carl Wallace
cwallace@cygnacom.com

Suggested Way Forward (from Stockholm)

- Wrap up IETF last call for TAF
- Hold working group last call for revised TAMP draft
  - draft-ietf-pkix-tamp-03.txt (will be submitted in August)
- Address expiration of requirements draft
  - No change version bump, allow to expire, progress towards informational?

Since Stockholm

- Several revised drafts
  - One new version of TAF
  - Two new versions of TAMP (in October, not August, as planned)
  - One new version of TAM Requirements (version bump only)
- TAF completed IETF LC
- TAMP entered WG LC
  - Some minor edits resulted in new version

Since Stockholm (continued)

- Current PKIX drafts
  - draft-ietf-pkix-ta-format-04
  - draft-ietf-pkix-tamp-04
  - draft-ietf-pkix-ta-mgmt-reqs-04
- Related
  - draft-wallace-using-ta-constraints-01
  - draft-housley-cms-content-constraints-extn-02
    - -03 version will be posted soon to correct mistake in ASN.1 module introduced in -01 draft

TAM Requirements changes

- Version bump only due to I-D expiration

TAF changes

- Added reference to X.680 to introduction
- Clarify some references to TA entities vs. TA information
- Clarification regarding usage of version field
- Added pathLenConstraint to the CertPathControls structure
- Added field to provide language tag for the TA title field

TAMP changes

- -03 includes changes previewed in Stockholm
  - Corrected a tagging issue with VerboseApexUpdateConfirm
  - Added usesApex field to TAMPStatusResponse and VerboseUpdateConfirm
  - MIME type registration information
  - TAMP over HTTP appendix
  - Corrected import statements in ASN.1 module to refer to modules in new ASN.1 document

TAMP WG LC

- Changes made resulting from WG LC
  - Clarify references to TA entity vs. TA information
  - Incorporate trust anchor store definition from TAM requirements draft
  - Assorted editorial changes
- Proceed with IESG submission?
  - Outstanding issues best addressed independent of this draft, if there is interest (i.e., EKU constraints, TA validity)

Suggested Way Forward

- Address any RFC editor issues with TAF
- Submit TAMP to IESG
  - Address any IESG last call issues for TAMP
- Submit TAM requirements draft to IESG as informational